
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

dominant place in public worship its almost sacramental character may be forgotten. It comes to be regarded as a particular kind of literary composition with its special technique developed by the preacher for the expression of his own ideas. The sense of responsibility is lacking, for the preacher has forgotten that he cannot preach except he be sent, but the text of Scripture at the head of his sermon ought at least to keep his commission before his eyes.

There is another school of thought, strong in the Anglican communion at present, which strives earnestly to give the sacraments that high place which is their due, but which is apt to depreciate preaching. Yet, according to Anglican formularies, the priest is ordained to the ministry of the word and sacraments (the terms occur in that order), and in the history of priesthood it will be found that the declaring of the oracle of God as a priestly function is as early as (in the Jewish priesthood it seems to have been earlier than) the offering of the sacrifices of the people which corresponds to the ministry of the sacraments. And surely it is easier to discern the ministry of the word in a sermon based on a Biblical text than in 'a few brief thoughts on the Collect for to-day' or a dissertation on the life of some unknown saint.

Our consideration of the view that preaching from texts is a convention, if we have argued rightly, points to the conclusion that though it may be a convention it is a sound one, not based on an obsolete presupposition regarding the nature of the inspiration of Scripture, but rooted in the very nature of preaching. It is a convention that may be departed from when occasion demands, as in Bible-class addresses, week-day lectures, and so on, but it is one that ought always to be kept in view where the public worship of the Church is concerned.

Altars and Sanctuaries in the Old Testament.

By the Reverend Canon J. Battersby Harford, M.A., B.D., Ripon.

V.

B. One Sanctuary or Many? (continued).

II. *Wellhausen's argument for many sanctuaries.*

Let us remind ourselves what Wellhausen's thesis is.

The Hebrews, he said, took over the sacred places of the Canaanites. The Bāmoth (high places) of Shechem, Bethel, and Beersheba, *e.g.*, were ancient sanctuaries associated in the popular mind with the patriarchs. But new sanctuaries were also instituted as needed. Shiloh and Gilgal, Ophrah, Ramah, and Nob became important centres of worship. These sacrificial seats were not all held in equal esteem. Shiloh in particular acquired widespread fame, but this was not to the discredit of other sanctuaries. Even when the Temple was built at Jerusalem, it was not made the one exclusive centre. Amos tells us (5^5) that the Ephraimites flocked to Gilgal and Bethel and Beersheba; Jerusalem they left unvisited. In their own land they served Jehovah at Bethel and Dan, at Shechem and Samaria and Mizpah, and many other places. Every town had its high place. Nobody had the faintest suspicion that there was anything heretical in such conduct. Wellhausen further pointed out that 'apart from the greater cities with their more or less regular religious service, it is perfectly permissible to erect an altar extempore and offer sacrifice whenever an occasion presents itself,' and quoted, as an example, the incident after the battle of Michmash. He does not, however, call these extempore altars sanctuaries (*Prolegomena*, pp. 17–21, and see Art. I. *A*, 1–4).

Wiener, however, will have none of this. As we have seen (Art. IV.), he declares Wellhausen's multiplicity of sanctuaries to be 'an incredible blunder.' His positive arguments for a single legitimate sanctuary from the first we have dealt with in the last article. His negative arguments and criticisms will be considered in this and the concluding article. As the questions at issue between Wellhausen and Wiener are mainly questions as to the true meaning of three key passages—viz. Ex 20^{24-26}, Lv 17^{1-9}, and Dt 12^{1-28}—our best method will be to subject these passages to careful examination, and to weigh the rival arguments as they come up in the course of our study.

1. Exodus 20^{24-26}. There are four points requiring attention in v.[24] (i) 'An altar of earth shalt thou make unto me; (ii) and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt-offerings and thy peace-offerings, thy sheep and thine oxen; (iii) in every place (iv) where I record my name,' (R.V.m., 'where I cause my name to be remembered') 'I will come unto thee and bless thee' (R.V.).

i. The Hebrew word translated 'altar' is formed from the root זבח, the usage of which we discussed in Article III. It may etymologically mean 'place of slaughter,' but (*a*) in usage the slaughter was sacrificial slaughter; (*b*) as Wiener points out in *Some Fundamental Errors*, § 2 (cf. G. B. Gray, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, p. 97), in later usage the altar was the place of burning, and the actual slaughter took place at a little distance; and (*c*) it was even used in connexion with bloodless offerings, such as meal-offerings. In all these cases, however, the altar in one essential respect remained the same; it was an erection specially set apart and related to the Deity—'an altar . . . unto ME.' I have not noticed any special reference in Wiener's writings to these last two words—yet they are of decisive importance. The *mizbeăḥ* was never in Israel a mere place of slaughter, as he would suggest. When the animal was placed upon it and slain, it was essential that the blood should flow down to the base of Jehovah's altar. As Wellhausen says: 'The pouring out of blood was ventured upon only in such a way as to give it back to the Deity, the source of life. In this way, not by any means every meal, but every slaughtering came to be a sacrifice' (*Prolegomena*, p. 63).

When Wiener (see Art. III. *A*, 3) speaks of the slaughtering upon the great stone after the battle of Michmash as being 'non-sacrificial,' because no priest was called in (although a priest, Abiathar, was there), and because the burning of the fat was a specifically priestly function, (*a*) he is, among other things, ignoring the fact that the pouring out of the blood was the essential part of primitive sacrifice. Although during a great part of Old Testament times the fat of the peace-offerings was burned on the altar (1 S 2^{16}), and the blood and the fat are mentioned together by P in Lv 3^{17} as sacred, yet there is a variety of evidence to show that 'it was only gradually that the burning of the fat came to be an integral part of the altar ritual.' The altar (*mizbeăḥ*), as we have just seen, was originally the place of sacrificial slaughter and outpouring of blood. The law of Ex 23^{18} merely requires that the fat of my feast shall not remain until the morning. It was too holy to be eaten and must in some way be consumed. The most natural way was by fire, and so Lv 7^{15-17} lays down that any remains of the flesh of peace-offerings 'shall be consumed by fire.' But it does not seem as if this was on the altar (see v.[19]). Even in Dt 12^{27} a distinction is made between burnt-offerings and peace-offerings (sacrifices); in the former case 'the flesh and the blood' are to be offered upon the altar, in the latter 'the blood shall be poured out upon the altar . . . and thou shalt eat the flesh.' Nothing is said here about 'the fat.' So also in Lv 7^{11-21}, 'the law of the sacrifice of peace-offerings' speaks of (v.[14]) 'the sprinkling of the blood' and (v.[15]) 'the eating of the flesh' without reservation. It is only in the supplement (vv.[22-27]) (notice the fresh heading in vv.[22. 23]) that reference is made to 'the fat.' Lv 17^{11} points in the same direction: 'the life (Heb. "soul") of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life.' But in process of time the altar became the hearth on which a fire burned, and the fat and the burnt-offering were then regarded as thereby made over to God. (See W. Robertson Smith, *The Religion of the Semites*, pp. 379–389, and also, for present-day usage among Syrians and Arabs, S. I. Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*, chap. xviii. pp. 229 ff., 222 f., 237.) (*b*) What, in Wiener's view, did become of 'the fat,' when there was no priest? According to him, Leviticus was in force, except where tacitly repealed in Deuteronomy, and Leviticus lays down (3^{16}) that only the priest can burn the fat on the altar, and (3^{17}) that it is unlawful to eat 'the fat' (*i.e.* the viscera, which were regarded as a special seat of life). Yet something must have been done with it. The only alternatives seem to be that it was reverently consumed by the lay worshippers either by eating, as part of the sacrificial meal, or by fire, but not necessarily in the earlier time by altar-fire.

ii. Upon Jehovah's altar were to be sacrificially slaughtered '*thy burnt-offerings and thy peace-offerings, thy sheep and thine oxen.*' It has been usual to understand the latter clause as being in apposition to the former and as specifying the animals which were required for the just mentioned offerings, but Wiener is sure that, on principles of legal construction, 'express mention excludes the possibility of such an interpretation.' He says: 'The lawgiver clearly intends that sheep and cattle which are to be killed not as burnt-offerings nor as peace-offerings should be slaughtered on a

mizbeăh (*Fundamental Errors*, p. 4). But (*a*) is it likely that sacrificial and non-sacrificial slaughtering would both take place on Jehovah's altar?

In proof of his view Wiener quotes from S. I. Curtiss (*op. cit.* p. 235), Dr. Schumacher's account of a Bedouin ceremony: 'A sheep or a goat is brought to a shrine under a tree, the khatib or priest lays it across the "altar" . . . and with the words "in the name of God . . ." he cuts the throat of the animal with a knife, and the Bedouin gather the blood and sprinkle it over the grave of the [Muhammadan] saint buried at the shrine.' This Wiener regards as an example of non-sacrificial slaughter, but what better example could we wish of 'sacrificial' slaughter? The absence of any offering of the flesh by fire does not remove it from the category of sacrifice. And (*b*) is the construction at all probable? We may well doubt whether we can safely apply modern ideas of legal construction to the words of an ancient legislator. It is far more reasonable to understand 'thy sheep and thine oxen' as either a natural, if somewhat redundant, phrase in the original, specifying the animals of which the offerings would usually consist (Heb. = 'flock' and 'herd' in Lv $1^{3.\ 10}$ $3^{1.\ 6}$), or as a gloss which has come in from the margin.

iii. '*In every place . . .*' Wellhausen translates practically as the R.V.m. Wiener, with his usual sublime assurance in his *Essays* (p. 186), pronounced this rendering 'impossible.' 'Either,' he said, 'we must translate literally and correctly "all the place," *i.e.* all the territory of Israel for the time being (first the camp and its environment, then the national possessions in Palestine, cf. Dt 26^{9}), or, if we insist on translating "in every place," we must read with the Syriac: "where thou (*i.e.* Israel) shalt cause my name to be remembered."' The Syriac reading makes good sense, and Professor Budde, *e.g.*, adopts it, but it is quite unsupported, and Wiener himself prefers the Massoretic text, and translates 'in all the place' with the interpretation given above. He does not like the usual interpretation given to 'in every place,' and therefore he pronounces that interpretation to be impossible. And yet the Hebrew usage, which he rejects as impossible, is quite a common one,[1] while the interpretation which he favours is extremely far-fetched. I think that really what Wiener wanted to rule out as 'impossible' was not the translation so much as the interpretation which he seems to think Wellhausen puts upon it. This we will now deal with.

iv. *Where I cause my name to be remembered.* Wellhausen interprets this phrase as meaning: 'that the spots where intercourse between heaven and earth took place were not willingly regarded as arbitrarily chosen, but, on the contrary, were considered as having been *somehow or other* selected by the Deity Himself for His service' (*Prolegomena*, p. 30). In the two following pages, Wellhausen refers at some length to the JE narratives of the patriarchs, and points out that 'the altars *as a rule* are not built by the patriarchs according to their own private judgment, wherever they please; on the contrary, a theophany calls attention to, or at least afterwards confirms, the holiness of the place' (p. 31). On page 22 he says in like manner: 'if a theophany made known to Joshua the sanctity of Gilgal, gave occasion to Gideon and Manoah to rear altars at their homes, and drew the attention of David to the threshing-floor of Araunah, Jehovah Himself was regarded as the proper founder of *these sanctuaries*.' The words which I have italicized should be noted. It is amazing that, after quoting the first two of the above passages quite correctly, Wiener should calmly charge Wellhausen with saying that 'every altar, however casual,' was preceded by a theophany and was a sanctuary. This, he says, 'is one more example of Wellhausen's neglect to examine the facts. For instance, Saul erects an altar after Michmash, but no theophany can be suggested. Similarly with Samuel's altar at Ramah. . . . Can it really be suggested that theophanies are to be postulated in the case of the cattle-thieves? . . . Not merely David's clan, but every other clan in the country, must have had clan sacrifices (1 S 20^{6-29}). But sacrifice implies an altar—according to Wellhausen, a theophany. Did every Israelitish householder have a theophany in his back garden?' (*Essays*, pp. 185 ff.).

I have quoted this passage at length in order to show how egregiously Wiener first misreads Wellhausen, and then plays to the gallery by the use of

[1] Cf. Gn 1^{29} lit. all (or the whole of) the tree = Every tree or all the trees.
Ex 1^{22} ,, ,, ,, the son = ,, son ,, sons.
Dt 4^{3} ,, ,, ,, the man = ,, man ,, men.
11^{24} ,, ,, ,, the place = ,, place ,, places.
Jer 4^{16} ,, ,, ,, the city = ,, city ,, cities.

I see that in *The Altars* (p. 7) Wiener is now good enough to say that the phrase '*may* be rendered by "in every place," although it is the correct Hebrew for "in all the place"' (!).

cheap ridicule. It is really inexcusable to talk like this, and unworthy of a man who is by way of conducting a serious discussion. It is only necessary to read the above quotations with any care to see that Wellhausen did not say that a theophany invariably preceded or accompanied the building of any altar, however casual. What he did justly point out was that theophanies were so frequently spoken of as preceding the building of an altar where a sanctuary afterwards stood (esp. in the case of the patriarchs), that the words 'every place where I cause my name to be remembered' were most reasonably understood as referring to manifestations of the Divine presence, which pointed out these spots as places where God would 'meet with and bless' His would-be worshippers. And with Wellhausen I think all reasonable people will agree.

2. Leviticus 17^{1-9}.

i. This chapter is part of a small code, generally known as the Holiness Code, which extends from chapters 17 to 26 and which is distinguished from the rest of P by marked features of its own. The keynote is 'holiness' (19^{2} etc.). 'I am Jehovah' occurs alone twenty times, and with additions another thirty-two times. The parallels with Ezekiel are especially remarkable. 'I am Jehovah,' *e.g.*, occurs in Ezekiel seventy-eight times, while in Jeremiah it occurs only once. In this chapter the phrases (v.^{3}) 'whatsoever man there be (Heb. "man man") of the house of Israel' and (vv.$^{8.\ 10}$) ditto + 'or of the strangers'; v.^{10}, 'I will set . . . people'; v.^{13}, 'he shall pour out . . . dust'; v.^{16}, 'shall bear his iniquity' find their parallels respectively in Ezk $14^{4.\ 7}$ (Heb. ^{8}) 15^{7} 24^{7} 14^{10} $44^{10.\ 12}$. There are many features which point to the two conclusions—(*a*) that these chapters are an earlier compilation (note the colophon Lv 26^{46}) which was afterwards incorporated in the larger P code, and (*b*) that the laws therein contained are of various dates, and that they have been edited to bring them into some kind of harmony with the rest of P.

ii. Wiener says that 'on the face of it this is a camp law given in the desert; Moses and Aaron, camp and tent of meeting all occur.' Quite true; but the facts already noted warn us that we must look below the surface before accepting face-value as decisive. In this chapter it is clear that editorial hands have been at work. Certainly v.^{3} speaks of the camp, v.^{4} of the tabernacle, and vv.$^{4.\ 6}$ of the tent of meeting, but v.^{5} speaks of 'the open field' (cf. $14^{7.\ 53}$) as opposed to the city, and 'satyrs' (or he-goats) only occurs again in Is 13^{21} 34^{14}, both of which are chapters of exilic date. V.^{8} seems to be a doublet of vv.$^{2b-7}$, with the addition of non-Israelites and of burnt-offerings. Driver writes (*Commentary on Deut.* p. 138): 'The most probable opinion is that, as originally formulated, Lv 17^{1-9} had no reference to a single sanctuary, but presupposed a plurality of legitimate sanctuaries and was only accommodated to the single sanctuary by a modification of its phraseology when incorporated in P.'

iii. Wiener (*Fundamental Errors*, p. 5; *The Altars*, p. 12; *Essays*, p. 193) explains that the permission of Ex 20^{24} had been abused. Sacrifices had been offered to local satyrs. Therefore, a year or so later, Moses legislates that in future no domestic animal was to be slaughtered anywhere, except as a sacrifice at the entrance of the tent of meeting. 'That,' he continues, 'could remain in force without modification only during the desert period. Once the Israelites were scattered over a territory of any extent, such a law would be unworkable.' Quite true; but what, then, are we to make of v.^{7} (lit. a permanent statute shall this be to them for their generations)? 'It is surely unlikely,' says Wiener, 'that any legislation in a confessedly transitional era like that of the wanderings should intend to characterize as permanent a provision which from its very nature would have to be entirely repealed or, at least, modified out of all recognition, on the happening of an event the occurrence of which in the near future was confidently predicted.' Again, quite true. Wiener would therefore 'prefer the construction which regards the words as to permanence as limited to the prohibition of worship of the he-goats.' No doubt he would. But a study of the thirty-three occurrences of the phrase (all in P) must convince an unprejudiced student that the phrase refers to the whole law immediately preceding and not to a subordinate matter like that of the 'he-goats.' If, then, it refers to the whole law, what must we say? Wiener, in another connexion, when faced with a similar difficulty arising from the same phrase, has to resort to the desperate expedient of declaring that 'permanent' only means 'permanent for the time being' and that 'a permanent statute' could be altered by lawgiver, prophet, or even king, at a moment's notice (see his *Early Hebrew History*, pp. 57 ff., and my *Since Wellhausen*, p. 126).

Is it not much more reasonable to say that, at the time when the Priestly Editor after the Exile introduced into the earlier Law the references to the camp and the tent of meeting so as to give the

Mosaic colour to the requirement of resort to the central sanctuary, he also added: 'A permanent statute shall this be to them for their generations,' meaning thereby to say that though camp and tent were things of the past, sacrifice at the central sanctuary (now the second Temple) for all time still held good? In Leviticus as it now stands, P was legislating not for the whole nation, now largely in exile, but for the small community in Jerusalem and Judæa after the return. Centralization was therefore no hardship in the new conditions. The people had become accustomed to non-sacrificial worship in their own neighbourhoods, and accepted as natural and right the obligation to attend the Temple at the three Annual Pilgrimage Feasts.

3. Deuteronomy 12. (See the concluding article next month.)

Supplementary Note on 'Sanctuary.'

There are two words translated 'Sanctuary' in the A.V.

i. We have spoken of one (*miḳdash*) already in Articles I. and II. In Art. I. (p. 13), I should have said, 'six times,' because, in addition to the five passages there mentioned, it is found in Ex 15^{17}. It there refers either to Shiloh or Jerusalem, but the song (vv.$^{2\text{-}18}$) is of late date.

If the word was in use for the tabernacle before the entrance into Canaan (P, twelve times), it is remarkable that (with the extremely doubtful exception of Ex 15^{17}) it is never used of Shiloh or even of Jerusalem before the Exile, whereas in the four pre-exilic passages (and in Lv 26^{31}) it is used of high places. It is not once used in Deuteronomy, Judges, Samuel, or Kings, but occurs twenty-nine or thirty times in Ezekiel, and twenty-four times elsewhere (outside the Pentateuch), almost always of the Temple. When, therefore, Wellhausen speaks of high places as sanctuaries, he is following Biblical usage, whereas Wiener, who rejects such usage, is not.

ii. Another word (*ḳōdĕsh*) is translated 'the sanctuary' sixty-seven times in the A.V., and 'the holy place' twenty-nine times. It always has the article, when used in this sense, and means literally 'the apartness' or 'sacredness.' Passages in which there is a separate word in Hebrew for 'place' are not included in these figures. The word also occurs eleven times in the phrase translated in E.V. 'Holy of holies' or 'most holy place.' It is used of the Temple thirty-four times, of the Tabernacle sixty-two times. Here, again, we want an adequate explanation of the fact that at the beginning and end of the Hebrew Bible we have such frequent use of the phrase, while in the middle section it is almost non-existent, Zeph 3^{4} being the only sure example. (The double use in 1 K $8^{8\text{-}10}$ occurs in a notoriously interpolated passage.)

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Door that wouldn't open.

By the Reverend Alexander Small, B.D.,
Boreham Wood, Herts.

'A door was opened unto me of the Lord.'—2 Co 2^{12}.

Bruno is an Irish terrier. He has lovely brown eyes, and when he looks up at us, we know he is trying to speak. He begs for his food; he holds up his paw to be shaken, just as if he is shaking hands; he will carry a kettle downstairs and do other tricks. But sometimes he is naughty. He does just the opposite of what we tell him to do. Then we have to scold him, and his tail stops wagging and he puts it between his legs. Sometimes we lose him. We call him and he does not come. We look for him downstairs and find no trace of him. Then, knowing as we do, that he thinks he has the right to roam all over the house, we go upstairs, hunt through the rooms, the doors of which are open, but Bruno is not in any of these. Then we come to the study door. It is closed. He cannot be in there, we think. No dog can get through a closed door. Yet we know he must be somewhere and we open the door. There he is, the rascal, perfectly contented, lying in the soft comfortable arm-chair. But sometimes we have found him behind the door, waiting to be let out, for try as he might he has not been able to get out by himself. He found it easy to get into the room, for he pushed open the door