

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

tion of this Commentary will lead to animated discussion, for it initiates many people into views which may be at first unwelcome. But it marks a stage in the education of the public mind. It will reach thousands who are not reached by ordinary

critical text-books, and the spirit in which it has been executed is all the more likely to be persuasive since it is, in the best sense of the terms, both candid and ironical. To sum up, the book is timely, full of stimulus, and a genuine guide.

Altars and Sanctuaries in the Old Testament.

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

VI.

PART II. B (*continued*).

3. Dt 12¹⁻²⁸. Four times over (vv. 5-7, 11-12, 13-14, 26-28), it is here laid down that all sacrifices, tithes, and vows are to be brought to the place chosen by Jehovah, and (vv. 2-3) all rival places are to be destroyed or (v. 13) passed by. But (vv. 20-25, 15-16) distance would make it a great hardship if, when the Israelites were spread over the land of their inheritance, they could only eat of flock or herd at the one centre. Permission is therefore given to them to kill and eat non-sacrificially within their own gates. To such a feast the ceremonially unclean could come. Only the blood must be poured out upon the earth as water. So far Wellhausen and Wiener agree. Difference begins when we ask: What was the occasion which led to this ordinance being laid down so emphatically? Wellhausen answers: 'We have here the embodiment of the prophetic views which inspired the reformation of Josiah. Up to this time sacrifice and feasting have taken place at a number of sanctuaries and altars. But now, in view of the heathen character of the worship at the high places, the order goes forth that at one place only is sacrifice to be offered. And, as a corollary to this, feasting is not henceforth to be tied to sacrifice, and Israel may feast at home.' (See Part I. A, II. and B, II. in Articles I. and II.)

Wiener repudiates this altogether. Moses is the legislator, and Israel is in the plains of Moab. In the first year after their arrival at Sinai the Israelites had been permitted to offer sacrifices at various local altars (Ex 20²⁴), but this permission was abused, and therefore in the second year was superseded by a new rule which forbade sacrifice anywhere except at the door of the Tabernacle (Lv 17). Under this rule they had lived for nearly forty years. But now they are about to enter

Canaan, and Dt 12 lays down an amended rule to meet the new conditions. At the three pilgrimage seasons they must still offer sacrifices at a central sanctuary, but at other times Ex 20²⁴⁻²⁶ is to be once more in force, and both non-sacrificial slaughter at home and sacrifices at local 'lay altars' are to be again permitted (*Essays*, p. 193).

Is this view possible? In confirmation of it, Wiener advances five considerations:

- (i) This whole legislation is expressly said to be spoken by Moses (4⁴⁴ 5¹).
- (ii) Dt 12⁵⁻⁷, etc., refer to statutory offerings, and do not touch the customary offerings of Ex 20²⁴.
- (iii) Dt 12²¹ and 16²¹ expressly recognize the altars of Ex 20.
- (iv) It is unthinkable that public worship should be restricted to the Pilgrimage seasons.
- (v) Semitic usage, ancient and modern, exhibits a dual system of sacrifice.

We will consider each of these in turn.

i. Wiener has the initial advantage that in *form* this chapter purports to be spoken by Moses in the Plains of Moab. But (a), as we saw in connexion with Lv 17, it is not safe to take everything at its face value. V.⁸, e.g., bids us pause. If, as Wiener holds, the Tabernacle with all its elaborate ritual and its three Orders of Ministers had been set up by Moses in the wilderness and it had been the centre of camp life for nearly forty years, can we imagine him saying to Israel, 'Ye shall not do after all the things that *we* (emphatic in Heb.) are doing here this day, every man that which is right in his own eyes,' and contrasting the present lack of order with the future happier days of rest and security when it would be possible to set up a central 'place' of Jehovah's choosing to

which all could resort? Whatever the date of Deuteronomy, it seems clear that the author had no idea that a centralized system of worship had been set up in the wilderness. His conception of the wilderness life seems to have been much more like that in the days of the Judges (Jg 17⁹ 21²⁶). Wiener points to the Moabite (according to P, Midianite) apostasy (Nu 25) as exemplifying the religious lawlessness of v.⁹, but this verse speaks of something much more universal and irremediable than a temporary outbreak which, according to the story of Nu 25, was speedily stamped out by the religious authorities.

(b) Moreover, there are many indications that Dt 12 was not all spoken or written at one time. Its repetitions and its varied phraseology point to its being composed of at least two, probably four, sections, vv. 1-7, 8-12, 13-19, 20-28 (see Welch, *The Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 47 f., and Carpenter and Harford, *The Hexateuch*, vol. ii. p. 268). If so, it could hardly have been spoken by one man at one time. (On the whole question of the compilation of Deuteronomy, see *Since Wellhausen*, art. 4, pp. 91 f., and *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, pp. 147-148.)

ii. Wiener has to meet the difficulty from his point of view that chapter 12 repeatedly says that Israelites are to bring their burnt-offerings and their sacrifices, etc., to the one central 'place,' and to offer them there upon (v.²⁷) 'the altar of Jehovah thy God,' whereas Ex 20 bids the Israelites offer their burnt-offerings and their peace-offerings upon local altars of earth or unhewn stone. He tries to meet it by saying (*Essays*, pp. 195, 199-203) that Ex 20 refers to 'customary' offerings which Moses found in regular use and which he was content to retain and regulate before Lv 17 was in force and after it was superseded, whereas Dt 12 refers to 'statutory' offerings, which by Divine command were to be offered only at the central place. In Ex 20, therefore, the phrase meant 'all such burnt-offerings and peace-offerings as thou mayest offer in accordance with the existing custom as to lay sacrifice, but not other burnt-offerings and peace-offerings which do not fall within this custom,' and in Dt 12 the similar phrase meant the statutory offerings of Leviticus which were to be brought to the central altar, and did not refer to the customary sacrifices at all. This is a very forced explanation and without any solid foundation. There is nothing in the wording of Exodus or Deuteronomy making any such discrimination. How was the ordinary Israelite to whom Deuteronomy was in any view addressed (see, e.g., 5¹ 6¹⁻² 11²⁻⁷, etc.) to

realize that such distinctions were to be read between the lines? Would he not naturally take the burnt-offerings and sacrifices in Deuteronomy to mean all such offerings, especially when he is told that when he wants to kill of his flock or herd at home, he can do so non-sacrificially? Wiener makes much of the fact that the list of offerings to be brought to the central sanctuary are not exhaustive. Because tithe, animals, new moon, Sabbath, family, and local celebrations are not specifically mentioned, these, he says, must be intended to go on locally as before. But if their non-mention means that they do not come within the scope of the centralizing ordinance of Dt 12, because they are not statutory offerings to be offered centrally, then what are we to make of the fact that some of the most important of the statutory offerings, as laid down in Lv 1-7, viz. meal-, sin-, and guilt-offerings are also not mentioned? Are they not statutory after all, and are they not as important as tithes and vows, which are mentioned? Are they, being unmentioned, to be offered on local altars? The fact is that Wiener is quite right in saying that the sacrifices of Ex 20 were customary, and that those in Lv 1-7 were expressed in statute form. That is no new discovery. Every critic teaches the same—so, e.g., Robertson Smith, *O.T.J.C.*, p. 339: 'A code is of necessity the final result and crystallized form of such a living, divine Torah, just as in all nations consuetudinary and judge-made law precedes codification and statute law.' But what Wiener fails to see is that the two represent, the one the beginning, and the other the end, of a long process, in the course of which the one gradually merged into the other. As the history shows, primitive custom regulated the matter and manner of sacrifice in Old Israel. Deuteronomy did not alter these sacrifices, but laid down that they should no longer be offered under the debased conditions of the high places, but should all be brought to the central sanctuary. At the same time it provided for local feasting (v.²¹) at a distance from the central sanctuary by laying down that local slaughter for food should no longer be sacrificial. It is only when we come to the Exilic and post-Exilic period that the sacrificial rites and regulations which had become the rule in Jerusalem appear in codified form in Leviticus. Wiener's further argument as to the difference between 'substantive law' and 'procedure' is equally fallacious. It is based on the same inability to realize the long history that lies behind the laws of 'procedure' in Leviticus.

iii. Wiener (*The Altars*, p. 18, *Fundamental*

Errors, Monatsschrift, p. 362) claims Dt 12²¹ and 16²¹ as showing that the altars of Ex 20^{24, 25} are expressly recognized by the law-giver in Deuteronomy. It requires considerable audacity to claim 12²¹ as so doing, when there is no mention of an altar either in this verse or in the parallel v. 15, and when these non-sacrificial slaughterings are expressly contrasted with the sacrifices which (vv. 26, 27) were to be 'offered upon the altar of Jehovah thy God' at the place of Jehovah's choice. Wiener can only give the slightest semblance of reason for such a claim by laying down (a) that the altar of Ex 20²⁴⁻²⁶ was used for non-sacrificial as well as sacrificial slaughter, and (b) that 'as I have commanded thee' in Dt 12²¹ points back to Ex 20²⁴⁻²⁶, but as we have seen good reason for turning down the former view (see Art. V. B, II. i.-ii.), and as the latter phrase much more naturally refers to v. 15, we must reject his view of 12²¹ as quite untenable.

As to Dt 16²¹ there is fairly general agreement that this passage, prohibiting Ashera and Pillar 'beside the altar of Jehovah thy God,' refers to altars of Jehovah in high places of the older period, and that it is a relic which survived such revision of laws as was carried out, when the law of the one sanctuary was put at the head of the collection of earlier laws. It may well have been felt that, until the new régime was firmly established, it still had its value. Wiener says that it is 'generally recognized as referring to "cairn" altars,' but this is not at all the case. It refers to high place altars, and these were horn altars at least as early as Amos. To say, as Wiener does (*Essays*, p. 195), that no law-giver would recognize as lawful in one chapter what he had just prohibited in another would have some force, if we could accept the view that Moses was the author of both chapters as they stand; but that, as we have seen, we cannot do.

iv. Again, Wiener (*The Altars*, p. 18; *Fundamental Errors*, p. 363), starting from the premiss that 'in the whole pre-Exilic age all public service was sacrificial,' argues that 'to confine all sacrificial worship to one religious centre would have been to abolish all public worship for all Israel except at the Pilgrimages.' 'This,' he says, 'is surely unthinkable.' 'Local public worship would be necessary,' he argues, 'for the celebration of Sabbath and New Moon, family anniversaries, local festivals and probably tithe-animals.' Wiener is quite right in saying that it is unthinkable that for all the period between the crossing of Jordan and the reformation of Josiah all public sacrificial worship would be forbidden except at the one centre. But

if, as Wiener maintains, Deuteronomy is Mosaic as it stands, that is just what it does say. The truth is that, at the time when Deuteronomy laid down that the feasts 'within thy gates' were to be non-sacrificial, Israel was not just about to enter Canaan, but had been deprived of most of its territory and 'had practically become the City of Jerusalem with its dependent towns' (Welch, *The Code of Deuteronomy*, p. 147). The one sanctuary sufficed for the sacrificial needs of the people, thus situated, and family and other feastings were provided for non-sacrificially. If we may judge from 1 S 9¹²⁻²⁴, at local festivals the feasting was at the best of times the main consideration in Old Israel, the sacrificial part of the function being performed behind the scenes. The ordinary Israelite would hardly notice the change, and he would appreciate the fact that ceremonial uncleanness no longer disqualified him from partaking of the feast. As bearing upon this point of public worship away from the centre, Wiener quotes Wellhausen's remark in regard to Old Israel that 'any strict centralization is for that period inconceivable in the sphere of Divine worship as in every other sphere,' and he comments that this was true 'for every period except that of the desert wanderings, and a strict centralization of sacrificial worship is only possible after Divine worship has been almost divorced from sacrifice' (*Fundamental Errors*, p. 363). In a footnote elsewhere (*The Altars*, p. 21 f.) he says: 'the pilgrimage laws of the Pentateuch presuppose a population with the mobility of Bedouin settled on a small territory' and 'they became continually less capable of execution. They had in view a population all the members of which would habitually be within easy reach of the religious centre.' Do not these statements, when pondered over, suggest that, on Wiener's own showing, the Israel, for whom the pilgrimage laws were laid down, could not have been the nation which was just about to leave the desert behind and to spread over a wide territory, but rather was the nation when its numbers and its territory had been reduced to a remnant of its former population and size? When the priests after the Exile had set up a centralized sacrificial worship, it was easy for them to imagine such worship as having already existed in the wilderness, because that period lends itself to such treatment.

v. In *The Altars of the Old Testament* (pp. 18-20; cf. *Fundamental Errors*, pp. 10-11), Wiener elaborates one more argument. 'Duality of the places of sacrifice,' he says quite justly, 'was a

feature of early Semitic worship.' 'If Balaam and Balak raise impromptu altars, Moab nevertheless boasted permanent high places (notice the plural, J. B. H.) and a sacerdotal system (Is 15^a, Jer 48⁷⁻³⁵). . . . Similarly in the Palestine of to-day we find pilgrimage and local sacrifices side by side. Thus S. I. Curtiss writes as follows: "There are two primitive places of sacrifice—(a) at the shrine of some being who has the value of God to the worshipper—these shrines vary from a circular wall of stones around a supposed grave—to a building known as a Kubbeh . . . (b) at the dwelling of the one offering it, whether that be cave, tent, or permanent dwelling." This dual system was familiar to every Israelite.' At this point we expect to have evidence from history that the same dual system obtained in Old Israel, but, instead of that, Wiener turns to the Pentateuchal Law. Moses, he says, (a) 'regulated the system of local worship,' and (b) 'substituted one great religious capital for the numerous centres usual in the heathen religions,' and these two laws ran concurrently. He then attacks Wellhausen for ignoring this duality and constructing a theory, according to which the law of local sacrifices prevailed alone up to 621 B.C., while after that date a new law took its place, which set up one central sanctuary of exclusive legitimacy.

As soon as we turn to the history, this whole argument falls to pieces. As Wellhausen showed conclusively, there did exist in Old Israel, not the dualism which Wiener pictures, but a dualism which exactly answered to that which obtained among neighbouring peoples at the time and still obtains to-day, viz. (a) local altars near a man's own home, and (b) numerous sanctuaries of more or less repute to which people flocked from far and near at certain times of the year. And when Wiener turns from law to history (*The Altars*, pp. 20-22), he practically reads it in the same way. The law, according to him, was quite definite and clear, but 'a little while after the death of Moses—the Israelites were a scattered minority in a land the strong places of which were mostly in the hands of heathen races that were predominantly hostile. The ideal of one place as a centre to which the whole nation could make three pilgrimages a year in complete safety was unrealizable. Hence some compromises between the extreme demands of the law and the dictates of practical necessities were inevitable.' 'The political situation was long such that for the majority of the Israelites pilgrimages to Shiloh were quite impossible. Accordingly breaches of the strict law were necessary, and *local sanctuaries served by priests* (my italics,

J. B. H.) were inevitable. . . . There may have been sanctuaries of varying degrees of legality, and some of them were probably nothing more than old heathen high places of some baal. . . . If Zebulun and Issachar (Dt 33¹⁹) had a sanctuary that complied with the requirements of the law so far as circumstances permitted, it may well be that their cult was thoroughly consistent with the spirit of the legislation where the fulfilment of the letter was impossible.' Wiener agrees with Wellhausen that the compiler of Kings adopted an unhistorical view, when he condemned some of the best kings for allowing worship in the high places, but he does so for a different reason. Wellhausen is of opinion that the writer regarded the Deuteronomic law of the one sanctuary as having been in force from the first, whereas it was really of much later date. Wiener says that the writer was right in regarding Deuteronomy as Mosaic, but that he misunderstood it and thought that it condemned local sacrifices, whereas, as Wiener himself has discovered, in reality it did nothing of the kind (*Essays*, p. 192). This misreading of history by the writer of Kings henceforth prevailed. The post-Exilic view was that from the beginning there was only one legitimate place of sacrificial worship, and this view 'prevailed till the rise of the modern critical schools' (*The Altars*, p. 23).

We have carefully considered Wiener's fivefold argument, and we have seen that it breaks down in every single case. As a matter of fact the difference between Wellhausen and Wiener is not so much as to the historical happenings, but as to the date at which the law of the one central sanctuary was laid down. Wiener, believing that the only choice is between the Mosaic authorship of the whole Pentateuchal Law and deliberate fraud, clings desperately to the former, although he recognizes that the law of the one central sanctuary was unrealizable from the moment that Israel entered into possession of the land of Canaan. Wellhausen believed that all the evidence went to show that no such impossible law was imposed upon Israel at the beginning of its national history; that in accordance with Ex 20²⁴⁻²⁶ sacrifices and offerings were made in Old Israel on the lines of primitive practice; that only when the earlier prophets had taught higher views of God and righteousness were efforts made (Dt and 2 K 23) to remedy abuses and to put down idolatry and immorality; and that the law of the one central sanctuary was then laid down in the name of Moses, which finally issued in the worship of the second Temple. It may safely be left to those who are able to weigh evidence impartially

and without *a priori* presuppositions to decide which of the two reads the facts correctly. We may sympathize with Wiener's desire to maintain Mosaic authorship, but when he says that Wellhausen's view means deliberate fraud on the part of the Deuteronomist and post-Exilic writers, our answer must be that such a verdict is the result of looking at the question from a modern and western

point of view. We may wish that another mode of presentation had been used, but it is clear that the method adopted was one which *in that age* was regarded as perfectly legitimate. It was probably the only one which at that time could have secured the acceptance of the new legislation, and, if God Himself did not disdain to permit and bless it, who are we that we should condemn?

Entre Nous.

'One trained soul can teach another.'

THAT one is dependent, absolutely dependent, in the development of the religious life on teaching by others was a basic belief of Baron von Hügel. As he put it colloquially to his niece, 'I never learnt anything myself by my own old nose.' 'The spiritual world is a great world of facts,' he said to her one time, 'and you must learn about it, as you would learn forestry from the forester. After five or six years among the trees you will know something about them. You are a goose if you cavil at that! I learnt all that I know from Huvelin. What I teach you is him, not me. I learnt it from him. What a great saint he was! and what he taught me! "One torch lights another torch" (Lucretius). One penitent soul awakens to the desire to teach other souls—in sufferings and dryness a more experienced soul can sustain the less. It is best to learn from others; it gives a touch of creatureliness.'

In a volume which has just been published by Messrs. Dent—*Letters from Baron Friedrich von Hügel to a Niece* (7s. 6d. net)—we have a proof of how faithfully he carried his belief into practice. During the six years before his death, he had regularly talked with his niece, Miss Gwendolen Greene. 'I want to prepare you, to organise you for life, for illness, crisis, and death.' And he wrote her a series of letters. They form the bulk of the present volume. They are prefaced by a valuable forty-five pages in which Miss Greene shows the most salient of her uncle's religious teachings, as they come back to her from the notes which she made of his talks.

Messrs. Dent have sent us a companion volume—*Readings from Friedrich von Hügel* (7s. 6d. net). There is an introductory essay by Algar Thorold. It is an illuminating and penetrating study of von

Hügel's teaching, and should be read alongside Miss Greene's introduction. For those who have not Baron von Hügel's three important works—'The Mystical Element of Religion,' 'Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion' (these two are published by Messrs. Dent), and 'Eternal Life' (published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark)—a volume of selections such as this is a necessity. The greatest religious thinker of the day, some have thought, certainly the greatest Roman Catholic thinker, Baron von Hügel had a picturesque and pungent way of putting things. Miss Greene has remembered and noted many characteristic phrases: 'Religion is like a cuckoo in some people's nest' (p. xxxi).

'God is not an idea. He is a fact' (p. xviii).

'I must wear my own top-hat, and also I must not kick any one else's top-hat' (p. xxx).

'Religion can't be clear if it is worth having' (p. xvii).

'Clever people never think' (p. xiii).

'Be silent about great things' (p. ix).

'I think we have got all our values wrong, and suffering is the crown of life' (p. xv).

Christianity a Heroism.

'People seem sometimes to think it is a dear darling, not-to-be-grumpy, not-to-be-impatient, not-to-be-violent life; a sort of wishy-washy sentimental affair. Stuff and nonsense! Christianity is not that. Christianity is an immense warning; a tremendous heroism. Christ teaches a great austerity. He teaches renunciation: the life of the Cross. He was not comfy. He had not where to lay his head. He was no rigorist, yet he tells us to die to ourselves, to take up the Cross, to follow him. Is that all comfy? . . .

'Young people seem absorbed nowadays in