

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

establish it in any busy thoroughfare. The market, temple, and street corner prove their particular haunts, and the garrulousness of the moneylender adds to the general confusion of the street noises. The strings of copper cash, often secured to the

table by a chain, are piled up on one side, and the silver, together with the small ivory yard with which it is weighed, is kept in drawers. Their sign is a wooden figure carved in the form of a cylinder, to represent a string of cash.

## Altars and Sanctuaries in the Old Testament.

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

### IV.

#### PART II. (continued).

#### B. One Sanctuary or Many?

IN the preceding article we dealt with Wiener's first main criticism of Wellhausen's position. We saw that that criticism broke down under examination, and that the available evidence fully justified the conviction that in Old Israel the slaughter of domestic animals and sacrifice were normally coincident. We come now to the second indictment. Wellhausen asserted that in Old Israel there was a 'multiplicity of sanctuaries,' and that 'for the earliest period of the history of Israel, all that precedes the building of the Temple, not a trace can be found of any sanctuary of exclusive legitimacy.' And, even when Solomon built his royal sanctuary, 'we nowhere find that that king sought to abolish all the others.' 'The restriction of worship to a single selected place was unknown to any one, even as a pious desire.'<sup>1</sup>

This position Wiener declares to be an 'incredible blunder,' due to two causes. We have already dealt with one of these, viz. the neglect of relevant passages (see Art. III., introductory page). The second is 'the hopeless mental confusion induced by gratuitously calling various places and objects "sanctuaries"' (*Essays*, pp. 179, 187). The truth is, Wiener says, that we must distinguish between lay-altars, built of earth or unhewn stones, which might be erected anywhere, and the horned altar, built of hewn stones and with steps, which could be found only at the one legitimate sanctuary. At this latter altar only priests could sacrifice, whereas at the former any layman might so do. The lay altars were pre-Mosaic in origin. Moses did not attempt to get rid of them—in fact he

<sup>1</sup> *Prolegomena*, pp. 17–22. And see above Art. I. A, I. 2, and Art. II. B, I.

offered at such himself—but he regulated them and, side by side with the primitive usage, he set up the new usage of the Tabernacle. Wiener enlarges on the obvious difference between a mound (or cairn) and a house (with horned altar), and then proceeds: 'The stoutest opponent of the higher critics would have thought it impossible that they could be so hopelessly incompetent as to be unable to distinguish between a mound and a house, and that merely because they had called both these objects "sanctuaries," but unfortunately the facts admit of no doubt' (*Essays*, p. 187 note).

[Wiener is so pleased with this supposed exposure of the 'hopeless incompetence' of the higher critics that he repeats it over and over again in his various writings. The latest and perhaps the most flagrant of these is in an article on 'The Need of a Jewish Biblical Scholarship,'<sup>2</sup> in which he says: 'When I came to Biblical studies, I found the great Kuenen and his disciples busily engaged in piercing the ear of a slave (Ex 21<sup>6</sup>) to the door or doorpost of a mound of earth or stones which they had called a sanctuary and then mistaken for a house. The way it came about was this. In Ex 20<sup>24</sup> they had found a law which permits the erection of a number of altars. They then called these altars "sanctuaries." . . . Having labelled them sanctuaries, the critics became the victims of their own terminology. Sanctuaries were generally houses and have doors or door-posts. Mounds of earth or stone have not. But the philologists and theologians were too confused to know the difference, and so in every rationalist lecture-room, the mounds sprouted doors under the wonder-working influence of

<sup>2</sup> Sent me in MS., and which I understand is to be published in the *Monatsschrift für Geschichte . . . des Judentums*.

critics living thousands of years after the events of which they spoke. Nobody will be so ungenerous as to grudge rationalism its miracles; but sensible men must be excused for regarding their scholarship as fit for nothing but the comic opera stage.]

A man who can write such stuff and nonsense as this, and speak in such manner of scholars of the front rank, must not be surprised if these men, who weigh their words and who seek to conduct controversy in a reputable manner, decline to take any notice of his writings. Needless to say, 'the critics' do not make any such mistake. Whether 'before God' in Ex 21<sup>6</sup> means 'at the sanctuary' is open to question (see Driver's and Peake's Commentaries, *ad loc.*), but that is not the question here. In Old Israel there were many 'high places' which in pre-exilic days were called 'sanctuaries' (Art. I. A, I. 2). Such a typical high place as that at Ramah had permanent buildings (1 S 9<sup>22</sup>). Its 'guest-chamber' would seat thirty persons (same Hebrew word in Jer 35<sup>22</sup>). It was these permanent high places, and not casual altars, which the critics, following Biblical usage, called sanctuaries. Wiener's charge, in fact, recoils on his own head. It is he, and not the critics, who confounds mound and house and treats such a sanctuary as that at Ramah as being nothing more than a mound of earth or stones. Must one not apply to him his own words: 'How can a man, who cannot distinguish between a stone and a house, claim to speak with authority on complicated questions of historical development?' (*Origin of the Pentateuch*, p. 63).

But now to business. We will consider in the rest of this article:

#### I. Wiener's arguments for one sanctuary.

Wiener agrees with Wellhausen on two points: (1) that Ex 20<sup>24</sup> declares a multiplicity of altars to be legitimate, and (2) that the history shows that such a multiplicity actually obtained; but he discounts this by asserting that from the beginning there was also (i) a single sanctuary, with (ii) a horned altar, where (iii) priests only could minister, and (iv) at which alone statutory sacrifices could lawfully be offered. What evidence does Wiener bring forward in support of this view?

1. His statement that a single sanctuary was in existence from the beginning is based upon four passages in JE (Ex 23<sup>19</sup> 34<sup>26</sup>, Jos 9<sup>23</sup> (27), Ex 21<sup>14</sup>). The expressions, 'the house of Jehovah thy God,' 'the house of my God,' and 'mine altar' prove, he says, that both the legislation and the narrative of JE recognize the existence of a 'house of

Jehovah' and show that 'pilgrimages to this house, and not to lay altars, are firmly established in the earliest legislation' (*Essays*, p. 183).

[We must note here a characteristic outburst on Wiener's next page. 'Wellhausen in his famous chapter on "The Place of Worship" professes to discuss the evidence of J (pp. 29-32). He has not detected Ex 23 or 34 or Jos 9. . . . I have often asked partisans of Wellhausen, if they can show me any references to these passages in his discussion, but I never can get an answer.' If only Wiener had read the *Prolegomena* with any care, he would not have needed to ask this question, for on page 42 Wellhausen refers to Jos 9<sup>27</sup> in a footnote, and on p. 374 he discusses it for half a page. In Chap. III. p. 89, Ex 23<sup>19</sup> and 34<sup>26</sup> are quoted in full and discussed throughout the whole of the following page. Once more we see that Wiener charges his opponent with a neglect which is quite imaginary and is himself guilty of 'failure to collate the whole of the relevant evidence.']

That these passages refer to a 'house of Jehovah' is quite clear; that they refer to one sanctuary of exclusive legitimacy is the reverse of clear. If JE were homogeneous and if its date were known, the task of interpretation would be much easier; but while JE unquestionably contains very ancient materials, the dates at which they were written down in J and E and then later combined in JE are very difficult to determine. Dates as wide apart as the tenth and sixth centuries B.C. have been assigned to them (e.g. Sellin's *Introduction*, E.T. pp. 54 ff., and Kennett's *O.T. Essays*, pp. 6-9). Moreover, JE bears clear marks of editorial handiwork, Deuteronomic and Priestly. Careful scrutiny is therefore needed before adducing particular passages as evidence for the earliest times.

The phrase 'the house (a) of Jehovah,' or (b) 'of Jehovah thy God,' occurs very rarely in the early books ((a) 1 S 17 3<sup>15</sup> (Shiloh); (b) Ex 23<sup>19</sup> 34<sup>26</sup>, Dt 23<sup>18</sup>). 'The house of God' occurs in Gn 28<sup>17, 22</sup> (Jacob's pillar) and Jg 18<sup>31</sup> (Shiloh); cf. Jos 9<sup>23</sup> ('house of my God'), Jg 17<sup>5</sup> R.V.m. 18<sup>14</sup> (Micah). [In Jos 6<sup>24</sup> LXX omits 'the house.' For Jg 19<sup>18</sup> see R.V.m.] It occurs with equal rarity in the earlier literary prophets: Am 7<sup>13</sup>, 'the house of the kingdom' (Bethel); Hos 9<sup>4</sup>, cf. vv. 8, 15 (northern sanctuaries); Mic 4<sup>1, 2</sup> = Is 2<sup>2, 3</sup> (Zion). [Is 37<sup>1, 14</sup> 38<sup>20, 22</sup> = 2 K 19<sup>1, 14</sup> 20<sup>5, 8</sup>.] But when we come to Kings, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel we find the phrase in very frequent use (Kings one hundred and fifty-seven, Jeremiah forty-one, Ezekiel sixty-three times) and always meaning the Temple, in

fact or in vision. Now Samuel and Kings (in all probability originally one) were compiled by one or more contemporaries of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. 1 S 1-3 describes the sanctuary at Shiloh as a 'house' with doors, but the writer to whom we owe 2 S 7 knows of no 'house' before the days of David (v. 6 and cf. 1 K 3<sup>2</sup>). What, then, are we to understand by 'the house' or 'altar of Jehovah' in the passages adduced by Wiener? We will take them in order.

(i) Ex 20<sup>23</sup> 22<sup>20-30</sup> 23<sup>12-19</sup> cover the same ground as 34<sup>17-26</sup>, and the two seem to be E's and J's versions of 'the words of Jehovah' (24<sup>9</sup>). The editor, who found room for both in JE, appears to have assimilated them to one another (esp. in 23<sup>18, 19</sup> 34<sup>25, 26</sup>). The phrase 'Jehovah thy God' occurs two hundred and thirty-one times in Deuteronomy, and the particular phrase 'the house of Jehovah thy God' is found in Dt 23<sup>18</sup>, while the context exhibits many Deuteronomical phrases (e.g. Ex 23<sup>15</sup> 34<sup>20</sup> = Dt 16<sup>1, 16</sup>; 23<sup>17</sup> 34<sup>23</sup> = Dt 16<sup>16</sup>; 34<sup>24</sup> = Dt 4<sup>38</sup> (Heb.) and six times, and Dt 12<sup>20</sup> 19<sup>8</sup>). Probably, therefore, 'the house . . . thy God' comes from a Deuteronomical writer and means the Temple. If, however, it should be due to an earlier writer, it would naturally mean at the time the nearest place of pilgrimage, but would later be read in accordance with the then current meaning.

(ii) Jos 9. The Gibeonites are condemned to provide bondmen for v. 23 'the house of my God,' v. 27 'the altar of Jehovah.' It is noteworthy that (1 K 3<sup>4</sup>) Solomon went to Gibeon to sacrifice there, for that was the great 'high place,' and that Ezekiel (44<sup>7-9</sup>) denounces the bringing in of uncircumcised aliens to keep the charge of God's sanctuary. It would seem that Gibeonite bondmen served at the local 'house of God,' now converted to Jehovah-worship, and that this bond-service was later carried over to the Temple at Jerusalem.

(iii) Ex 21<sup>14</sup>. Wiener is perfectly right in saying (*The Main Problem of Deuteronomy*, pp. 12-13) that 'mine altar' cannot here mean any casual altar of earth or stones, but neither can it mean a single sanctuary altar for the whole land. The asylum, to be of any use, must have been within reach of the fugitive manslayer, and it is most reasonable to regard 'mine altar' as being that at the nearest recognized sanctuary of Jehovah.

With the best will in the world, on such shaky foundations as are provided in Wiener's four passages it is impossible honestly to build up the thesis that from the beginning in Old Israel there was one sanctuary of exclusive legitimacy. And,

on the contrary, as we shall see in the next article, there is abundant evidence that there were many sanctuaries.

2. Wiener next brings evidence to show that 'at any rate as far back as the days of David and Solomon' there stood 'before the ark' a 'horned altar.' First Adonijah, and then Joab (1 K 1<sup>50f.</sup> 2<sup>28ff.</sup>), fleeing for sanctuary, 'caught hold of the horns of the altar.' In Joab's case this altar is said to have been 'in the tent of Jehovah.' Here, according to Wiener, we have clear proof of the truth of his thesis (*Essays*, p. 182). Two difficulties, however, arise: (a) it is precarious to trust to a statement by the author of Kings as proving what was the nature of the altar in 'the tent of Jehovah,' in the early days of King Solomon, seeing that the first compiler seems to have done his work after the death of Jehoiakim (2 K 24<sup>6</sup>), and therefore in speaking of the horns of the altar he may simply be reading back into earlier times the usage of his own day. And a further difficulty arises: (b) Where was this horned altar? Wiener says (p. 188) that 'the tent of Jehovah,' in which Joab found it, must have been the tent which David pitched for the ark at Jerusalem (2 S 6<sup>17</sup>), but, according to 1 K 3<sup>4</sup>, Gibeon was at that time 'the great high place,' and its altar was so large that Solomon offered upon it one thousand burnt-offerings. Is it likely that this great sanctuary was content with an altar of earth or unhewn stone, while the much smaller tent at Jerusalem had the superior horned altar? The author of Chronicles obviously thought otherwise. He states in the parallel passage to 1 K 3 (2 Ch 1<sup>3-6</sup>; cf. 1 Ch 16<sup>39</sup>) that the Mosaic 'tent of meeting' and 'the brazen altar which Bezalel made' were at Gibeon. But, if so, what becomes of Wiener's horned altar at Jerusalem? Could there have been two? The Chronicler is as convinced as Wiener that the Levitical worship was in full swing in 'the tent of meeting' in the wilderness, and he believes that the Tabernacle and the altar came in with Joshua, were preserved in David's time at Gibeon, and were finally deposited in the Temple at Jerusalem (2 Ch 5<sup>5</sup>), but his view will not square with Wiener's view that the sole legitimate sanctuary altar, in the years before the Temple was built, was in David's tent. Wiener will no doubt say that Chronicles is 'midrash' (see *Pentateuchal Studies*, p. 284), and with good reason; but the Chronicler has sound sense on his side when he assumes that, if *any* sanctuary had 'the brazen altar,' it would be the great high place at Gibeon, and not David's tent at Jerusalem.

Wiener does acknowledge that there were 'horned altars' at what he regards as illegitimate sanctuaries (Am 3<sup>14</sup> proves that), but that does not shake his confidence that there was at any one time only one legitimate sanctuary and only one legitimate horned altar. There will not, however, be many who, having weighed his at the best very scanty evidence, will share that confidence.

[In the prophetic, poetic, and historical books altar 'horns' are mentioned in four passages: Am 3<sup>14</sup>, 'I will visit the altars of Bethel: and the horns of the altar shall be cut off'; Jer 17<sup>1</sup>, 'The sin of Judah . . . is graven upon the horns of your (R.V.m. 'their') altars' (see also v.<sup>2</sup>); Ps 118<sup>27</sup>, 'Bind the sacrifice with cords, even unto the horns of the altar'; and Ezk 43<sup>15, 20</sup>, 'from the altar-hearth and upward there shall be four horns.' In the Pentateuch (Ex 27-30, 37-38, Lv 4, 8, 9, 16, all P) the horns of the altar are mentioned eighteen times. By the time that P was written, no other kind of altar would have been thought possible.]

The passage in Amos proves that horned altars were in full use in the time of Jeroboam II. (about 760 B.C.). How far back we must go for their first introduction it is impossible to say. There is nothing incredible in the supposition that they had begun to appear in the larger sanctuaries as early as the end of David's reign (about 1000 B.C.); it is when we are asked to believe that Israel entered Palestine with such an altar and that it could be found only at one legitimate central sanctuary that we are compelled to part company with Wiener and to say that the evidence, literary and historical, points decisively the other way.

3. The third part of Wiener's position (B, I. above) is that at the altar of the supposed single sanctuary only priests could minister. This, of course, is what P lays down, but when we turn to the history (see Art. I. Part I. A, 4) we see that David himself, girded with a linen ephod, offered his offerings before Jehovah at the tent which he erected for the ark at Jerusalem, and blessed the people in the name of Jehovah of hosts (2 S 6<sup>17, 18</sup>). Even when the Temple was built, Solomon himself offered the great prayer, blessed all the assembly, hallowed the Temple court, and offered sacrifice (1 K 8). Was this, then, a lay altar? or, rather, is not Wiener's whole view an anachronism? It was not until long afterwards that ministrations at the altar at Jerusalem were hedged round by awful sanctions and declared inaccessible even to anointed kings. It is significant that the story of Uzziah's trespass in the Temple to burn incense

is to be found in Chronicles, not in Kings (2 Ch 26<sup>16ff</sup>; cf. 2 K 15<sup>5</sup>).

The further question arises: Were not local altars at high places served by priests, although, according to Wiener, these altars were in the eyes of the law only lay altars? They certainly were in the days of Josiah, when every city of Judah seems to have had its high place and its priest (2 K 23<sup>6, 8</sup>), and there can be no doubt that at least the larger high places to which the people resorted from early days had priests in charge. Jeroboam was clearly following the custom of his day, when 'he made houses of high places and made priests' to serve in them (1 K 12<sup>31</sup>). This leads up to the question: What, in fact, was the status and what were the duties of a priest in the early days? Wiener clearly thinks of him, in accordance with the later idea, as chiefly concerned with sacrifice and Levitical ritual, but in the earliest days it would seem that slaughtering and pouring out the blood and the burning of the fat were carried out by the offerer himself (see Art. II. B, I.). But as soon as settled conditions permitted the establishment of permanent 'houses,' men had to be set apart to take charge of them. We may compare the primitive practice at local shrines in Syria to-day. S. I. Curtiss (*Primitive Semitic Religion To-Day*, chap. 12) writes: 'There is virtually a priesthood in existence, called Sheiks of certain shrines, or servants of certain saints. . . . They keep the shrine in order. They slay, if the offerer does not wish to do so himself. They are supported in part at least by the sacrifices brought to the "makam"' (=Heb. for 'place,' Dt 12<sup>2, 5, 11, 13</sup>, etc.). Two words used to describe priestly functions show the early conception—'minister' (שָׂרַת) and 'keep' (שָׁמַר). The former is used in civil life of higher domestic service, of royal officers, of Joshua's service to Moses, and Elisha's to Elijah; and so in ecclesiastical life Samuel, e.g., is said to 'minister' unto or before Jehovah (1 S 2<sup>18, 31</sup>). Wiener, with his anachronistic ideas of a priest's duties in Old Israel, writes in his *Pentateuchal Studies*, p. 264: 'It stands to reason that the child can have performed no priestly duties whatever, though doubtless he ran errands and performed odd jobs for Eli as a kind of page.' But, as a matter of fact, opening and closing of the doors (3<sup>15</sup>), caring for 'the lamp of God,' placing bread before the presence (21<sup>6</sup>), cleaning 'the house,' with its guest-chamber (where such parties as Elkanah's ate the sacrificial feast) and its precincts, were precisely 'priestly duties' in Samuel's day. (In 1 S 2<sup>15, 16</sup> it is not clear who burnt the fat.) In Deuteronomy שָׂרַת

occurs five times, and in all five it is used of priestly duties, including that of blessing in the name of Jehovah (10<sup>8</sup> 17<sup>12</sup> 18<sup>5</sup>. 7 21<sup>5</sup>), and the same usage is found in connexion with both priests and Levites in the later writings and in P (Ex 30<sup>20</sup>, Nu 3<sup>31</sup>, etc. etc.). Another duty is brought out by the second word (שמר). When the ark was brought into the house of Abinadab the men of Kirjath-Jearim 'sanctified' his son to 'keep' it. In the same way 'such an image as that of Gideon or Micah (Jg 8<sup>26</sup>. 27 17<sup>4</sup>. 5) was well worth stealing,' and needed a priest as guardian over it. This verb is used in P of both priests and Levites (Nu 18<sup>5</sup>. 7. and 3. 4; cf. 2 K 25<sup>18</sup>, Ezk 44<sup>14-16</sup>). A third duty of the priests in Old Israel was to give oracular answers to those who came to inquire of God (Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, p. 130). So

Abiathar came down to David with an ephod in his hand, and David through him 'inquired of Jehovah' (1 S 23<sup>6</sup>. 9-13. 2. 4 14<sup>3</sup>. 18 R.V.m. 22<sup>10</sup> with 21<sup>0</sup> 30<sup>7</sup>). [In 1 S 14<sup>3</sup> 22<sup>18</sup> the Heb. means 'carry' or 'bear,' not 'wear,' and the ephod is clearly a small image and not the 'linen ephod' of 2<sup>18</sup>, Ex 28<sup>6</sup>. In 22<sup>18</sup> 'linen' is wanting in the LXX, and we should read 'ephod-bearing men.']

This giving of oracular answers developed into the giving of 'torah,' *i.e.* teachings and decisions on moot points of law and order (Dt 33<sup>10</sup> etc.). And, when daily sacrifices were inaugurated in national sanctuaries, of necessity the priests themselves slaughtered sacrificially.

4. Wiener's fourth contention, *viz.* that statutory sacrifices could be sacrificed only at the central sanctuary, will be discussed in Art. VI.

## In the Study.

### Virginibus Quærisque.

#### Refusing the Easy Way out.

BY THE REVEREND STUART ROBERTSON, M.A.,  
GLASGOW.

'Others were tortured, not accepting deliverance.'—  
He 11<sup>35</sup>.

THERE is one thing written very plainly across the pages of the Bible, and that is that God is our Deliverer. The Bible is a book of deliverances. Its histories tell us how God delivered Israel from Egypt, David from Saul, the Jews from captivity, Daniel from the lions, Peter and Paul and Silas from prison. Its Psalms are prayers for deliverance, and thanksgivings because God heard those who called on Him and delivered them from all their distresses. Its prophets preach the hope of a Deliverer who should come some day; and when Jesus came at last, He said He was come to 'preach deliverance to the captives.' His very name 'Jesus' means 'Deliverer.'

Yet in one place, when the writer is exulting in the long list of those whom God had delivered, he goes on to say, 'Others were tortured, not accepting deliverance.'

What does this mean? That they refused God's way of deliverance? No! It means that they refused a way of deliverance because it was not God's way. There was a way out, an easy way, but they refused to take the easy way out.

It means that it is a fine thing to trust God to deliver you in trouble, but it is a finer thing to go on trusting Him when He doesn't deliver you; and so the Bible puts high in the list of its heroes those who refused the easy way out.

What splendid pages of history these people have written! I see the disciples brought before the very man who had put Jesus to death and who had power to put them to death. He forbids the disciples to preach about Jesus. Peter answers that they 'must obey God rather than man,' and faces the consequences boldly. The easy way was just to be quiet, but they didn't take it. I see the early Christians. They were only asked to cast a pinch of incense on the altar of the Emperor: that was the easy way. The other way was the lions and the torture and death. Why not do the easy thing and confess Christ in their hearts? It meant peace and quietness. Some did it, but many others refused deliverance and were tortured. I see George Wishart and Patrick Hamilton in Scotland. They had the same choice: to hold their tongues and live unharmed, or to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ and face burning and the stake. They refused the easy way out, and were martyred at St. Andrews. I think of Cranmer and Latimer and Ridley; to all there was an easy way of escape: to deny Christ, to hold their peace, to forget their conscience; but, instead, they chose to be loyal to Christ and to conscience.