

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

Seen from the human side, the energy of prayer seems to be exercised mainly in two directions—towards God, and towards men. We offer ourselves to God both as worshippers and as workmen, that our spiritual energy may be used to promote His purposes. It is true that many phrases of the great masters of prayer, taken alone and out of their context, would seem entirely to exclude that spiritual action of one soul on other souls for and in God, which is the essence of intercession, and would make the life of prayer consist entirely in adoration and adherence. But this contradiction is only apparent: and is simply a vigorous statement of the obligation to put first things first. The adoring surrender of the soul to God, and even a certain union with the immanent Holy Spirit, forms the one essential foundation of all intercessory action. For this depends primarily, not on the intensity of our sympathetic interest, our psychic sensitiveness or telepathic power—though all these may contribute to its effectiveness—but on a profound and selfless devotion to the purposes of the Divine Immanence. Even in the crudest, most naïve act of prayer, the soul lays itself open

in some degree to that Divine action; and this movement, initiated by God, is completed and used by Him. Thus the purposive action of God and the soul collaborate in every prayer. 'Feelings,' 'experiences,' and all the rest, fade into insignificance before this most solemn privilege of men.

Adoration, then, is required of us as the condition of our entry into the supernatural action; as the temper of soul which alone maintains us within it, and gives to the praying self that suppleness and self-oblivion which make it amenable to the gentle impulsions of the immanent Spirit. Thus communion and collaboration, adherence and intercession, can never be separated in experience. They are the two aspects of that total life of prayer of which the key-word is to be *fiat voluntas tua*. Even while it moves, within the action of God, to an ever more complete individuation—a discovery and fulfilment of its unique task within the mystical body of praying souls—this life moves also to that profound surrender which places it, in action and in contemplation, wholly at the disposal of the living charity of God.

The Purpose of Deuteronomy, Chapter vii.

BY PROFESSOR ADAM C. WELCH, D.D., NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

THIS chapter is again a unity which deals with the relation of Israel to the surrounding nations. Its position is that the holy nation must be segregated from all others. This was the purpose which Yahweh had when He brought it out of Egypt. In that great act He separated the people to Himself. In pursuance of this aim the chapter demands that these nations shall be put under the ban, and specially insists that there must be no connubium between the peoples, lest the pure religion be corrupted. The subject is developed in an address which employs the second singular, but has received a few plural additions. Unfortunately, since I cannot accept Steuernagel's, Puukko's, or Hempel's verdict about these omissions, it is necessary to examine them with some care.

Vv.^{4b}.⁵ are generally recognized to be secondary. Not only are they plural, but they include a threat, which is directed, not against any neglect of the law about intermarriage with

foreigners, but against failure to destroy their altars and religious emblems. The sentences turn the attention away from the main theme of the passage, the attitude of Israel to the foreigners themselves. V.^{4a} then forms the conclusion of v.³. No Israelite is to accept a foreign girl as wife to his son, because that would turn the son away from Yahweh, and he would serve or it would cause him to serve strange gods.¹ V.⁶ then clinches the matter by the statement that Israel as a people is consecrated to Yahweh.

The mention of the election of Israel led to another addition, vv.⁷.^{8a}. This sentence is not only plural in form, but introduces a somewhat irrelevant reflection. Vv.⁶.^{8b}.⁹ state that Yahweh chose Israel to be a peculiar people, and in pursuance of His purpose with it delivered it from Egypt. Israel, therefore, should recognize alike the character of

¹ Either read with Sam. LXX עברי for עברי, or with Ehrlich point עברי.

its God and the character of its relation to Him (v.⁹). The remark that Israel was chosen because of no merit of its own serves to interrupt the close-knit connexion of the thought.¹ How greatly Israel is set apart to its God is proved by His election of the nation, followed by His act in redeeming it from Egypt. This Divine act, and no general reflection about its consecration, is the ground for the nation recognizing what is involved in the relation into which Yahweh has brought it to Himself.

Again, I cannot agree with Hempel and Steuernagel in cutting out vv.^{10f}. They do this, in spite of the verses being singular in form, on the ground that these dwell on Israel's duty arising out of the relation into which Yahweh has brought it, while vv.^{9, 12b} are content to insist on the Divine faithfulness. Yet in this connexion it was wholly appropriate that both sides of the covenant should be emphasized. The writer has given, as the reason for a law against intermarriage with foreigners, the peculiar relation in which the nation stands to its God. Yahweh set it apart by redeeming it from Egypt, and brought it into a covenant to which He Himself has been faithful. But the covenant implies an equal obligation on Israel's part, and it must recognize that Yahweh is not indifferent to any conduct which may weaken its consecrated character. Hence it is perfectly natural that the writer, since he has begun with a specific law which he is enforcing, should continue in v.¹¹ with a reference to the general law, namely, the *huggim* and *mishpatim*² which governed the nation's whole conduct in Palestine, and which aimed at preserving its distinctive character. When, however, he returns in v.^{12b} to the leading thought of the Divine faithfulness to the covenant, it is because he wishes to develop in the following verses what will be the result of such care to a loyal nation. But he felt it necessary to state that a nation which has been redeemed in order to be consecrated must be loyal to this by segregating itself.³

The only other verses which rouse suspicion are vv.^{25f}, and they present a peculiar question.

¹ Steuernagel cuts out v.^{9b} as part of the addition. But he has failed to note that it is singular in form, that it connects very badly with the preceding sentence, and that it connects excellently, as above, with v.⁹.

² With 13 MT MSS and Sam. omit ו before נח and cf. 5³¹ 6¹.

³ V. 12^a, however, is secondary. Not only is it plural in form, but, while v.¹¹ speaks of a law consisting of *huggim* and *mishpatim*, it employs a looser phrase. It also emphasizes in a somewhat unnecessary way the conditional character of the following promises.

Steuernagel, Puukko, and Hempel have all recognized that they have no connexion with what precedes. The preceding section has insisted that Israel need not fear the superior power of the foreign nations. Yahweh, who delivered it so amazingly from Egypt, can and will succour it still. Hence, however the conquest be delayed, it is sure and will be complete. Into this vv.^{25f}. interject a direction as to how Israel shall deal with idols. The three scholars, however, are content to call the verses secondary, and fail to note certain remarkable features about them. In the first place, the verses begin with a clause in the plural and continue in the singular. Now that is as odd in two verses as in a chapter. Again, the opening clause in the plural is a direct quotation of the three final words in v.⁵. Finally, the rest of the section does not repeat anything which was previously commanded, but introduces an entirely new subject, for it orders the people to refrain from converting to their own use the precious metals on the heathen idols after these have been destroyed. The silver and gold are so severely tabu that they may not even be brought into Israelitic homes, far less used for private purposes. In my judgment the sentence was originally a marginal note on v.⁵. The annotator introduced it by repeating the little final clause of that verse, so that he began his note by what would answer to our 'in connexion with the burning of those images you are forbidden to use the precious metals which adorn them.' But this special regulation which he quoted was originally second singular in its form. It has no parallel in any other law, so that it is impossible to decide whence it was derived. Originally the note was added to v.⁵, but has been introduced by a copyist in the wrong place.

The chapter, like the three which precede it, envisages the Code as already in existence, since it speaks of it as an entity (v.¹¹). It further employs, in speaking of the Code, the expression which has already appeared in two of those chapters—the law, consisting of *huggim* and *mishpatim*. Naturally, however, it says nothing about the Decalogue, because it has to deal with a subordinate regulation in the life of the nation, not with the fundamental principles of the Yahweh religion.

Further, the chapter is not only a unity, but an independent unity with no close relations to what surrounds it. There is a certain relation to chap. 6, so far as that warns Israel to be on its guard against the dangers which may arise through its new possessions in Palestine. But the earlier chapter concerns itself with the relation of the people to Canaanite property, of which they are supposed

to have made themselves the masters. The later confines itself to the relation of Israel to the peoples and shows itself conscious that the question deals with more than merely the Canaanites. An even more significant difference, however, is found between the two chapters. The writer of chap. 6 conceives the people to be complete masters of Palestine and all its wealth. On the other hand, the writer of chap. 7 feels it necessary to reassure his co-religionists that they need have no fear of the consequences of their following his command. Not only does he promise a direct blessing from Yahweh in the form of unexampled prosperity to their flocks and herds; but he reassures them against the possibility of thus bringing on themselves the hatred of the other peoples. Yahweh once showed the value He set on Israel's segregation by bringing it out of Egypt. He will not fail to protect them, should they, in following out the same purpose, incur the enmity of those nations. There is a difference of atmosphere in the two chapters. In one, Israel is dominant, and master in its own house: in the other, it needs to be heartened by large promises in doing anything which may disturb its relation to its neighbours.

Again, alike in its demand that Israel shall rigorously avoid all connubium with the heathen and in its command to put these under the ban, the chapter goes beyond the terms of the Code. For that can readily conceive the case of an Israelite taking in marriage a woman who has been captured in war (21¹⁰⁻¹⁴), and, since it lays down regulations for this special case, shows that it has no horror of the act in itself. And, while the Code orders the ban against Canaanite towns which resist the conquerors, it commands that those which offer no resistance shall be admitted on terms (20¹⁰⁻¹⁸). In thus admitting the possibility of an agreement with these last, it not only differs from 7², which forbids any such agreement, but it takes a different attitude to the foreigner *per se*. Not only can it contemplate the *gērim* or strangers forming a permanent and considerable section of the population, but it is careful to commend them to the charity of the community, and can even conceive them taking a certain share in its worship.

Chapter 7 is intended to stiffen up the terms of the Code in the direction of segregating Israel from the heathen. And the character of the two proves them to reflect the needs of the religious life of the nation in two very different conditions. A strong, homogeneous nation, which is full of self-conscious vigour and confidence in the religion which has formed the strength of its resistance to foreign

influence, can rely on its native power to absorb the relatively few foreigners who become part of it. It does not need to be on its guard against their dangerous influence, and may even take measures to see that their rights are protected. The Code, which belonged to such a time, took the *gērim* under its charge and could be confident that any woman whom an Israelite married would adopt the faith of her new mate. Its one anxiety was that she must be purified from the pollution of her former heathenism. When, however, a people's self-consciousness has been broken, and especially when the foreign elements within and around it have increased in numbers and in influence, it feels the need to stiffen up its resistance against absorption by its heathen surroundings.

It may, however, be said that the command to put the foreigner under the ban (v.²) implies that Israel was in a position which made it able to do this. Yet this uncompromising demand not merely contradicts the actual situation which followed the conquest of Palestine. It also contradicts the situation which the author conceives the people to occupy toward their neighbours. For his law against intermarriage with foreigners implies the continued existence of such foreigners in sufficiently close relation to Israel to make the danger of intermarriage a real one. To carry out the ban in the sweeping form prescribed here would have left no one who could enter a Jewish family and contaminate it. It further implies an attitude of bitterness between Israel and the nations which would make intermarriage practically impossible. Besides, the writer falls away from the idea of the ban, when he adds, in closer agreement with the actual facts, that the process of conquest will be gradual (v.²²). Throughout the passage one is conscious of the distinction between the practical demand for avoiding intermarriage and the ideal conception of an Israel which has purged its land from all foreigners and now lives in an impossible isolation from the world.

And this impression is deepened when it is noted that the entire emphasis, in connexion with the removal of the heathen, is thrown on what Yahweh can and will do. The promise is not cast into the form of an encouragement to the people, urging them to do their part in reliance on the Divine help. Elsewhere Moses or Joshua or the nation is bidden to be of good heart, because they can do what Yahweh bids them do. Here the entire appeal is taken to the might of Yahweh. Israel is conscious of its feebleness over against the overwhelming numbers and strength of its enemies (vv.¹⁷⁻²¹). Let

it take heart, when it recalls what God can do in pursuance of His will towards it. At the beginning He purposed to have the nation separate from the world and consecrated to His service. He therefore broke Egypt, and by His power led His people into liberty. What He did once He can and will do again, for His purpose is unchangeable. Let Israel do what is within its power in connexion with this purpose of its God. Let it segregate itself from the peoples which are in its land, and refuse to intermarry with them. Then Yahweh will not fail to do His part. He will give the conditions which are necessary to keep it separate and consecrated to Himself. He will break the power of the nations and make Israel master of its own life in its own land. Did He not do this very thing, when He brought it at the beginning out of Egypt?

The chapter, accordingly, is late. What it demands goes beyond the terms of the Code, though its aim is the same, namely, to maintain the distinctive religious life of Israel. The conditions, too, which it implies are not those of the Code, for the nation is weakened and has lost its self-confidence. It remains to ask whether there is any period in the life of the people to which it is possible to assign it.

Now I have recently offered the proof of the existence of a movement in North Israel about the time of Josiah in the direction of segregation from the heathen settlers among whom it had to live after the destruction of Samaria.¹ It took the

¹ Cf. two articles in *Z.A.W.*, 1929, pp. 130 ff.; 1930, pp. 175 ff.

form of a solemn fast at which appropriate passages from the Torah were read. Certain liturgies, which were written for this special service, have survived. Two of them are found in the Psalter, namely, Pss 80 and 44. One of them has been included in the miscellaneous material at the close of Nehemiah (9¹⁻³⁷). In all these appear the same features. The people are under the power of their enemies in their own land. They seek to preserve their nationality and their faith by segregating themselves from their heathen neighbours, and by refusing to intermarry with them. Nowhere do they anticipate a Return. Instead, they seek to strengthen their hold on their distinctive faith, by separating themselves from the foreigner, by joining in the ritual of their fast and prayer, by reading from their law. And they trust in Yahweh's power to give them help in their intolerable situation. This fast continued at least until the period of the building of the second temple, for there is mention of a deputation which came from Bethel to Jerusalem to ask whether the men were at liberty to discontinue it (*Zec* 7¹¹).

The chapter in Deuteronomy belongs to the same period and the same movement. It enacts a specific regulation, a rule against intermarriage, which was to serve the purpose of segregation from the heathen. Living now under institutions which are not their own, and subject to constant disintegrating influence from the paganism among which they are plunged, the people took the only means which remained within their power to preserve their distinctive life.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Vigil.

BY THE REVEREND R. E. THOMAS, M.A.,
MIDDLESBROUGH.

‘A good soldier of Jesus Christ.’—2 Ti 2³.

Most boys and girls must have seen a picture which is called ‘The Vigil.’ It is a picture of a young man who is kneeling in church before the altar. He is alone, and evidently it is night, for no light burns save the altar light. The young man is dressed in white, and his strange clothing and the locks of hair falling to his shoulders tell us he

belonged to an age of long ago. In front of him, indeed, is the armour of a knight of old, while on the altar lies a sword. What is this young man doing? What does the picture mean?

The picture, I have said, is called ‘The Vigil,’ and this young man is keeping the vigil, or watch, which every youth of noble birth had to keep in olden times before he could become a knight. It carries us back to the customs of the Middle Ages. In those days the sons of noblemen might serve first as pages when they were but little boys. As such they would bear the trains of the dresses of the ladies, just as sometimes to-day at fashionable weddings we still see little pages acting as train-