

importance will detach the sympathy of sensible Churchmen and excite the ridicule of the world outside.

The Discipline Bill is an attempt in the right direction. Either the Civil Court or the Church Court must try a delinquent clergyman. Both cannot. Common sense revolts against two independent trials, which might result in a man being sent to penal servitude by the State, and retained in his cure of souls by the Church. On the other hand, the country will never consent to a clergyman being exempt from the ordinary criminal law which governs lay people. In fighting for trial by Canon Law in an Ecclesiastical Court Churchmen are making a demand which no Parliament will ever concede, and are thus rendering an urgent Church reform impossible, to the joy and satisfaction of the Liberationists. And for what? For the sake of preserving for the Church imaginary rights which never existed, and of vindicating for the Canon Law a spiritual character which it never possessed.

LEWIS T. DIBDIN.

ART. VI.—“THE LAW IN THE PROPHETS.”

The Law in the Prophets. By the Rev. STANLEY LEATHES, D.D. Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1891.

A WELL-KNOWN critic of the “advanced” school—I think it is Wellhausen himself—has somewhere described the delight with which he arrived at the conclusion that the prophets preceded the law, and not the law the prophets. Before this he found the history of Israel an unexplained riddle. The law forbade high places, but Samuel and Solomon sacrificed in them without incurring censure, and Jehoiada the high-priest and Jotham the king did not remove the high places. Hence arose the dilemma: either this part of the law existed and was broken by the best men of Israel, or these men were blameless because no law existed to blame what they did. It was this second solution which our critic accepted with so much joy.

But if there was no special law existing even as late as Jotham (the grandfather of Hezekiah) against high places, was there, therefore, at that time no Pentateuch, no book or books of Moses at all? There was at least, says the newer criticism, no Book of Deuteronomy, neither was there a book beginning with the story of six days of creation, and including the account of the construction of the tabernacle and the list of laws touching the rights and duties of the priesthood. There may well have been, however, according to the newer critics, a historical work, or, at least, the materials of one, beginning

with the allusions to creation contained in Gen. ii. 4, ff., and covering most of the ground covered by our present Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua. It is allowed, in fact, that there may have existed in the time of Jotham, and perhaps a hundred years earlier, a writing or writings containing the lives of the patriarchs, the story of Joseph, the history of the Egyptian oppression, of the plagues, of the exodus, of the wandering and of the conquest of Canaan. Thus the question between the newer criticism and the old view is not, Were there "books of Moses" at all in the eighth century B.C. ? but, Were the writings then existent practically identical with our Pentateuch, or did they lack a great mass of material consisting of many separate narratives, the great bulk of the ceremonial law, and the whole Book of Deuteronomy ?

For a decision both sides appeal to the prophets of the eighth century, particularly to Hosea and Amos, who prophesied during the first half of the century, and to Isaiah and Micah, whose activity belongs to the second half. It is necessary to recognise clearly what are and what are not decisive elements in the decision. The new critical school rely partly on the silence of the prophets just mentioned as to the Book of Deuteronomy, and as to those sections in the remaining books of the Pentateuch which are styled "Priestly," and partly on the supposed actual antagonism of the prophets to the principles and injunctions of the priestly sections.

Two courses are open to the opponents of this school. They may, in the first place, produce external rebutting evidence. They may call attention to allusions to Deuteronomy or to the "Priestly Code," or to both, occurring in the prophets of the eighth century, but overlooked by recent critics. Secondly, they may put to the proof the arguments based on internal evidence against the unity of the Pentateuch. If these arguments can be shown to be unreasonable, then the many acknowledged allusions to Pentateuchal narratives and ordinances occurring in the prophets of the eighth century will be most reasonably referred to the Pentateuch as we have it, and the theories that Deuteronomy was first published under Josiah, and that the "Priestly Code" was first codified under Ezra, fall to the ground.

Of course, even so the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch is not *proved*, for it is a far cry—six centuries at least—from Hosea to Moses ; but if it can be shown that Hosea and Amos, Isaiah and Micah, all refer and appeal to the Pentateuch, it becomes clear that the Pentateuch has a history behind it, and the supposition of its Mosaic authorship becomes reasonable.

The course adopted by the author of the "Law in the

Prophets" is the accumulation of external evidence for the existence and authority of the Pentateuch. Dr. Leathes, beginning with Isaiah, goes through the prophets in the order in which they are arranged in the Authorized Version, quoting parallels from the law wherever possible. He rarely deals with the suggestion often made by recent critics, that in such passages the Pentateuch depends on the prophets rather than *vice versâ*.

Out of the mass of parallels produced by the author, a few of the more striking may be given here. The author himself prefixes an asterisk to distinguish them:

Isa. i. 9. "The reference to Sodom and Gomorrah," writes Dr. Leathes, "presupposes the narrative in Gen. xix. . . . The word in [Isa. i.] ver. 7, 'as *overthrown* by strangers,' is used again of Sodom and Gomorrah in Isa. xiii. 19; but the original of the expression is that in Gen. xix. 25, 'and He *overthrew* those cities.'"

(It must be acknowledged that this parallel does not of itself score any point against the newer criticism, which assigns Gen. xix. 25, and the narrative to which it belongs, to the "Jehovist," *i.e.*, to a date between 750 and 900 B.C.)

Ver. 12. "'To appear before Me' = Exod. xxiii. 15, 'They shall not appear before Me empty.'"

(Neither does this parallel touch the results of the newer criticism, for Exod. xxiii. 15 is likewise assigned to the "Jehovist.")

Ver. 13. "'Assembly' (Heb. 'Mikra')."

(This word occurs some twenty times in the Pentateuch, and always, as far as I am aware, in "Priestly" passages. Further, we have, as Dr. Leathes points out, the word "solemn meeting" ('Atsarah) in the same verse. The word in its alternative form ('Atsereth) occurs once in Deuteronomy and twice in the Priestly Code. The union of Mikra and 'Atsarah forms a noticeable parallel to Lev. xxiii. 36 (a "Priestly" passage), for both words are special rather than general in their reference.)

Ver. 24. "'The mighty one of Israel' = Gen. xlix. 24, 'the mighty one of Jacob.'"

(The word here is a very peculiar one, אֵלֵּי. A translation has been suggested, "The Bull (the Apis) of Israel," as though the word were אַבְיָר. Here, again, it must be confessed that the parallel does not, taken by itself, affect the results of the newer criticism. Gen. xlix. 24 is ascribed to the "Jehovist.")

Let us now pass to a prophet whose activity was almost over before Isaiah's began, Hosea, the great prophet of the Northern Kingdom. We will again quote from those parallels which Dr. Leathes has marked with an asterisk as most important:

Hos. ix. 10. "'They went to Baal Peor, and separated them to that shame' = Num. xxv. 3, 'And Israel joined himself to Baal Peor.'"

(Again the parallel is drawn from the "Jehovist," and so does not meet the newer criticism.)

Hos. xi. 8. "'How shall I make thee as Admah? how shall I set thee as Zeboim?' These places," writes Dr. Leathes, "are not mentioned except in Gen. x. 19; xiv. 2, 8; and Deut. xxix. 23."

(Gen. xiv. is said by the newer critics generally to be taken from a special source. Probably they would accept this reference in Hosea as proving that this "special source" existed in the prophet's day.)

To the objection that the most striking quotations cited from the prophets do not affect the theories of the critics, Dr. Leathes might make one of two answers. He might say that his book is written to reassure those who imagine that the new criticism has proved that the whole Pentateuch was a forgery composed after the Captivity. For such a purpose Dr. Leathes' quotations from the prophets are fully adequate. But the author would more probably give a different answer. In the latter half of the book reference is made to some of the arguments against the unity of the Pentateuch based on internal evidence. Dr. Leathes brings forward some important considerations affecting this internal evidence, and would probably, therefore, claim his quotations from the prophets of the eighth century as evidence for the whole Pentateuch, and not merely for the so-called "Jehovistic" sections.

Among these considerations is the note on the use of the Divine names (p. 295, ff.). When the critics teach us that we must distinguish between a later "Elohistic" (the "Priestly Writer"), who is everything that the "Jehovist" (the "Prophetic Writer") is not, and an earlier "Elohistic," who is related to the "Jehovist," when, further, the existence of a redactor is maintained who introduced the name "Elohim" into "Jehovistic" sections, and the name "Jehovah" into "Elohistic" sections, it is clear that Professor Leathes is right when he says that "this test (the test of diversity of Divine names) alone is one that cannot be trusted absolutely" (p. 301).

Again, on the same page, there are some just observations on real and imagined difference of language as a test of different authorship. "It was asserted," says Dr. Leathes, "that the Elohistic would use the phrase 'establish a covenant,' *hekim berith*, while the Jehovist would prefer the expression 'make a covenant,' *karath berith*; but it was entirely forgotten that these two phrases were no more identical and inter-

changeable...than our own to *make* a promise and to *keep* one.”

On p. 290 Dr. Leathes rightly challenges the assumption that the text of Exod. xx. 24 (“In all places where I record My name I will come unto thee and I will bless thee”) gives the virtual permission in consequence of which the worship on high places was adopted and allowed. I am, however, unable to accept the author’s correction of the translation, viz., “in all the place” (*i.e.*, throughout all the land). It seems better to accept the second of Dr. Driver’s alternatives (“Introduction,” p. 81, *note*): “The expression [“In all places”] may include equally places conceived as existing contemporaneously *or selected successively*.” In this second case the promise of blessing would attach to Shiloh, Kiriath-jearim, the house of Obed-edom and the city of David in succession, and the history of Israel from Joshua to Solomon is the fulfilment of the promise.

Not the least useful part of Dr. Leathes’ book is the collection of passages from the New Testament illustrating our Lord’s appeal to the Old Testament (pp. 239-244). The Christian must look upon the Jewish Scriptures as Christ looked upon them. He will not regard them as perfect, for Christ said that some precepts were given because of the hardness of heart (*i.e.*, the inability to receive anything higher) of those who received them; but he will regard them as Divine, because Christ said, “These are they that bear witness of Me” (St. John v. 39).

In conclusion, a word of general criticism may be allowed. The book as a whole seems somewhat hastily put together. The critics, with great expenditure of learning, have entrenched a position, not impregnable indeed, but too strong to be taken by a hastily organized assault. It must rather be assailed by a patient investigation as thorough as the work of the critics themselves.

W. E. BARNES.

Notes on Bible Words.

NO. XIX.—“VISITATION.”

VISITATION, in A.V., is the Hebrew בְּקָרָה, and the Greek ἐπισκοπή, the Vulgate being usually *visitatio*. (Our ecclesiastical word “Visitation” is suggestive.)

The Hebrew word means care, oversight; God looking into, searching out, the ways and character of men.