

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

teacher of physical science, Mr. Haigh's treatment of such subjects as 'Natural Science and Religion,' 'Natural Science and the Bible,' 'Evolution,' 'The New Psychology and Religion,' 'Nature a Divine Revelation,' is excellent. His wide reading is apparent on every page, and his extracts from leaders of religious, philosophic, and scientific thought are informative.

The following quotations will show Mr. Haigh's standpoint: 'Has Natural Science anything to do with Religion? Very little—very little indeed . . . an educated religious man cannot be wholly indifferent to the scientific knowledge of his age. Though no one is responsible for ignorance which is unavoidable, yet no one is at liberty to reject facts or wilfully shut his eyes to truth from whatever quarter it may come. He cannot so act without injury to his moral character.' 'It is of happy augury that so many of the leaders in science at the present time are enforcing the truth that the scientific view of Nature is but a partial view which leads up to and requires the complement of a spiritual interpretation.'

In 1893 Christina Rossetti prepared a number of her poems for separate publication. They had already appeared along with prose devotional studies. The volume was called simply *Verses, by*

Christina G. Rossetti. And twenty-one thousand copies of it were sold up to 1914. Now the S.P.C.K. has issued a new edition (3s. 6d. net), containing an introduction and appreciation and a crayon drawing of Christina and her mother by Dante Gabriel Rossetti. The direct simplicity of Christina Rossetti's language, coupled with the appeal of her mysticism, have made for her a unique place in the affections of some of us.

The Rev. D. C. Mitchell, M.A., has found an attractive title for the volume of sermons which he has published through Messrs. Thomson & Cowan. It is *The Nonsense of Neutrality* (3s. 6d. net). The title is taken from his treatment of the eleventh verse of Obadiah, 'In the day that thou stoodest on the other side, thou wast as one of them.' The title is not only captivating, it is also informing, for this volume of sermons is concerned with the Christian conduct of life. Dealing with neutrality, for example, Mr. Mitchell discusses its consequences and culpability as a sin first of all against the self, and secondly against society. He ends on the evangelical note, which is characteristic, when he shows how one can be saved from this sin. The teaching in the sermons is pointed by apt illustrations both from literature and from Mr. Mitchell's personal experience.

The Two Descriptions of the Sanctuary in Deuteronomy.

BY PROFESSOR ADAM C. WELCH, D.D., NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for July 1925 I published an article on this subject. The reason for returning to it so soon is that Canon Battersby Harford, in the November issue of the *Expositor*, has discussed the article and my entire attitude on the question at some length. It is true that few things are less interesting than a debate between two specialists. But the issue involved here is of such significance that a reply may be of value, especially if the discussion is severely restricted to broad principles.

There are, then, two descriptions of the sanctuary, (a) which Yahweh elects out of all your tribes, (b) which Yahweh elects in one of thy tribes. As to

(a) there is no debate; it means the temple at Jerusalem. But as to (b) I have pointed out that, wherever *one* followed by a plural noun occurs in Deuteronomy, it always means 'any of.' The natural sense, therefore, of 'one of thy tribes' is any tribe, not a specific tribe, such as Judah. The reason for this sanctuary being prefaced by the definite article is that it is followed by a qualifying clause. The shrine was to be one reserved to the worship of Yahweh.

So to translate the phrase is, of course, to deny its reference to centralization and to run counter to the interpretation which has been constantly put upon it. The Canon, accordingly, indulges in a

gentle jibe at my expense by remarking that for two thousand years the words have received only one meaning. The sarcasm would be legitimate, had it come from one like Wiener, who believes in the Mosaic origin of Deuteronomy, but is a little surprising from a convinced Wellhausenite. Perhaps the Canon will reckon up for us the number of centuries during which the Deuteronomic Code was believed to have been issued by Moses on the plains of Moab, before Wellhausen 'proved' it to have been issued by Josiah in 621. It hardly becomes those whose entire position represents a break from tradition to make much of tradition in defending themselves against a new heresy.

The Canon proceeds, however, to criticism of the heresy. He does not attempt to deny that 'in one of thy tribes' may mean, or rather, after the analogy of the usage in the rest of the Code, must mean any of thy tribes. What he fastens on is the use of the definite article before the sanctuary, and there he denies that it could be used otherwise than for one definite place of worship. To quote his own words, he 'can find no adequate parallel case in which a noun with an article, followed by a defining relative clause of this type, can be treated as one of a class.'

I believed that 18⁸, which speaks of *the* Levite coming from any of thy towns to take up priestly duty at a sanctuary, proved the use of the definite article for one of a class; and therefore did not overload my previous article with further examples. Since this is not considered sufficient, perhaps because the Levite is not followed by a defining relative clause, it is necessary to quote others. Here are two, which have both been taken from the Deuteronomic Code itself.

In ch. 20, from v.10, the legislators give orders as to how Israel is to carry on war. In particular, the army is forbidden to cut down fruit-trees in the neighbourhood of any town which they are besieging. The law concludes in v.20 with the permission to cut down other trees, and adds that the army shall lay siege 'to *the* town that makes war against thee, until it fall.' The town, which has appeared in vv. 10, 19 as a town without the article, now appears with the article and followed by a defining relative clause. According to the Canon the sanctuary which Yahweh chooses can only be one specific sanctuary, that at Jerusalem. Then the town which comes to war with Israel, must be some specific town, such as Ekron or Damascus. Accord-

ing to my view, the town of 20²⁰ may be any town which makes war on Israel. But that implies that the sanctuary which Yahweh chooses may be any sanctuary of this character.

An even more striking case occurs in 14²¹, because there a noun with the definite article and a qualifying relative clause stands alongside an indefinite noun which has no qualification. The Israelites are forbidden to eat a carcass from which the blood has not been drained. But it is added: 'thou mayest give it to *the* ger who is within thy gates, or to *a* foreigner.' Will the Canon require us to believe that there was only one specific ger to whom an Israelite farmer might make over his dead sheep? If so, it is to be feared that he will find difficulty in carrying that out in reference to every passage where the ger within thy gates is mentioned. Evidently the Law declares it to be legitimate to dispose of the carcass to any ger or to any foreigner. But, since the foreigner has no qualifying relative clause, he receives no article: since the ger is qualified, he receives an article.

Again, in course of proving that 'one of thy tribes' may mean any tribe, I appealed to 23¹⁷, which orders that a fugitive slave shall live in 'one' of the towns which he might choose as a refuge. This town might obviously be any town in Israel. König and Sellin retorted that the slave might certainly choose any town, but, after he had chosen it, it could be only one specific place. Hence, of course, Yahweh might choose any sanctuary, but, after He had chosen it, it could only be one. My reply was that the two cases were not parallel. In the nature of the case, the slave could only live in the place he chose, because a man cannot live in two places. To say, however, that Yahweh could only locate His name in one sanctuary was to beg the question at the beginning. And I added that to say that Yahweh could only locate His name in one sanctuary contradicts Ex 20²⁴, where we read about every place where He records His name. The Canon, however, objects that this is no help, since Exodus speaks of every place, while Deuteronomy speaks only of the sanctuary. Yet my reason for quoting Ex 20²⁴ was that it does speak of every place. By so speaking, it implies the belief that Yahweh could record His name in several places. He could, therefore, make His name dwell in more than one. To say that He could not, means that Deuteronomy has moved away from the position of Ex 20²⁴, and teaches that there is only one legiti-

mate sanctuary. And that, I repeat, is to beg the question at issue from the beginning.

Another example of the same kind of argument by begging the question is to be found in connexion with my reply to an objection brought forward by Gressmann. It would only be tedious to enter into full details. The matter involved was in connexion with the law about Passover. I acknowledged that Gressmann's objection would have force, if it were certain that this law was first issued as a law for all Israel. Since, however, I did not believe that the Code of Deuteronomy was issued for all Israel, and since I had given special reasons for regarding the law of Passover as one for Ephraim, his objection carried no weight against my position. But, writes the Canon 'how does he know that the passover law was for Ephraim only.' The retort is easy and obvious. How does the Canon know that the regulations of the Deuteronomic Code, and among them the law about Passover, were first issued for all Israel? He knows it, because he accepts the Wellhausen theory, which declares that Deuteronomy was drafted at the time of Josiah and was then issued to be the law for all Israel. Yet that is the very question which is under discussion. To determine it by principles drawn from the 'regnant hypothesis' is to attempt to foreclose discussion by authority. It is more remarkable to find such a position advanced by the Canon, because in a later passage of his article he says: 'In Deuteronomy we have a compilation of laws and groups of laws, probably laid down at different times, at different centres and by different authorities. . . . The laws about first-fruits, tithes and sacrifices may have originally required only that they should be offered at a local sanctuary.' It will be noted that, while first-fruits, tithes and sacrifices are here allowed to a local sanctuary, Passover is carefully excluded. Why? Is it possible that to include Passover would seriously endanger the Canon's whole position? Yet it is difficult to see why it should be excluded, especially when it is known about it that the law of Deuteronomy on the subject is not the same as that of Exodus, and that the law of Deuteronomy curiously resembles the practice of the Samaritans in the hill-country of Ephraim. Is there any analogous distinction between the sacrificial customs of old Israel which will justify the Canon in granting that the laws about these may have been connected with a local sanctuary?

It remains to ask whether anything has been

advanced to weaken my conclusions as to the other phrase, which occurs only in the section 12¹⁻⁷, the sanctuary which Yahweh elects out of all your tribes. Here, naturally, the Canon finds no fault with my recognition that the passage can only mean centralization at Jerusalem. But he questions whether it is correct to make it later in date than the rest of the chapter in which it occurs. My reason for doing this is that vv.¹⁻⁷ regard the conquest as so complete that the Canaanites are wholly subject to Israel, and must submit in everything to the will of the conquerors. In the rest of the chapter, on the other hand, the Canaanites are living among the Israelites and are strong enough and numerous enough to present a real danger to Yahweh worship. Now these two views of the conquest are found in Joshua and Judges; and it is generally acknowledged that the idea of a complete conquest is the later and the less historical of the two. The Canon objects that this view of a complete conquest appears in passages of Joshua which are generally regarded as Deuteronomic, and also appears in certain sections inside our Book of Deuteronomy. But what real bearing has this on the question at issue? What is at issue is the relative date of two sections in the twelfth chapter of Deuteronomy. In one of these appears a view of the conquest which is generally regarded as late, wherever it occurs, whether in Joshua or anywhere else. In the rest of the chapter we find a different view, which is also generally regarded as early, wherever it occurs. The two views are so incompatible that one writer could not hold them both at the same time. Especially they are so incompatible that a body of legislators could not base a law which is comprised in seven verses on one of them, and then proceed to base a new series of laws on the other. The only conclusion which seems reasonable is that the two sections of the chapter have been drafted by different men and belong to different periods.

What seems to have led the Canon to the above criticism is his evident conviction that to pronounce 12¹⁻⁷ later than the following verses implies that this little section is also later than the period of Josiah. At least he follows up his previous remarks by stating that, since I hold 12¹⁻⁷ to be later than the rest of the chapter, 'although he nowhere explicitly says so, Welch is compelled by the exigencies of his theory to range himself with Kennett and to throw overboard the trustworthiness of the account in Kings.' So little am I conscious that the exigencies

of my theory involve this conclusion that I have contributed an article to the forthcoming number of the *Z.A.W.* to prove the opposite. Hölscher and Oestreicher, for very different reasons, question the reliability of the account in Kings. They hold that Josiah made no effort at centralization and aimed merely at purifying the temple-worship. I have done my best to prove them wrong and to support in this matter the account in Kings.

Nor is it easy to see why the exigencies of my theory compel the conclusion of the Canon. One hesitates to add another hypothesis to those which have gathered round this significant and fateful period of Israel's history. Yet, if it were only to point out that my theory as to Deuteronomy does not involve the rejection of the account in Kings, it may be done. What interested and surprised me most in studying afresh the Code of Deuteronomy was to find how constantly it brings one back to conditions in Northern Israel. The law may have been originally intended for use in that kingdom. If so, it would go into captivity, when the kingdom was swept away, for at that time all the priesthood disappeared from the land. At a later date, however, an Assyrian king sent back a priest, at the request of the population in what was now one of the imperial provinces (2 K 17²⁷). The man renewed the Yahweh-cult at the old shrine of Bethel. Since the purpose of his coming was to teach the people 'the manner of the God of the land,' he must have brought with him a rule or law which was adapted for this purpose. And no other was better fitted for the task he had to fulfil than the Code which had once been in force in this very district. The old ritual was restored at Bethel, and the old Code of Deuteronomy was again issued to guide the remanent Israelites. For, while the province had been stripped of its leaders and priests, the backbone of the population still largely consisted of the Hebrew peasants.

Now we have reason to believe that Josiah, seeing the weakness of the Assyrian government, tried to extend his authority beyond Judah over the Northern province and to bring back all Israel under his power. In this he merely followed the example of his predecessor, Manasseh. But, while Manasseh's plan was to weld together the Assyrian settlers and the old Israelite settlers by an amalgam of the Assyrian and Hebrew faith, Josiah sought to appeal to the native Hebrews in the name of their own religion. In the weakness of Assyria he could

afford to follow this policy. His aim, however, was partly political, and he therefore sought to turn the men's minds to Jerusalem, as the one centre for the true Yahweh worship. Centralization of worship at Jerusalem could serve alike a religious and a political end. Hence we find the king desecrating the altar at Bethel (2 K 23¹⁶), which is not the high-place of Jeroboam. It was the one Yahweh-shrine which remained in the Northern province, the place to which the priest from Assyria had brought back the restored cult. As such, it was the only centre of Israelite devotion and pride, which could in any way compete with Jerusalem.¹

Yet the destruction of the altar at Bethel did not necessarily involve the destruction of all its sacra. Indeed, with the ideas of the holiness of all the sacred utensils which were prevalent at that period, such an action would have appeared a daring and useless sacrilege. It is remarkable how careful the historian in 2 K 23^{16ff.} is to justify Josiah's conduct in desecrating the altar. Evidently there were men who were shocked and startled by the act, and it was necessary to show that the king in this was fulfilling a Divine command given by a prophet. The sacred vessels may rather have been transferred to Jerusalem, and with them would go the sacred books.

What happened to them there it is impossible to know. But it is not impossible that the Code of Deuteronomy was among these sacred books and fell aside in one of the Temple rooms only to be rediscovered at the famous repair of the Temple itself. There its discovery served the ends both of the court and the priesthood. They used it as a means for appealing to Northern Israel. They gave it full authority as one of the sacred books of their Law. But the priesthood were careful to preface it all with the opening section 12¹⁻⁷, which set in the forefront of an otherwise dangerous code of law the command that Jerusalem was the one shrine for all legitimate worship. That would serve to explain why the section hangs loose where it stands, having no relation to all which follows. It would explain why it uses language about the sanctuary which has no parallel in the rest of the Code. And it would finally explain why the section makes an impracticable demand. The men were content to countersign the Law with a general command, which made it innocuous.²

¹ See another article in the December *Z.A.W.*

² I would add that at one time or another the sacred literature of Northern Israel was combined with that

But, further, if we could suppose that by some such means the Code of Deuteronomy was made part of Israel's law, but yet made subservient to the great aims of the court and priesthood at Jerusalem, a fresh and welcome light is cast on the work of Jeremiah. His famous verse about the false pen of the scribes working deceitfully (8^o) does not need to be watered down and explained away. He means exactly what he says. To him the conduct of the court and priestly party seems unworthy in itself. But not only does this method of gaining their end seem unworthy; the end which they are seeking is bad in itself. To the court the centralization of worship at Jerusalem was a welcome means of restoring the unity of Israel through an appeal to the common religion. To the priesthood it appealed as a means of getting rid of the local shrines with their danger to the purity of the faith. Jeremiah is as well aware as any other of the abuses which attach to the bamoth and as unhesitating in condemning them. But he will have nothing to do with a cure which, while removing one evil, poisons the whole system.

For Jeremiah sees this question of centralization to be a means by which the Temple is made an of Judah. There are definitely Ephraimite psalms, such as 80 and 81 (cf. Gunkel's recent Comm.), which have been incorporated into the great psalter. The Northern book of history was joined with that of Judah. When was this done, and when was it felt to be necessary? I suggest that it was about the same time as the law of Ephraim was joined with the law of Judah. And it was probably done for the same purpose.

essential of true worship and the Yahweh religion is bound to stone and lime. Therefore, he goes up to the Temple, and in his great address declares that in the interest of true religion the Temple must go: Yahweh will deal with it as He dealt with Shiloh. From that hour too He announces that Chaldea must capture Jerusalem. It is Yahweh's instrument to destroy the things which men are counting essential to their religion. He writes to the captives at Babylon to bid them give up hankering after a return to their own land. Yahweh has sent them to Babylon in order that they may learn to do without a temple. He tells the priests at Jerusalem who call the exiles rotten figs, because they can no longer offer sacrifice, that it is they who are the rotten figs. The Prophet's political attitude and his religious teaching become a unity, when we recognize that they had a common source. And their common source was that the Temple was not essential for the true worshipper of Yahweh. Since the men would learn it in no other way, since they were making the only place where God could be rightly worshipped to be Jerusalem, Yahweh would teach them through the awful means of Chaldea's war. The holy and beautiful house, where their fathers had worshipped, and which they had desecrated through making it the only place where men might worship, should go up in flame. And in the villages round Jerusalem and in the settlements in Babylonia men would find that they could worship Him; for they should still go and pray to Him, and, praying, find Him as near as He had once been to Abraham.

The Sacrament of Beauty.

BY THE REVEREND ALBERT D. BELDEN, B.D., WESTCLIFF-ON-SEA.

THE fundamental meaning of the word 'Sacrament' is a pledge or covenant, and the contention behind this title is that in all the beauty so prodigally distributed round our human life there is a pledge of the Love of God, demanding on our part an answering covenant of loyalty and service.

The term 'Sacrament' is mostly used to refer to the holiest rites of our faith, such as Baptism, Marriage, and Holy Communion; yet the very purpose of these sacraments is that all our life should become sacramental, and that every day,

in all the circumstances of life, we should be in Holy Communion with God—our consecrated service answering continually the Divine Love. Unfortunately there is grave danger, in this over-commercial age, of our missing the sacrament of beauty. One has only to consider the way in which we permit our lovely countryside to be disfigured by commercial advertisements to realize the inferior place that we still give to beauty in our time. Even in our towns and cities it is well-nigh impossible to get a fair, square view of