

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

value. The tone and temper of these ancient men, which is the attitude of many at all times, especially the old, are natural in the presence of changes, and have a lesson for all of us, a lesson of tenderness and sympathy.

2. *The Danger of the Past.*—It is well that the boisterous, uncritical hopefulness of youth should be modified and toned down by the temperament of the ancient men. But perhaps more damage is wrought by the other extreme. There is a distinct danger that the past may be unduly magnified at the expense of the present and to the lasting detriment of the future. These ancient men, who wept with a loud voice, did not believe that the new house could ever be anything like the first, and their temptation was to think it hardly worth while building at all. An exclusive view of the past paralyses effort. Nothing can be done like what has been done, therefore we need do nothing. That is fatal doctrine.

And yet it is a doctrine often in our hearts, if not on our lips. We are always tempted to think the golden age somewhere behind us. But our Christian faith, the ever-young, the ever-green religion, makes it lie before us. It is not a worn-out ideal burnt to nothing like a fallen star. It is a yet unrealized ideal, shining clear and true, the master-light of all our seeing. We have a continual tendency to refer the Kingdom of Heaven to some past

date—the days of the Apostolic Church, or the days of the early Fathers, or the days of the Reformation, or some signal time of blessing that lies back of us. It is a mistake. Never think that God has brought us thus far, to leave us guideless in the wilderness. Never dream but that He has larger purposes for us as a Church and for the land we love. Never doubt that He will lead His living Church on and ever on. We want in this our generation—and this is the lesson of the past—the spirit of our fathers, the faith in God, the strong sense of right, the love, the self-sacrifice, the loyalty to duty, which they displayed when they laid the foundations of the commonwealth and of the Church.

We cannot live on yesterday. We have to-day, because we had a yesterday, it is true; but we have to-day for the sake of to-morrow. We look back and see a track of light, for God is there; and we look forward and see a track of light, for God is there also. The past is an argument for faith. Only faith in God and His loving purpose will enable us to keep faith in ourselves and in our future. Christ is to us both the pledge and the promise of that purpose. He leads us out into a large place of faith and of service. If we to-day refuse to weep over a vanished past, but are ready to rejoice over a new future, it is because we believe this.¹

¹ H. Black, *According to my Gospel*, 13.

Altars and Sanctuaries in the Old Testament.

BY THE REVEREND CANON J. BATTERSBY HARFORD, M.A., B.D., RIPON.

III.

PART II. CRITICISM AND COUNTER-CRITICISM.

WE have set forth in the first two articles of this series the line of argument taken by Wellhausen and modern scholars generally, and the conclusions which they arrive at. But those conclusions have been challenged by various writers, and by none more vigorously than by Mr. H. M. Wiener. He attacks with such vigour and self-confidence that those who have heard only his side are apt to believe that he has carried all before him. Wiener himself apparently believes that 'the Wellhausians' have, for many years, taken refuge in cowardly silence because 'they know that no

convincing answer can be made' to his arguments, and that it would not be 'safe for them to permit him to deal with the questions involved in any periodical they control.' Their reasons for silence are far different from those which he imagines, but it seems well that his arguments should be examined, as impartially as possible, and this we now proceed to do. Considerations of space necessitate that we confine ourselves to specific criticisms of Wellhausen's *Prolegomena: Part I.*, which Wiener sets forth in his *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, chap. vi.; *Some Fundamental Errors of Wellhausenism* (German translation in *Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*).

tums; 71, Jahrgang, 1927, pp. 353-364); and *The Altars of the Old Testament* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1927).¹

Wiener charges Wellhausen with 'incredible blunders,' due to two causes, one being 'the hopeless mental confusion in which Wellhausen involved himself by calling various places and objects "sanctuaries"' (this charge we will take up in our next article), and the other his 'habitual neglect to collate the whole of the relevant evidence of any document.' This latter charge against the scholars whom he criticises is a favourite one with Wiener, but it is quite unfounded. True, these scholars do not always set forth the whole of the evidence which Wiener considers relevant, but the reasons are simple. They don't consider all these passages to be relevant, and they could not, without extending their writing to an interminable length, quote every passage. They could only present, out of the whole number, those passages which seemed to them really significant. As Wellhausen puts it (*Prolegomena*, p. 368): 'To discuss it all in detail would take another book.' Unless, therefore, really vital facts have been ignored, we have no right to charge writers with 'habitual neglect to collate the whole of the relevant evidence.' And, if we do, we ought at least to make quite sure that they really do so. On pages 192-3 of his *Essays*, Wiener writes with reference to Dt. 16²¹: 'When I ask a Wellhausenite to show me any reference to this important verse in the *Prolegomena* I never get any answer. The index to Dr. Hastings' larger Bible Dictionary may also be consulted in vain for any sign of recognition that this passage exists. As is usual with the Critical School, the whole of the relevant material has not been consulted.' How dreadfully remiss! —if true. But is it true? On turning to *Prolegomena* (E.T.), p. 239, we read: 'According to Deut. 16²¹ these artificial trees must have stood often enough beside the altars of Jehovah.' In the index of Hastings' Dictionary, a reference to this passage is duly recorded as having been made by Owen Whitehouse in his article on 'Pillar' (iii. 881b). Wiener will not be surprised if, after this, we are not able to accept his most confident assertions without careful verification.²

¹ Mr. Wiener has put me in his debt by sending me copies of the last two pamphlets and by various other kindnesses. I am sure that he will take it in good part if I meet his vigorous speaking by equally vigorous speaking.

² A similar unfounded charge in his *Essays*, p. 184, is dealt with in Art. IV. B, I. 1.

But now to business. Wiener (*Essays*, pp. 176-220) attacks three positions taken up by Wellhausen. The first attack will be considered in the remainder of this article. The second will occupy us in Articles IV. to VI. The third I have already dealt with in *Since Wellhausen*, pp. 123-127.

A. Was the slaughter of domestic animals in Old Israel normally coincident with sacrifice?

Driver, in his Commentary on Deuteronomy, (pp. 145-6) writes: 'By ancient custom in Israel, slaughter and sacrifice were identical; the flesh of domestic animals, such as the ox, the sheep, and the goat (as is still the case among the Arabs) was not eaten habitually; when it was eaten, the slaughter of the animal was a sacrificial act, and its flesh could not be lawfully partaken of, unless the fat and the blood were first presented at an altar' (cf. *Prolegomena*, pp. 18, 63, 71). Wiener quotes this passage and asserts, on the contrary, that 'in the earliest times with which we have any acquaintance non-sacrificial slaughter was the rule in Israel' (*The Altars*, p. 5). He refers to a series of occasions on which slaughter for food took place. Abraham took a young calf and had food prepared for his three visitors (Gn 18⁷); Rebecca prepared savoury meat for Isaac (27⁹⁻¹⁴); the Egyptian steward 'slays a slaying' for Joseph's brethren (43¹⁶); Nabal 'slays a slaying' for his shearers (1 S 25¹¹); Elisha slays his yoke of oxen and makes a farewell feast for his people (1 K 19²¹). Was there an altar, he asks, in each of these cases? 'Sacrifice to the God of Israel was only possible in early days in the desert or on the soil of Palestine.' The Law in Ex 21³⁷ (E.V. 22¹) deals with the case of a man who steals an ox and kills it. 'Is the thief likely to sacrifice?' Gideon makes ready a kid and broth for his angel-visitor (Jg 6¹⁹). 'Had Gideon already sacrificed the kid when he killed it? or at an altar?' 'An eminent critic' having said in correspondence that 'it was impossible to adduce *direct* evidence to show that all slaughter was sacrificial,' Wiener comments: 'I respectfully submit that it is possible to adduce direct evidence that it was not' (*Essays*, pp. 175 ff.).

1. It is a surprising thing that a lawyer should have submitted such a contention, because, when we look at the evidence which he adduces, we see that it is not direct evidence at all. Wiener's correspondent was absolutely right. It is impossible to adduce direct evidence on either side, because the O.T. writers could not know that over two thousand years later scholars would dispute over such a point. That which is primitive and customary is so often not mentioned, because

it is taken for granted. Wiener can produce various instances of slaughter in connexion with which no mention is made of an accompanying sacrificial act, but that in no wise proves that it was not there. In England it has been the normal thing for hundreds of years to 'say grace' before meat both at private meals and at ceremonial banquets. It would be dangerous to conclude, because at a particular meal no such action is recorded, or because the feasters were not pious people, that therefore grace was not said.

2. It may seem to us Westerners in the twentieth century A.D. improbable that a witch or a cattle thief or a churlish cattle-king would have accompanied slaughter by sacrifice, but is it really so? The author of Pr 7 pictures an adulterous woman inviting a poor fool to share her dinner and her bed. How natural it would seem to us if Wiener were to ask, Was slaughter in this case sacrificial? But as a matter of fact he cannot, for in vv. 13-14 we read: 'With an impudent face she said unto him: Sacrifices of peace-offerings are with me. This day have I paid my vows. Therefore came I forth to meet thee . . .' Clearly there would have been no meat for the feast, had there not been sacrifice first. If to such a harlot of a woman the two things would necessarily go together, we may be sure that that was the universal opinion in the author's day. 'A woman that had a familiar spirit' was not necessarily an irreligious woman; on the contrary, such persons were popularly supposed to be in special relation to unseen powers. Even a robber would be quite likely to perform the formal sacrificial act or acts which would make everything right with the deity. Indeed, in many countries it is the man who is going to commit robbery or murder who is punctilious about the formal act. He looks upon the latter as a set-off against the former. We have no reason for thinking that the cattle-robber of Ex 22 would omit the sacrificial act, but, if he were to do so, that would not disprove the general rule. All that Driver asserts is that the flesh could not *lawfully* be eaten, unless the fat and the blood were first presented at the altar. Such presentation could easily be made, wherever a man was. The early narratives tell us that, wherever Abraham and Isaac and Jacob pitched their tents, there they also built their altars (Gn 12⁷. 13⁴. 18²⁶ 33²⁰ 35⁷). And, away from home, in case of emergency an altar of earth or of unhewn stones (Ex 20²⁴. 25) would only take a few minutes to raise.

3. The negative evidence clearly breaks down. But further, there is much positive evidence that

slaughter of domestic animals for food in Old Israel was regularly accompanied by sacrifice. When David did not appear at Saul's table at 'the new moon,' Saul in his own mind accounted for David's absence by saying: 'He is not clean' (1 S 20²⁶). What did he mean? Nothing is said about sacrifice having taken place, but clearly on this festival day, flesh-meat was specially provided, and that meant sacrifice, and no one who was ceremonially unclean could partake of it.

The parallelism between Pr 15¹⁷ and 17¹ is equally significant. The former passage runs: 'Better is a dinner of herbs where love is than a stalled ox and hatred therewith.' Nothing is said here about sacrifice. But read the parallel in 17¹: 'Better is a dry morsel and quietness therewith than a house full of the sacrifices of strife.' Clearly custom would require that the slaying of the ox and sacrifice should go together. We saw in Article I. how Saul after the battle of Michmash insisted that the people should slay the animals by 'a great stone' and 'there' pour out the blood. Wiener comments on this: 'Although a priest was present in the camp, there was no attempt to convert the slaughter into sacrifice.' A most futile remark, for he has himself been at pains to show that any layman could minister at a 'cain-altar.' And that the writer believed that there was sacrifice is shown by his words immediately following (1 S 14³⁵): 'And Saul built an altar unto Jehovah: the same was the first altar that he built unto Jehovah.' It is not quite clear whether he regarded the 'great stone' as being itself the altar, or whether he meant that, while the blood of necessity was poured out to Jehovah at the time of slaughtering, 'the fat' of the slain animals was separated and set aside until it could be burnt on an altar which was built immediately after.¹

As late as Hosea, the prophet asserts (9³¹) that, dwelling in a foreign land, the food of Israel will be 'unclean,' because 'it will not come into the house of Jehovah.'² Clearly, as long as they were in their own land, the sacrificial portion would come into the house of Jehovah, and the feast would thus be rendered ceremonially clean. We may compare with this the heathen usage in the days of St. Paul. His argument in 1 Co 10^{23ff.} is based upon the fact that at a feast it might be taken for granted that the meal upon the table had first been offered in sacrifice at a heathen temple.

One more bit of evidence may be adduced under

¹ See also Art. V. B, II. 1. i.

² Not the Jerusalem temple, but one of the sanctuaries in Northern Israel.

this head. The passage quoted above from Driver came from his Commentary on Dt 12. Vv. 5-7. 13. 14 (cf. v. 20) lay down that sacrifice shall only be offered upon 'the altar of Jehovah' and at 'the place which Jehovah shall choose.' Vv. 15. 20-22 permit the Israelite to slay non-sacrificially within his gates and eat flesh as if it were gazelle or hart; clean and unclean alike may partake. Only, the blood must be poured out upon the earth. It seems clear that the non-sacrificial killing thus permitted was necessitated by the restriction of sacrifice to a single centre and was a reversal of ancient custom. As long as the Israelite and his family could sacrifice at a local altar of Jehovah, the old usage held good. Slaughter of domestic animals for food and sacrifice went together. Now that this was no longer possible, the rule was relaxed (see also Article VI. B, II. 3).

4. A study of the words used for slaughter and sacrifice points to the same universal ancient custom.

i. The 'root' in most general use is **זבח**. The substantive *zebah* is used one hundred and sixty-three times, and invariably in the sense of sacrifice. The verb is used one hundred and thirty-three times (in Qal and Piel). In one hundred and twenty-five of these it clearly means slaughter with sacrifice. In six passages there is room for doubt; in two only is the word certainly used non-sacrificially, namely, Dt 12¹⁵⁻²¹, to which we have just referred above.

[The six passages referred to are 1 S 28²⁴ (the witch of Endor), 1 K 1⁹ (Adonijah), 13² and 2 K 23²⁰ (the slaying of the priests of Bethel), 1 K 19²¹ (Elisha), and 2 Ch 18² (Ahab, for Jehoshaphat and his servants). I should say that in three or probably in four of these cases the sacrificial act did take place. Even in the case of the slaying of the priests upon their altar the thought of sacrifice is present. There is an ironical reference to the fact that the altar upon or by the side of which they were slain was that at which they had themselves offered sacrifice. Driver thinks that, in addition to Dt 12¹⁵⁻²¹, the word may also in 1 S 28²⁴ and 1 K 19²¹, as the result of the Deuteronomic legislation, have ceased to have its original force.

Wiener comments with emphatic italics that these last two usages occur in passages relating to times when, according to Driver, non-sacrificial slaughter was unknown. Quite so. But the point is, not the times to which the passages relate, but the date at which the *author* lived and wrote, when he used the word in question. *Samuel* and *Kings* were written by men who lived after the

reformation of Josiah, men who were familiar with the later usage and who might use the word in the later connotation. Personally, however, I see no reason why on these two occasions sacrifice should not have taken place.]

ii. The verb **זָבַח** (*zābah*) occurs only eleven times. It does not, like *zābah*, bring out the sacrificial side of slaughter, but it certainly does not negative it. Three times it is used (poetically and metaphorically) of the slaughter of human beings in judgment or in malice; the other eight times of slaughtering for food (twice in similitude).

[The three former passages are Ps 37¹¹, La 2²¹, Ezk 21¹⁵; cf. v. 20. The eight are Gn 43¹⁶ (Joseph), 1 S 25¹¹ (Nabal), Ex 21³⁷ (22¹) (the cattle-thief), Pr 9³ (wisdom), Dt 28²¹ (an enemy), Jer 11¹⁹, 'like a gentle lamb that is led to slaughtering'; cf. 51⁴⁰ 25³⁴. The first three of these eight are passages referred to by Wiener in the string of questions quoted above. The cognate noun is used twelve times with similar connotation. In Is 34⁹ it is parallel to *zebah* in the preceding clause. In 1 S 19^{23, 24} *zabāh* (translated 'cook' in E.V.) occurs in connexion with the sacrifice at the high place at Ramah. This word is used elsewhere only in the plural in the sense of 'guardsmen' (Gn 37³⁶⁻⁴¹¹², 2 K 25, and Jer 39⁹⁻⁵²³⁰, altogether thirty times; note margin in Jer 39⁹). They were the royal butchers, and in Jerusalem the animals slain for the royal table would be first offered as peace-offerings at the adjoining temple.]

iii. The third verb is **שָׁחַט** (*šāḥaṭ*).

It is used of beaten gold five times (1 K 10 and 2 Ch 9); thirteen times of killing generally, five (or three) times of slaying for food, and sixty-one (or sixty-three) times of slaying in sacrifice. In P it is used ritually forty-two times, whereas *zābah* is used only six times, five of these being in H (Lv 17-26). It looks as though, when *zābah* ceased to mean sacrificial slaughter, *šāḥaṭ* was adopted by the later priestly writers instead.

This brief survey of the three Hebrew verbs used in connexion with slaughter confirms the opinion which we formed from the references to sacrificial slaughter in Old Testament books, namely, that in Old Israel, when domestic animals were slaughtered for food, the rule was to pour out the blood (and to burn the fat) to Jehovah.

5. In one of his latest articles, 'Some Fundamental Errors,' Wiener elaborates further arguments, and, in order that it may not be said that relevant arguments were ignored because they could not be answered, a few words must be added.

i. [*Monatsschrift*, 1927, p. 354] 'Nobody with any

knowledge of Hebrew antiquity would hold that women ever performed sacrificial service. Yet this would be necessary, if we are to hold that the two passages in Samuel [1 S 25¹¹ and 28²⁴] refer to sacrifices.' Wiener actually quotes 1 S 25¹¹ as the words of Abigail! He has since discovered that they are the words of Nabal [*MGWJ*, 1928, p. 323], and thereby one-third of his argument falls to the ground. As to 1 S 28²⁴, the witch was not an orthodox person and (if there was no male to act for her) might be quite capable of taking upon herself on occasion the sacrificial accompaniment of slaughter. He quotes a third passage (Gn 27⁹⁻¹⁴), in which Rebekah says that she 'will make savoury meat.' Really, when a man catches at such straws as these, he must be in desperate case.

ii. [*MGWJ*, same page] Wiener argues that hospitality is a law of the East, and that, as sacrificial impurity would prevent a host from killing sacrificially, such killing as that of Gn 18⁷ must have been non-sacrificial. But we have no evidence as to what was the custom with regard to sacrificial purity in Abraham's day, and in any case some one of his household servants would be 'in a state of purity,' even if the host himself was not.

iii. [*MGWJ*, pp. 354-5 and 1928, p. 323] Gn 43¹⁶ is appealed to as a clear instance of non-sacrificial slaughter. 'Nothing is better established than that in early days sacrifice to the God of Israel was possible only in the desert or on the soil of Palestine.' . . . 'During the whole of the sojourn in Egypt all the meat consumed by the Israelites was

necessarily slaughtered non-sacrificially.' We may ask, in the first place, what has this got to do with the custom of the early centuries of the national existence in Palestine? But further, in proof of his thesis, Wiener quotes Ex 8²⁶ (22 in the Heb.) Dt 4²⁸ 28³⁶. 64, 1 S 26¹⁰, Hos 9^{3ff.}, Jer 16¹³ (= Dt 28³⁶), but Ex 8²⁶ gives a very different reason for not sacrificing to Jehovah in Egypt, and it is idle to quote passages as to what was believed centuries after the settlement in Canaan in order to show what was the belief at a time when Israel had no national home. We have not sufficient evidence to dogmatize as to the actual custom of Israel in Egypt. According to E (Ex 3¹³) and P (Ex 6⁹), Israel did not even know the name 'Jehovah' as the name of their God, and, judging by what they did in later centuries, they may quite probably have performed the sacrificial part of slaughter to the gods of the land in which they dwelt (as 1 S 26¹⁹ suggests). On the other hand, in Gn 46⁴ (also E. See *Prolegomena*, p. 22 note) we read that God bids Jacob go down into Egypt without fear, 'for I will go down with thee,' and therefore it may be inferred that Jacob and his descendants would not feel that they could not set up altars to their own God in their land of sojourn. The one view that seems quite impossible is Wiener's, namely, that they performed no sacrifice to any deity during their whole sojourn in Egypt. That to any ancient people would be equivalent to atheism and is unthinkable.

iv. The argument from Ex 20²⁴, Lv 17¹⁻⁹, and Dt 12^{21ff.} will be dealt with in Articles V. and VI.

The Seed Growing Secretly.

A STUDY IN THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE PARABLES.

BY THE REVEREND A. T. BURBRIDGE, RICKSMANSWORTH.

THE Master was Master everywhere. He was Master in the realm with which the psychologist is concerned. In some sense He anticipated the discoveries of modern psychology. Take, for example, the saying in Mt 12⁴³⁻⁴⁵. The psychologist talks of 'inhibited impulses' or 'complexes': he says, 'If you suppress an emotion or passion the danger is that it grows stronger and stronger; you think you are con-

quering it, subduing it, destroying it, by your self-restraint and self-control, but you are doing nothing of the kind: it will break forth presently more invincible than ever: your last state will be worse than your first.' Did not Jesus anticipate this when He spoke of the evil spirit driven forth, and then returning in sevenfold power to the house that was empty, swept, and garnished? Or let us take as another illustration the little