
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

sanctioned by religion. Such things reveal the real state of our hearts, and we have to take stock of the disclosure. Therefore it is wise for us to take account of our off-duty moods, to note the things we say when we are off our guard.

3. *Mere repression of the idle word is useless.*—There are many people who maintain a considerable renown for wisdom by keeping solemnly silent when others are flowing over with talk, who preserve their dignity against betrayal. But we never know these people through and through, and they may lose some valuable opportunities for knowing themselves. It is not even enough to control one's temper, though the expression of certain feelings in speech does tend to give those feelings more possibility of action and even increase their violence, while repression has the opposite effect. Mere control is, however, exhausting, for it leaves feelings internally still struggling for expression.

Nothing more is accomplished by going in dread of the Judgment Day. That old fear which kept so many tyrants from their worst deeds and kept many a villain within the bounds of ordinary behaviour, while useful socially, is useless individually; because the Judgment Day is to reveal all the hidden hates and secret lusts of the heart. The man who has a passion for holiness and a real hatred for all sin will welcome the premature and unintentional disclosure of what there is in him precisely that he may get rid of it.

4. What has to be sought is *a cleansing which fears no exposure.* We ought to be able to laugh and jest, to join in some boisterous battery of witticism, and find that we had said nothing unseemly, given utterance to nothing that left a wound, revealed nothing, even when our nature was churned up from the bottom, when every form of utterance was left unchecked, of which we have to repent. Thomas à Kempis says somewhere that we often return from company feeling worse than when we went into it. In a saint this might be due to a feeling of defilement from without; but with most of us the defilement is that which comes from ourselves; and we are miserable merely because we have betrayed ourselves.

What we have to seek is such profound purity of nature, such an overflowing of goodwill, such entire humility, that we can trust ourselves to speak without always keeping a watch upon the door of our lips, that even if we were delirious or lost our rational control, there would be nothing revealed which would condemn us to any right and discerning judgment. No lesser standard will leave us safe.

We shall need for that an inner cleansing. There must be the constant opening of the heart to the gaze and the habitation of God; there must be the welcome within of that cleansing stream which Christ opened on Calvary for all pride and hate, for all false ambition and coward fear. Inmost of all things in our being we must build a shrine for the Holy Ghost. Our most intimate interior companion must be the Christ, from whose radiant, spontaneous, freely flowing goodness we must hope to borrow something by intercourse, communion, and love. There must spring up within us something more than cleansing; a fountain of new life, a radiant holiness, an all-transforming love; for not until the very essence of one's being can freely express itself can we reckon to have attained the glorious liberty of the sons of God. How much prayer and meditation, what discipline and examination, how much seeking of personal union with our Lord there will have to be before this can come to us those who know themselves will dimly guess; but we can all be thankful for this warning given, and we can set ourselves to make it no more needed, but ready to render an account of even the idlest word.[1]

[1] W. E. Orchard, *No More War*, 100.

The Purpose of Deuteronomy, Chapter iv.

By Professor Adam C. Welch, D.D., New College, Edinburgh.

Even a casual reader cannot fail to note the absence of unity in this chapter. Outwardly and inwardly alike there is no cohesion among the fragments which compose it. The narrative passes suddenly and unaccountably from 2nd sing. to 2nd plur. in the form of address. It whirls the reader from events at Beth-Peor (v.[3]) to the theophany and the giving of the law at Horeb (v.[10]), only to bring him back to East Jordan by inserting a list of asylum towns in that district (v.[41]), and to end by an

apparent fresh start in the delivery of the law (v.[44]). These are fragments which have been put together by a collector, not material which has been arranged by an editor. The chapter raises a large question: was the Book of Deuteronomy, as it has reached us, ever really edited in the sense we now apply to that word? And is it not a misleading practice to write about 'editions' of Deuteronomy at all?

There is, however, one block of material which can be separated from the rest, and which ought to be studied in close relation, not to the subjects among which it has been placed, but to ch. 5. This is the reference to certain events at Horeb (vv.[10-28]), a prevailingly plural account which has been supplemented by vv.[29-30], a section in the singular. These last verses softened the threat with which the preceding passage closed, by adding a promise of Divine pardon in the event of the nation's repentance.

Here it is necessary, first, to say something about the sentences in sing. form which occur in the prevailingly plur. section (vv.[10-28]). The most important of these is the opening clause in v.[10], which in MT is singular. But all the LXX MSS read, 'ye stood before Yahweh'; and LXX[B] continues with 'our God,' LXX[A] with 'your God.' MT has been corrupted through a transcriber carrying on the sing. of v.[9] into the opening clause of the new verse. The trivial mistake brought a more serious confusion after it, for it led to the attempt to join v.[10] to v[9]., as is done in the RV. The sense which results from forcing the two verses into connexion is rather to seek. When, on the other hand, v.[10] is joined to v.[11], the sense is admirable: 'on the day when ye stood before the Lord your (or our) God in Horeb, when the Lord said unto me, Assemble me the people . . ., ye came near and stood under the mountain.' With this situation the little section opens. The writer has one definite message to deliver, that Israel must not worship Yahweh under any visible form. He deduces this from the way in which their God revealed Himself to them on the occasion of the first giving of the law. Accordingly he takes the people back to the event of that primary revelation, selects the features attending this which serve to illustrate what he wishes to say, and then develops his thesis. It will be noted that he follows exactly the method of the author of ch. 5. The narrative is merely the form under which the teaching is conveyed.

There is another case in which the plur. should be restored instead of the sing., the clause with which v.[25] opens. For Von Gall's edition of the Samaritan shows that version to have read the whole verse in the plural. Again, MT has been influenced by the preceding sing. verse. On the other hand, all the versions agree with MT in reading the last clause of v.[23] and all v.[24] in the singular. Here the sense combines with the change in number to prove the sentence an addition. For the final clause of v.[23], 'which Yahweh thy God commanded thee,' will not construe after 'and ye make to yourselves an image of the likeness of anything.' The sentence originally closed with 'likeness of anything,' as is the case in v.[25]. As for v.[24], it goes with what precedes and is an otiose addition made up of Ex 24^{17} 20^{5}. The remaining sing. verse, viz. [19], is also an addition, but deserves special attention later.

The resemblance between this section, vv.[10-28], and ch. 5 is not confined to the fact that both writers use the plural form of address and both cast their teaching into the form of a reference to the story of events at Horeb. They hold the same view of what happened there. Not only do they believe that Yahweh spoke directly to the people out of the mount which was on fire (v.[12]), and that this direct revelation consisted of the Decalogue. They both describe the law in the same terms, calling it the ten *d'bharim* or words, and adding that Yahweh inscribed these on tables of stone (v.[13]). Obedience to these commands will bring it about that Israel shall live long on the earth (v.[10]), so that they are not primarily intended for the land to which they go. Yahweh is also said to have commissioned Moses to teach Israel *ḥuqqim* and *mishpatim, i.e.* the terms of their positive religion, which, in contrast with the Decalogue, is to be practised in the land which they are about to enter (v.[14]). The general attitude of the two writers as to what happened at Horeb is the same, and the likeness extends to their careful use of terms. The only difference is that the author of ch. 5 dwells on the fact of Moses having received authority to lay down the terms of the national religion, while the author of this section merely mentions the commission of Moses in passing. The obvious reason is the different aim of the two sections. In ch. 5 the writer dwells on the character of the two parts of the Mosaic law, Decalogue and Code, and rather presses their difference, because he has it in mind to expound the relation between these two. In ch. 4 the same or another writer only mentions the distinction in passing, because it does not concern his immediate aim. That aim is to insist on the fact that Yahweh must be worshipped without the use of any image.

Steuernagel, however, proposes to cut out the

reference here to Moses' commission by omitting vv.[13f.]. He calls them an *Abschweifung*, or wandering from the point, because they contain merely an *Erinnerung*, or recollection of the giving of the law. But in this respect the verses are in the same position as the whole section in which they stand; it also recalls the act in which the law was given. In reality Steuernagel has missed the clear distinction both chapters make between the Decalogue and the *ḥuqqim* and *mishpatim* which Moses was authorized to issue for his people in Palestine. It is true that he recognizes the *ḥuqqim* and *mishpatim* to be the contents of the Code in chs. 12–26. But he is able to say about those last that they relate themselves to the Decalogue as *Thora explicita* to *Thora implicata*. Now the authors of chs. 4 and 5 had a far clearer conception of the relation between Decalogue and Code than their commentator. A mere negative series of mainly ethical laws could never spontaneously and naturally develop into the positive regulations which governed the practice of Israel's religion in Palestine. Regulations about the place of worship, its officials, its festivals, and its offerings, to say nothing of the laws about marriage and war and civil justice, are not implicit in the Decalogue. On the other hand, the command in ch. 4 to avoid all use of images in worship, while it is present in Deut.'s version of the Decalogue, is wholly absent from the Code.

The writer introduced his reference to the covenant in vv.[13f.] in order to insist on the significance of the events at Horeb. In that great hour Yahweh condescended to speak directly to Israel and to give it the ten words. Then also He instituted the covenant which made Israel what it was, a nation in peculiar relation to Him. From that hour it became the people of Yahweh. And the terms of the covenant-relation were obedience to the Decalogue which Israel had received directly from its God, and obedience to Moses, who was to give the law for Palestine. In connexion with this supreme moment of its history, this creative hour of its national existence, let Israel remember that it saw no outward form. All men witnessed was a voice.

This is the writer's theme: Israel uses no image in its worship of Yahweh. The historical form into which he has cast his teaching is merely the means he employs to mark how fundamental it is. At the time when Israel became the people of Yahweh and received directly from His mouth the revelation of His will, it received all this in such a way as was sufficient to convince it that the use of images in its worship was illegitimate.

But this is a remarkable way of proving or supporting so large a principle. Steuernagel has recognized the novelty of the principle which is here enunciated: 'The emphasis on the invisibility (immateriality, spirituality) of Yahweh is novel over against the older tradition (cf. Ex 24^{10}, Nu 12^{8}), and merely an *argumentum e silentio* from Ex 19, $20^{18ff.}$.' Whether one must derive it from the chapters in Ex. may be questioned. And to call it a mere argument from silence is hardly quite just. It would perhaps be more accurate to say that to the writer everything which took place at Horeb was normative to the religion of his people. As the covenant relation between Yahweh and Israel, the Decalogue, the commission to Moses constituted the norms of the nation's religious life, so the very method in which Yahweh revealed these things was also regulative of that life. Yet the broad fact remains that the writer must deduce his principle about the rejection of images from a secondary consideration like this. The writer could not and would not have taken this way of deducing a law against the use of images from the mere method in which the revelation was given at Horeb, unless he had no more direct means of enforcing it. The obvious way of deciding so significant a matter was to appeal to the terms of the law itself and to say plainly that Yahweh forbade such worship in the Decalogue which He uttered in the hearing of the people. The only reason why the writer did not do this was that he could not. The Decalogue of his time did not contain the clause which forbade the use of images.

There is another hint in the section which points in the same direction of showing the writer to be conscious that the command against the use of images was no part of his Decalogue, but was rather an inference drawn from the method of the initial revelation. Vv.[21f.] introduce a statement of how, since Yahweh was angry with Moses on the people's account, the leader was doomed to die in E. Jordan. Formally and in substance the statement agrees with what has already appeared in the historical narrative prefixed to the Code, cf. 1^{37} 3^{26}. Here it is employed as the reason for a fresh exhortation to the people to be very careful about keeping the regulation against the use of images. Yet it is remarkable that the exhortation is not enforced, as is the case in so many similar addresses, by an appeal to the 'law which I am delivering to you this day,' or to the 'law which Yahweh your God has commanded that it may be well with you.' The use of images is rather declared to be equivalent to a breach of the covenant (v.[23]), and the command

to avoid them is prefaced in v.[20] with a statement of how Yahweh chose the nation and brought it out of Egypt. Again, the writer cannot, or at least does not, venture to call the use of images a direct breach of the Decalogue: he can only describe it as the breach of the fundamental conditions which attended the new relation into which Yahweh and Israel had entered. And it is somewhat significant to find the law put into the mouth of Moses immediately before his death. That looks as though the writer were conscious that it was not found either in the Decalogue or in the Code of his day. It stands by itself. He claims for it the authority of Moses, *i.e.* of the prophetic order which has the right to develop and interpret the law of Israel. They have introduced it as a just inference from the whole method which has attended the Divine revelations to their people, and as a necessary means to preserve the purity of the faith which has been committed to their charge.

In an earlier article I pointed out that the natural explanation for the existence of two slightly differing forms of the Decalogue was the same which accounts for the two records of the story of Israel's origins: the two forms derive from the two kingdoms, and the Deuteronomic is from N. Israel. The gravest difficulty which meets us there is to explain how the N. kingdom, if its Decalogue forbade image-worship, could have instituted the official recognition of the calves at Bethel and Dan. Yet it has to be recognized that the only early prophet who attacks the calf-worship derives from the district where this was practised. It was not impossible, therefore, that the clause forbidding the use of images was a later addition to the Decalogue as a result of this prophetic reaction. I now suggest that ch. 4 offers the needed proof. Here is a strong protest against the use of images, which evidently cannot claim the authority of the Horeb Decalogue, and which can only base upon the authority of the circumstances which attended the initial revelation to Israel, and on the authority then given to the prophetic order. The religious leaders of the nation, under the influence of such teaching as Hosea's, are adding a corollary to the Decalogue.

Are there then any reasons, independent of this conclusion, which may help to set a date on the passage? On the one side, it seems clear that, though now appearing in the introductory material, it is really later than the Code. The close relations in language and in idea between this part of ch. 4 and ch. 5 are enough to prove that they belong to the same period and at least derive from the same school. The reasons, therefore, which compel a date for ch. 5 after the Code apply here also. It must, besides, be noted that the Code has nothing to say about the use of images of Yahweh: while it strictly forbids all heathen emblems, it goes no farther. Had the use of Yahweh-emblems been so strongly forbidden as it is here, its silence on the subject would at least be remarkable. But further, the threat of exile with which the section closes makes it likely that its writer was addressing a generation which was already acquainted with the wholesale transportation of peoples practised by the Assyrians. The section is later than the Code.

On the other hand, the passage cannot be post-exilic. Steuernagel has already recognized this, because, he says, there is no appearance of the threat it contains being a *vaticinium post eventum*. A more convincing proof can be found in the fact that even the section vv.[29-39], which has been added to the original threat in order to promise the Divine mercy in the event of Israel's repentance has not a word to say about a Return. Now the post-exilic men could not conceive that they were restored to the Divine mercy, unless they were also restored to the Temple. Naturally so, for the effect of the Josianic reform had been to make the sacrificial system at Jerusalem essential to the maintenance of the covenant-relation between Yahweh and Israel. They could not conceive themselves restored to the Divine mercy without this essential means of grace.

Steuernagel is content to place the threat before the close of the Exile. But that does not meet the difficulty of explaining why the later promise of mercy ignores a Return. Besides, one must ask for some evidence of the existence of any body of religious authorities during the Exile who could issue such a remarkable law as this, and one must ask to whom it was supposed to be addressed, or whether it was a kind of manifesto issued *in vacuo*. In addition, however, there is no sufficient reason for bringing the section so late as the Exile. Men in N. Israel, even before Samaria fell, could use such a threat, because the people had already seen some of their neighbours and even some of their own E. districts harried and depopulated by the invaders. And religious men, who were forbidding a practice against which Hosea protested, could naturally use his threat against a disloyal nation. For this prophet had declared that Yahweh, in His anger against Israel, would expel it from Palestine, that home to which He brought His bride. The threat of expulsion from Canaan is the leading threat Hosea employed. The sin ch. 4 forbids is

the sin against which he protested. Both elements of the chapter have the same source.

Again, vv.[29-39], the section of restoration to the Divine mercy, have a remarkably individual note. They are not made up of the stereotyped phrases which appear frequently in the exilic and post-exilic passages of the same character. The affinities which they reveal, both in language and idea, are rather to the series of oracles which Jeremiah in cc. 3–5 addressed to his fellow-countrymen in Ephraim. The little address was added after the collapse of Samaria, in order to hearten the remanent Israelites, who needed all the succour a prophetic message could bring them.

The same hand added v.[19], the other verse in 2nd sing. which appears in the plur. section. That this has been added is clear on other grounds than the change in the form of address. The rest of the passage insists, as has been said, on one theme, that men must make no emblem of Yahweh and employ no image in connexion with His worship. Now a warning against the worship of sun, moon, and stars is obviously out of place in this demand. Apart from the fact that men could not make the celestial bodies as they made images, these are spoken of as though they were worshipped directly, not introduced as emblems of anything. To worship them had nothing to do with image-worship; it was an offence against the primary demand of the Decalogue, that Israel shall acknowledge no other god but Yahweh. The verse is an addition which dates from the same period to which vv.[29-39] have been assigned, the period when N. Israel was living alongside heathen settlers who practised the astral cults of the Assyrians. Recognizing that the law said nothing about such a danger, recognizing perhaps that the Code also ignored it, the religious leaders of the people inserted this solemn word of warning.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By the Reverend J. W. Jack, M.A., Glenfarg, Perthshire.

Biblical Archæology is that branch of knowledge which takes cognizance of the past civilizations which have moulded Biblical history, and investigates them by means of the remains of art, architecture, monuments, inscriptions, literature, language, implements, customs, and all other examples which have survived. Without such knowledge it is impossible to understand properly the background of the Biblical records and the problems that confronted the Israelite world. Every scrap of knowledge of ancient life in Bible lands serves to make the Biblical narrative much more vivid, and enables the message of revelation to be transmitted with greater efficiency. Thanks to our excavators and explorers in Palestine and neighbouring lands, facts are being brought to light which are giving us truer conceptions of ancient history and putting it on a more trustworthy basis.

In addition to the work which is being carried on at numerous sites, several societies are developing far-reaching plans for the future. Their projects may open up vistas of history hitherto undreamed of. The Palestine Exploration Fund has meantime resolved to proceed no further with the excavation of the hill Ophel at Jerusalem, although the important work there will probably be resumed some day. It has arranged instead, in conjunction with Harvard University, the British School of Archæology in Jerusalem, the British Academy, and the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, to undertake a new intensive excavation, extending over three years, of the famous site of Samaria, which yielded such valuable information (including Hebrew *ostraca*) under Dr. Reisner over twenty years ago. The work, which will be under the direction of Mr. J. W. Crowfoot, assisted by Dr. Sukenik of the Hebrew University, will probably begin in March or April of this year. Sir Flinders Petrie, along with a large party of experts, has undertaken this winter to excavate the large Hyksos camp at *Tell Ajjul*, a few miles south of Gaza, in an effort to fill in the gap of, roughly, a thousand years in the history of Palestine from the neolithic age onwards. Close by, at Gerar (now *Tell Jemmeh*), where Abraham and Isaac lived, he is also to carry out digging operations, in the hope of unearthing relics of those patriarchs. The Oriental