

does not favour an early date, nor a close relation to any apostle, nor a higher rank as a historical authority than some removes below the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The evidence of the title Ariston Eritzou must be discussed hereafter.

B. W. BACON.

WELLHAUSEN.¹

THE name of Wellhausen is well known to English readers as that of the foremost representative of the dominant school of Old Testament criticism. Since the publication of his *History of Israel*, vol. i., in 1878, he has rightly occupied that place. But this is only one side of his remarkable personality and work. He is without question the greatest living force in the whole field of Old Testament scholarship. He has also done work of the first importance in the near-lying fields of Arabic history and religion, and—especially of late years—the origins of Christianity. In all these departments his finest work is constructive, and is marked by rare insight into the movements of the religious spirit. Wellhausen himself is anything but the cold dry critic of popular imagination. He is a man of deep religious feeling, who finds in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments a real revelation from the living God, and whose studies are all inspired by that faith.

Julius Wellhausen was born May 17, 1844, in the picturesque old town of Hameln on the Weser, where his father was pastor. He received his early education in his native town, and afterwards for a few years in Hanover.

¹ I wish to express my obligation to Professor Wellhausen for the kind interest he has taken in the preparation of these articles. To him I am indebted for the more personal details I have been able to introduce, as well as for the use of his early *Dissertation*. He has also read the manuscript, and approved my presentation of his aims and work as just. I should like also to express my indebtedness to Professor Duff, Bradford, for friendly counsel and help.

Then, in the spring of 1862, he entered Göttingen as a student of theology. The theological faculty of that time was somewhat colourless, and the young student found no inspiration there. Even Ritschl, who joined the faculty in 1864, and who exercised so strong an influence on the younger theologians of Germany, failed to win him. He was impressed by his personality and spiritual force; but his dogmatics (he says) "left me cold." The man to whom he owed his intellectual awakening, and to whom he refers as his "unforgotten teacher," was Ewald, the renowned Orientalist and historian of Israel. Ewald was then past the meridian splendour of his fame, but he was still the "teacher without a peer" (*der Lehrer ohne Gleichen*), possessed of the finest insight into the spirit of the Old Testament, and with the subtle power of enthusing his students with his own love for Israel's prophets and poets. Under his inspiration Wellhausen found his true bent, and devoted himself to the study of Semitic languages, and to the history and religion of Israel. As a student, he was also strongly influenced by Lotze, the most distinguished ornament of the philosophical faculty of Göttingen, who found in a thorough-going application of scientific principles the sure basis for his serene faith in God as the personal Spirit immanent in all things, and his lofty teleological view of the universe and man. At a somewhat later date he came under the influence also of Carlyle, whose *Sartor Resartus* was one of the books which most inspired him.

In 1868 Wellhausen began his professorial career as *Repetent* (University tutor) in his *alma mater*. Two years later he became *Privat-docent* (lecturer). The thesis he submitted for licence was the Dissertation *De Gentibus et Familiis Judæis quæ 1 Chr. ii. iv. enumerantur*. This slim essay of forty-one pages on what seems so forbidding a subject, is a fitting introduction to Wellhausen's literary activity. It exhibits the same clearness and sanity of

critical judgment, combined with a just sense of historical fact, which distinguishes all his work. He sees in these chapters no *mera nomina, quae nihil narrent quod scire cupiamus, nihil sibi elici patiantur quod nostra referat*. They are rather like names on tombstones, or dry bones, which when put together, "bone to his bone," and clothed in imagination with flesh and blood, recall the life of other days. Wellhausen shows rare skill, both in the arrangement and in the imaginative clothing of the "bones." He notes at the outset that the names are those, not of individuals (though some may originally be personal names), but of tribes, families, and guilds, and some even of cities, districts, and mountains. He argues accordingly that the relationships described in terms of marriage and sonship are really those of the communities or clans in question. Following lines already laid down by Ewald, he sets forth the general principles of a true interpretation. Thus the bond of brotherhood implies near relation, and the marriage tie the union, of families. Or if the name of the wife be that of a region or city, marriage implies the settlement of the clan in that particular place. A second marriage suggests a change of residence (e.g., ii. 18 ff.; 25 f.). Further study of the genealogies betrays the fact of variants, and a comparison with other books of the Bible shows that the conditions implied are partly pre-exilic, and partly post-exilic. Thus arranging the "dry bones" in order, he is able—apart from suggestive sidelights—to sketch an interesting piece of Jewish history, the wanderings and settlements of the Calebite and Jerahmeelite families, from the period when they emerged as nomads from the desert to win an inheritance in the Negeb of Judah, until they gradually attained to the hegemony of the whole tribe, and down to the time when they returned from the exile to find new settlements in the hill country of Ephraim.¹

¹ Wellhausen's principles of interpretation, as well as his general

I cannot refrain from quoting the last paragraph of this interesting brochure: *Atque haec quidem hactenus. Putaverit quis parturisse montes, nasci ridiculum murem. Me si quidem mus evenerit, exercuisse montes non taedebit. Si vero cui videor nimis audacter disputasse, equidem citius ex errore quam ex confusione emergit veritas.* These words are thoroughly characteristic of Wellhausen, and indeed of every true scholar.

The young *Privat-docent* had thus given proof of his powers. The following year he greatly enhanced his reputation by his brilliant study of the *Text der Bücher Samuelis*. This work he modestly introduces as but "a contribution to some future critical edition of the Old Testament." In reality it marks a distinct epoch in textual criticism.¹ In the introduction, Wellhausen lays down "once for all" (as Davidson says) "the principles according to which the Greek or any version can be rightly used in textual criticism." De Lagarde had already insisted that we cannot accept the LXX., as it stands, for critical purposes; we must attempt to reach the original form of the text; and to this end we must compare, as far as practicable, the different MSS., the variant Greek translations, with the Peschito and the Vulgate, and the quotations from the Fathers. He had also laid down the general canons of criticism: that we must proceed eclectically, inasmuch as the translators were eclectic in their methods, but that as a rule we should accept a free translation in preference to one slavishly literal, and a rendering which implies a variant from the Massoretic text, in preference to

results, are accepted by subsequent scholars. Cf. the *Comms.* by Kittel and Benzinger, and the arts. by E. L. Curtis in the *Dict. Bib.*, and S. A. Cook in the *Encyc. Bib.* Thus, within its own limits, this early Dissertation is as "epoch-making" as the later works.

¹ In the introduction to his *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, Driver refers to Wellhausen's *Text* as "an unpretending but epoch-making work." Davidson homologates this judgment (*Theol. Rev.* Apr. 1890, p. 263).

one directly derived from that text, as the most probable representative of the original.¹ Wellhausen starts from de Lagarde's principles, but he carries them out with a breadth, force and thoroughness all his own. In particular he insists on an accurate knowledge of the relations—the genealogical descent, as it were—of the various Recensions and Manuscripts, and the origin and history of their variant readings; on a true appreciation of their “style of translation,” not only in general, but also in the different books, and observance of the errors into which they are liable, whether by chance or design, to fall; and on an accurate knowledge both of Hebrew and of Jewish-Greek. Very often, when the original form of the Greek translation has been thus ascertained, the true Hebrew text in dispute will appear. If not, recourse must be had to conjectural emendation. Wellhausen strongly condemns haphazard and unmethodical conjectures. The true critic must exercise great judgment, and his emendations must proceed from a mind thoroughly at home in Hebrew and Semitic style. Literary appreciation and sound historical sense must likewise go hand in hand with textual criticism.

Of course, these are “counsels of perfection.” But in criticism, as in all else, a high ideal is the only way to success. In the body of the book Wellhausen gives a really brilliant illustration of his method. His criticism of the text of Samuel shows a judgment as fine as his scholarship, and a conjectural power as remarkable as his care in the collation of variant readings.² As the result, he has enriched Old Testament scholarship by a series of most “successful and happy emendations” (Davidson).³

¹ V. his *Anmerkungen zur Griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverbien*, p. 3.

² As examples of Wellhausen's conjectural power, we may cite his emendations in 2 Sam. xiii. 34 and 39, xv. 23, and xxiv. 5 f., which were afterwards “brilliantly confirmed” (Driver) by the readings found in Lucian's Recension of the LXX.

³ Driver's admirable *Text of Samuel* will give the English reader the

The author of the *Text of Samuel* must have appeared to de Lagarde "a man after his own heart." If any one scholar was adequate to the task of elaborating a new critical edition of the Old Testament text, this surely was the man. But Wellhausen's chief interest was not in textual studies. He refers to these as but seed sown. The fruit he looked for was the better understanding of the Old Testament as a revelation of the truth of God. And all his studies in textual and historical criticism were means to this end.

Wellhausen had now made his mark in the theological world, and in 1872 he was called to the chair of Old Testament literature in Greifswald. He threw himself with characteristic zeal into his new work, "winning golden opinions by the modesty, vivacity and friendliness of his demeanour, and by the marked ability of his lectures."¹ His college work put a temporary check on his literary activity. But the conferring of the degree of *summi in theologia honores*, with which his old University "surprised" him, called forth—as a *Δόσις ὀλίγη* by way of thanks—perhaps the most interesting and important of his minor works, the monograph on *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer* (Greifs., 1874). In this treatise Wellhausen gave the first real evidence of his great powers as a writer of religious history. Here we find the wide learning and accurate scholarship,² the incisive, but sane and well-

best idea of the importance of Wellhausen's work. Driver offers the following plea for what may appear an excessive dependence on Wellhausen: "I could not withhold from English scholars some of the best and soundest results which have been gained for the textual criticism of the Old Testament." The latest German commentators, Nowack and Budde, draw almost as freely from the same source.

¹ Curtiss, art. on "Wellhausen's Theory of the Pentateuch," *EXPOSITOR*, 3rd Series, vol. iii. p. 81.

² A notable example of Wellhausen's scholarship is found in the translation (with introduction and critical notes) of the *Psalter of Solomon*, which he introduces as an appendix to this book. Wellhausen's general results, as to date etc., are accepted by all subsequent editors of the *Psalter*.

balanced criticism,¹ the delicate spiritual perception and the broad historical construction, which are so characteristic of his later and greater works—already couched in that wonderfully lucid, vigorous and nervous style which is the envy and despair of German theological writers.²

Wellhausen does full justice to the nobler side of the Pharisees' character. They were really religious men, who kept alive the fire of religious enthusiasm through ages of spiritual declension. They believed in God, and sought His righteousness as their chief end in life. Their ambition was to bring the whole of life within the religious domain; and they sought to realize this ideal both day and night.³ Thus, in spite of the contrast in method, Wellhausen pertinently observes, Pharisaism and Christianity were really one in spiritual outlook, motive and aim. "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness" was as truly the Pharisaic ideal as the Christian. The other side—"*die Schattenseite*"—of the Pharisaic character is drawn with vivid and impressive strokes. "While the practice of piety was never pursued with greater zeal, the bane of intellectualism never dominated that practice more fatally." "Under its wretched yoke the most sincere and earnest piety was crushed." "The mass of derived material choked the spring; the 613 commandments of the written law, and the thousand other of the unwritten, left no room for conscience.

¹ Those who regard Wellhausen as essentially a destructive critic should study his vigorous defence of the historical value of the New Testament and Josephus as contrasted with the falsified and prejudiced traditions of the Talmud, on which Hausrath and other scholars had chiefly relied (v. pp. 42 f. 121 ff.).

² This style, with its "hatred of conventional phraseology, and love of simplicity and directness," Wellhausen says he possessed from childhood; he adds: "I grew up in association with very simple and very realistic people."

³ Wellhausen describes the Pharisees roundly as "the party of the scribes." This is perhaps too absolute. But he is right in emphasizing the spiritual kinship of scribes and Pharisees. The former were the students of the law ("*die lehrenden νομικοί*"), the latter the practical devotees of the law ("*die wandelnden νομικοί*").

The sum-total of the means became the end. In their devotion to the law men forgot God, and in their attention to the etiquette which surrounded approach (*προσαγωγή*) to God they forgot to approach Him." Thus Pharisaism became no better than "moral and religious materialism," while with many it developed that spirit of overweening pride and hypocrisy on which Jesus poured out His vials of wrath.

Wellhausen also rightly characterizes the opposition of Pharisees and Sadducees as one, not of official prerogative, but of practical views, principles and tendencies of life. Officially, the Sadducees were the party of the High-priests,¹ and as such should have been actuated by the same religious zeal as the Pharisees. But they had become immersed in the strife of worldly politics, and cared not really for the sacred duties of their vocation as priests, but for their worldly position and influence as aristocrats and rulers. Thus, while the Pharisees represented the Law, the Sadducees—in spite of their office—were worldlings in temper, ambition and practice.

This opposition in "practical philosophy" Wellhausen explains by the view, which he takes up and champions with characteristic force and learning, that the first Sadducees were no other than the adherents of Judas Maccabaeus and his brothers, towards whom the spiritual ancestors of the Pharisees—the Asidaeans—maintained from the first an independent, and afterwards a hostile, attitude.² In the early stages of the war of independence,

¹ Following Geiger, Wellhausen derives the name from Zadok, the high-priest of Solomon's reign. This view has received much support since then, and still appears the most plausible.

² The prevalent view, represented by Schürer (e.g.), is that the Sadducees were the direct descendants of the old Hellenizing Zadokite party, who were indifferent to the Maccabees and their cause (though at a later date they won them over to their side), while the Asidaeans were the real "heroes" of the struggle. This view finds its chief support in 2 Macc. xiv.—an authority, however, of quite secondary rank. Wellhausen's view

when the purity of the law and the worship of God was the battle-cry, the Asidaeans were ardent supporters of the Maccabees, though even then they were a separate party (*συναγωγή*). But when the cause they had at heart prevailed, when the temple of God was purged, and His worship restored, and above all when the conquerors usurped the priesthood, and prostituted the sacred office by using it to further their own worldly ends, the Asidaeans set themselves in deliberate opposition against them. This came to light first when they supported the claims of Alcimus ("a priest of the seed of Aaron") to the high-priesthood, as against the pretensions of the new rulers. And the more worldly the character assumed by the Maccabaeian priest-kingdom, the more resolute and persistent grew their opposition. In this Wellhausen finds the real root of bitterness between the Pharisees and the Sadducees. The Pharisees were the strictly religious party, proud in their devotion to their heavenly King, and seeking first His kingdom. The Sadducees were the pillars of the new Maccabaeian, or Hasmonaeian, State, as proud in their allegiance to their earthly king, and seeking first the glory of that kingdom. From this fundamental opposition in principle Wellhausen traces all the other differences which separated the two parties so sharply; here, too, he finds the key which explains their divergent policy during all the strange vicissitudes which marked the last tragic years of Jewish history.

In this monograph we have an interesting sign that Wellhausen's mind already turned, not on trivial details of scholarship, but on cardinal questions of faith and life. In this light, the book is a suggestive forecast of his latest

is supported by the much higher authority of 1 Macc. ii. 42, which clearly implies the independence of the Asidaeans ("then came to them the *συναγωγή Ἀσιδαίων*, who were mighty men of Israel, even all such as were voluntarily devoted to the law"), and 1 Macc. vii. 12 f., which tells of their passing from the side of the Maccabees to support the claims of Alcimus.

studies on the origins of Christianity. For a worthy treatment of these themes, however, the time was not yet come. Wellhausen had first to lay deep and strong foundations. And the chief fruit of his Greifswald period is the series of epoch-making works on "higher criticism."

The problem of the Hexateuch had already engaged the attention of scholars for upwards of a century. From the time of Astruc (1753) the distinction between Elohist and Jehovist had been recognized. In 1853 Hupfeld distinguished three sources, two Elohists and the Jahvist (P, E and J). Meanwhile, in 1806, de Wette had given the key to the historical solution of the problem by his demonstration that the law-book discovered in the reign of Josiah was no other than the Book of Deuteronomy. But the historical sequence of the documents was almost universally regarded as P, JE, D. P. was the *Grundschrift*, a work dating from about the time of Saul, and embodying much historical matter, with laws which were mainly Mosaic; this was expanded by the Jehovist about the time of David, and finally edited by the Deuteronomist between the reigns of Hezekiah and Josiah. To that view the most influential teachers, notably Ewald and Bleek, gave the whole weight of their authority. Only a few scholars, the forerunners being Vatke and George, followed by Reuss, with his distinguished pupil Graf, and Kuenen, of Leyden, dared to broach the "heresy" of the post-exilic date of P.

From his student days in Göttingen, Wellhausen had been exercised with the problem; and his mind turned almost instinctively towards the new "heresy." In the singularly interesting piece of mental history which he introduces in the Introduction to the *Prolegomena* he tells us:

In my early student days I was attracted by the stories of Saul and David, Ahab and Elijah; the discourses of Amos and Isaiah laid

strong hold on me, and I read myself well into the prophetic and historical books of the Old Testament. Thanks to such aids as were accessible to me, I even considered that I understood them tolerably; but at the same time I was troubled with a bad conscience, as though I were beginning with the roof instead of the foundation; for I had no thorough acquaintance with the Law, which, I was accustomed to be told, was the basis and postulate of the whole literature. At last I took courage and made my way through Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and even through Knobel's *Commentary* to these books. But it was in vain that I looked for the light which was to be shed from this source on the historical and prophetic books. On the contrary, my enjoyment of the latter was marred by the Law; it did not bring them any nearer me, but intruded itself uneasily, like a ghost that makes a noise indeed, but is not visible and really effects nothing. Even where there were points of contact between it and them, differences also made themselves felt, and I found it impossible to give a candid decision in favour of the priority of the Law. Dimly I began to perceive that throughout there was between them all the difference that separates two wholly distinct worlds. Yet, so far from attaining clear conceptions, I only fell into deeper confusion, which was worse confounded by the explanations of Ewald in the second volume of his *History of Israel*. At last, in the course of a casual visit to Göttingen in the summer of 1867, I learned through Ritschl that Karl Heinrich Graf placed the Law later than the Prophets, and, almost without knowing his reasons for the hypothesis, I was prepared to accept it; I readily acknowledged to myself the possibility of understanding Hebrew antiquity without the book of the Torah." (*E. T.*, p. 3 f.)

During his first few years at Greifswald, he gave much of his time and strength to the subject of Hexateuchal criticism. His studies thoroughly confirmed him in his impression of the later date of the Priestly Code. At last, in 1876, he began to publish his results. The first-fruits of his studies were the famous articles in the *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie* (1876-77) on the *Composition des Hexateuchs*.¹ In these articles Wellhausen

¹ These articles were afterwards combined with the chapters on Judges, etc., in Bleek's *Einleitung* to form the volume: *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (1st edit. 1885). This volume is dedicated to William Robertson Smith, with whom Wellhausen had formed a warm friendship.

applied the critical knife to the analysis of the text, dividing between J, E, D and P with an incisive keenness and skill, and a reasoned judgment, which raised them at once to the rank of "standard work" on the subject. But the epoch-making importance of the articles lay in the decision with which the author placed himself on the side of the Grafian "heresy." Even from a comparison of the documents in themselves, he argued that J and E were early sources, containing the primitive traditions of the people of Israel, while the Priestly Code (which he labelled Q) was a late—post-exilic—and highly artificial production. The main ground for this position he stated in succinct form in his revised (the 4th) edition of Bleek's *Einleitung* (Feb. 1878): "The decision of the question rests on this, that JE *knows nothing* of unity of worship, Deuteronomy *postulates* it as a new institution that had not hitherto existed, while PC *presupposes* it as having existed and been developed to its fullest consequences, as a matter of course, from the very beginning." (p. 178.)

In this new edition of Bleek, Wellhausen carried his critical studies through the historical books of Judges, Samuel and Kings, discriminating with the same thoroughness and skill between the original sources and the later Deuteronomic frame-work, and thus laying the foundations for all future criticism of these books.¹

The impression which these first studies produced was confined, of course, to the circle of Old Testament special-

¹ The introduction of these chapters into the work of the older scholar gives them rather the appearance of "the new patch on the old garment." Their effect is more impressive, therefore, when combined with the kindred work of Wellhausen on the Hexateuch. Yet one misses the chapters on the Canon and Text (in which the editor develops the principles he had laid down in his early monograph on the *Text of Samuel*), and especially the sketch of Old Testament scholarship, with its brilliant flashes of light on de Wette, Ewald and other heroes of criticism, which he introduces at the end of the volume.

ists. But the publication of the *Geschichte Israels*, vol. i.¹ (1878) made Wellhausen the recognized protagonist—indeed, the personification, both for good and ill report—of the whole critical movement.

The weakness of much of the previous criticism was that it confined itself too exclusively to mere analysis of the sources. Wellhausen saw that critical certainty could only be reached on a broad basis of history. Accordingly, in his *Prolegomena*, he carries through a detailed comparison of the religious institutions—place of worship, sacrifices, feasts, priests and Levites—sanctioned in the different documents of the Hexateuch with those presupposed or referred to in the prophetic and the other historical books of the Old Testament. In the earlier books (Judges, Samuel, Kings, and the earlier prophets) he finds that worship may be practised anywhere; there were indeed certain “holy places”—where Jahve had appeared to the patriarchs—which were regarded as specially sacred centres of worship, e.g. Bethel, Dan, Gilgal and Shiloh; but one was at liberty to worship Jahve wherever one pleased. In these early books, too, sacrifice was a simple joyous meal, shared between the worshipper and his family and friends and Jahve. Such an institution as the Levitical sacrifices in the Tabernacle was unknown. Indeed, the existence of such was explicitly denied by the prophets (Amos. v. 25; Jer. vii. 21 ff.) In early days, sacrifice could be offered at any time, though the popular feasts or festivals of Passah (the old nomadic spring-feast) and Easter, Pentecost and Booths (originally connected with harvest and vintage) were the great occasions of worship. And for these simple sacrifices there was no need of a priest.

¹ The second edition of the *Geschichte* (1883) appeared as *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (English translation, 1885). It is this volume which bears the memorable dedication: “*Meinem unvergessenen Lehrer Heinrich Ewald zu Dank und Ehren.*”

There were indeed priests in the service of certain private families and at the more important sanctuaries, and with the growth of the kingdom these priests increased in number and influence; but originally every man was his own priest. But after the destruction of the "high places" and the centralization of worship in Jerusalem, as the result of Josiah's reformation, a distinct change is observed. From this time the worship of God becomes more and more ritual. This process we find fully developed in the books of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah. In these, Jerusalem appears as the only conceivable place of worship. The ritual of worship, too, is most elaborate and refined. The old joyous meals with Jahve have now passed into statutory sacrifices—mainly relating to remission of sins—offered by the official priesthood. The old feasts have become regular church festivals, likewise connected mainly with remission of sins, and culminating in the great Day of Atonement. While the priesthood has now developed into a full-blown hierarchy, with the high priest as the head of the order, and with regular duties and regular stipends.

Passing now to the documents of the Hexateuch, Wellhausen finds the early simple stage of religious worship presupposed everywhere in JE., the second or Josianic stage—with its enforcement of unity of worship—commanded in D, and the third—with its full Levitical ritual—presupposed by PC as already existing in Moses' time, in the worship of the Tabernacle. *Post hoc, ergo propter hoc.* JE belongs to the early period, D introduces the second stage. and PC the third.¹

¹ Wellhausen justly protests against the charge that on this hypothesis "the cultus was invented all at once by the author of the Priestly Code, and only introduced after the exile." PC was not the origin, but only the complete *codification* of the cultus. The latter was gradually developed from beginnings which reach back to the time of Moses, and even earlier. The documents only *mark* stages in the development.

The second part of the *Prolegomena*—the “History of Tradition”—is a penetrating *critique* of the historical value of the narratives contained in the different historical books. In the third part—entitled “Israel and Judaism”—after repelling various objections to his theory, and buttressing his main position by subsidiary arguments, he seeks to estimate the influence of the law-books (D and PC) on the religion of Israel. From the time of Moses, the prophets had kept alive the fire of Divine inspiration. As often as the old spirit “had been in a fashion laid to sleep in institutions, it sought and found in the prophets a new opening; the old fire burst like a volcano through the strata which once, too, rose fluid from the deep, but now were fixed and dead.” But with the entrance of the written Torah, the fresh creative spirit of prophecy died. In its place, as the point of contact with God, stood the Law, with its rigid, inexorable demands. “Worship no longer springs from an inner impulse, it has come to be an exercise in religiosity.” And the end of all worship is atonement for sin. “For after the exile the consciousness of sin, called forth by the rejection of the people from the face of Jehovah, was to a certain extent permanent; even when the hard service of Israel was accomplished and the wrath really blown over, it would not disappear.”

Wellhausen thus sums up the moral and religious effect of the Law: “If, then, the value of the sacred offerings lay not in themselves, but in obedience to the commandments of God, the centre of gravity of the cultus was removed from that exercise itself and transferred to another field, that of morality. The consequence was that sacrifices and gifts gave way to *ascetic exercises*, which were more strictly and more simply connected with morality. Precepts given originally in reference to the consecration of the priests for their religious functions were extended to the laity; the observance of these laws of physical cleanliness was of

much more radical importance in Judaism than the great public cultus, and led by the straightest road towards the theocratic ideal of holiness and of universal priesthood. The whole of life was compressed into a certain holy path ; there was always a Divine command to be fulfilled, and by thinking of it a man kept himself from following after the desires and lusts of his own heart. On the other hand this private cultus, which constantly required attention, kept alive and active the individual sense of sin. The great pathologist of Judaism is quite right : in the Mosaic theocracy the cultus became a pedagogic instrument of discipline." (*E.T.* pp. 424 f.)

The effect of the publication of the *Prolegomena* was electric. By convinced Grafians like Kuenen, it was hailed with unbounded delight. "I can hardly describe," he wrote, "the delight with which I first read it." But on the minds of orthodox believers it created the most painful impression. Hitherto, criticism had played harmlessly among the clouds, as it were. Now it had descended to earth, and touched the shrine of faith. For it was seen that Wellhausen's views of the Hexateuch involved a complete reversal of the traditional idea of the origin and development of the religion of Israel. The strictly scientific spirit of the book, too, offended many reverent minds. To them it seemed unpardonable irreverence to treat the Bible as a *corpus vile* for the critic's scalpel. Thus a violent storm descended on the author's head. But the cogency and force of Wellhausen's arguments gradually triumphed over opposition. Scholars like Kautsch, who began the study of the book with a deep-rooted prejudice against the new hypothesis, found themselves compelled by the arguments to admit that it was "no longer a case of hypothesis against hypothesis, but of the denial or recognition of facts." Even men so cautious and reverent as Delitzsch and Davidson passed over to Wellhausen's side.

The mass of the younger men became enthusiastic "Wellhausenianer." By 1885 Kuenen was able to say that he "was no longer advocating a heresy, but was expounding the accepted view of European critical scholarship."¹

It is a mistake, however, to regard the *Prolegomena* as irreverent, or its tendency as destructive. It may be rigidly, even coldly, scientific; but Wellhausen had learned in Lotze's school—apart from his own natural disposition—to regard strict science as the sure basis for a lofty spiritual view of history. He would have protested against the charge of levity or irreverence. In a very interesting review of Seinecke's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (in the *Th. Litzg.*, 1877) he condemns the author for this very fault. The aim of criticism, he protests, is not to throw ridicule on the ancient traditions of Israel; neither is it mere "learned play." It is the indispensable preliminary to a true appreciation of tradition; and apart from that it has no meaning. Wellhausen himself had no love for criticism in itself. He even speaks of the pain it gave him "to see these naïve stories plucked to pieces." His supreme interest was in the history of religion. He pursued his critical studies only as the means to the right understanding of that history. And now that he had laid his critical foundations "well and truly," he was free to proceed with the superstructure.

The first draft of Wellhausen's constructive History appeared in his brilliant article "Israel" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (1881).² But when his larger work might justly have been expected, he resigned his chair at Greifswald and accepted the professorship of Oriental languages in Halle (1882). Three years afterwards he was called to the corresponding chair in Marburg.

¹ *V. Hexateuch, E.T.* p. xl.

² Afterwards published in German as *Heft 1* of the *Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten* (1884).

His motive was partly, no doubt, that he had fallen out of touch with official theology. But it was also, partly, that he might lay still deeper the foundations of his *magnum opus*. He had long urged the importance of wide Semitic studies for an understanding of the religion of Israel. And the chair he had now accepted gave him a free and spacious field for pursuing these studies.¹

ALEX. R. GORDON.

THE ETHICAL TEACHING OF ST. PAUL.

(3) THE PAGAN VIRTUES.

CHRISTIAN teachers, in their eagerness to maintain the dependence of morality upon religion, have not always done justice to the moral ideals to which man has attained without the aid of revelation. We may, indeed, argue that morality without religion is maimed and imperfect, but to speak as if, apart from the Bible, we have no sure knowledge of duty, and no adequate motive to its performance, is to fly in the face of the most obvious facts of history. "Natural morality," as it has been called, is a real and a great thing; and though its light does not shine with the clear and steady radiance of the Christian revelation, we must not forget that it was the only guide vouchsafed to some of the noblest teachers of moral truth that the world has seen. There is a well-known passage in John Stuart Mill's *Autobiography* in which he describes the kind of education which he received from his father. It was, as nearly as his father knew how to make it, the education of a well-trained pagan. The elder Mill, we are told, partook

¹ In his *Muhammed in Medina* (1882) he says: "I left the Old Testament for Arabic studies with the intention of getting to know the wild-stock on which the shoot of the Torah of Jahve was grafted by priests and prophets. For I have no doubt that a true idea of the original endowments with which the Hebrews stepped on the stage of history can best be gained from a comparative study of Arabian antiquity." (p. 5).