

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 Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

of the Reformed Church are now anxiously longing for a deeper and more living theology than that left them by the Reformation, it is from the thoughts of St. John, and from the manner in which the Lord Jesus Christ, the sum and substance of Christianity, is presented by him, that that theology will spring.

W. MILLIGAN.

WELLHAUSEN'S "HISTORY OF ISRAEL."

EVERY student of the controversies which now beset the "Hexateuch" is, for the time being, consciously or unconsciously, a Protestant. For no such question can ever be approached except upon the hypothesis that judgment is free, that we may not submit absolutely to the decision of authority, however venerable and however peremptory.

But when the new doctrine cries aloud in the market place, becomes popularized in reviews, and is delivered *ex cathedra* in encyclopædias, when the inevitable period of panic arises, another kind of protestantism comes into operation.

Plenty of readers who are not experts in the higher criticism, and who never will be qualified to become such, turn to a work like Wellhausen's *History*, not merely to ask, *How much revolutionary doctrine must be accepted?* but very emphatically to ask, *Why?* They want to know for themselves what is the nature of the new movement. Plenty of orthodox clergymen, and laymen too, who have not the slightest notion of rejecting anything which can be really proved, have just as little intention of letting go their old beliefs until the case is really made out to their satisfaction. There are many points of recondite research which they are quite content to receive upon the authority

of a fair consensus of technical opinion, knowing that they cannot themselves decide upon them. But even when the consent has been reached, to which it is fitting that they should concede such points, they will not be driven one step farther than their own judgments perceive to be involved by these concessions. They will not make their judgments blind. They are consistent Protestants.

Perhaps they are the bolder to pursue this course through remembering how Ewald affected them, how vainly they searched for evidence enough to justify his bewildering list of the geological strata in which the Hexateuch was deposited; how they needed to harden their hearts against even the decision of Stanley, that "Ewald had done for Judæa all that Wolf and Niebuhr did for Greece and Rome" (*Jewish Church*, i., xii.). These documents having now been redistributed as if a kaleidoscope were shaken, they cannot help thinking that perhaps it may be shaken again. How peremptorily were we bidden a while ago to believe that the Elohist came before the Jehovist, and the Priestly Code before the history. Surely the reversal of all this confident assertion, with more than equal confidence, exhibits "criticism" under a blue light. At that time it was proved to us by many infallible signs that Deuteronomy was written long after the rest of the Pentateuch had taken form. It is the contrary that is now proved to us, also by many infallible signs. "Merciful heaven," said Abou Hassan to himself, "inform me of the truth, that I may know what I have to trust in! Am I only Abou Hassan? or am I the Commander of the Faithful?" And this wonderful but somewhat volatile criticism, "merciful heaven, inform us," what is that?

Most readers of this kind will utterly refuse to be shaken by the discovery of later touches which may fairly be ascribed to editing, or even by evidence, if such were forthcoming, of the insertion of later laws. It would seem

indeed that if the laws were primitive, they must, in the nature of things, have been more than once revised and codified to suit the exigences of changing times. It has been notorious ever since the days of Spinoza that we have mention of kings who reigned in Edom "before there reigned any king over the children of Israel" (Gen. xxxvi. 31), and of the eating of manna "until they came to a land inhabited" (Exod. xvi. 35), and that places are called by later names, such as Dan, to which Abraham pursued the confederate kings, but which was Laish until the time of the Judges (Gen. xiv. 14; Jud. xviii. 29). Only stupidity can deny that if the documents are primitive, they have undergone a free editorship. For indeed, in those happy times, footnotes were unknown; the sacredness of an author's workmanship was a dogma yet to be propounded; and whatever could improve or illustrate the narrative was incorporated in the text with as little scruple as Croker felt in manipulating Boswell, or the editor of a modern hymn-book in distorting any masterpiece of genius and devotion. But all this was admitted long ago, and it is nothing to the present purpose to explode, for the hundredth time, that mechanical theory of the work of Moses which insisted that he wrote by inspiration the story of his own death. Do not we ourselves ascribe our Prayer-Book to the period of the Reformation, although it prays for Queen Victoria and Albert Edward Prince of Wales, and gives thanks for Her Majesty's happy accession upon the 20th of June?

It is for such readers that one of themselves now sends to *THE EXPOSITOR* some notes which he thinks may deserve consideration. As long as he abstains from even expressing the surprise he feels at the treatment of some technical departments of the subject, which belong to the professional students of an abstruse and recondite science, he cannot be reproached for examining what lies fairly within his

range; nor even for withholding implicit confidence from the reports brought him from beyond, when he finds grave reason for mistrust of the conclusions arrived at under his very eyes. Because, once more, he is a Protestant. Fortunately the conclusions which lie within reach of every careful reader are those upon which Wellhausen himself lays greatest stress, and upon which assuredly the issue will depend.

No candid reader will be blind to the charm of a theory so broad, lucid, and orderly, and sustained by so immense an array of references to Scripture, each of them professing to reveal the evidence for some assertion which is made without a qualification or a qualm. The orthodox theory finds itself confronted, for the first time, by a theory as compact and symmetrical, as truly explanatory of the phenomena, as itself. But does the evidence hold water? Do the references prove what they claim to prove? In the fulness of time, when the final verdict upon Wellhausen's *History* is pronounced, much will turn upon the answer to this latter query. And, in the meantime, some contribution to that result is made by every examiner who reports honestly what he has discovered, even if he have no pretensions to treat as an expert other more recondite questions which are also raised.

One important preliminary remark must still be made. The honest reader of such a book as Wellhausen's will often tax his mental energies, and even load the scale against his old opinions, in the endeavour to free himself from bias, prejudice, prepossession. But there is a bias which ought not to be got rid of. A man who is honestly convinced, upon solid grounds, of the miraculous origin of Christianity will bring to the examination of any work which is clearly intolerant of miracle the same kind of bias which an astronomer brings to the examination of clever theories which favour the opinion that the world is flat.

He will not refuse to examine them, feeling pretty sure that if they prove true they will not really involve the supposed result. But his first impressions will be unfriendly, and he need not be ashamed of that, provided he retains his candour. Now it will not be denied that Wellhausen's whole theory is unfriendly to the supernatural. Take one example of interpretation according to bias, steering by a deflected compass. He writes, "somewhat later perhaps" than the earliest historical books "the legends about the patriarchs and primitive times, *the origin of which cannot be assigned to a very early date*, received literary shape" (p. 464). Do we ask why they cannot be assigned to a very early date? He answers in the following footnote, which is also a good specimen of his confident manner. "Even the Jehovistic narratives about the patriarchs belong to the time when Israel had already become a powerful kingdom: Moab, Ammon, and Edom had been subjugated (Gen. xxvii. 29), and vigorous frontier wars were being carried on with the Syrians about Gilead (Gen. xxxi. 52). In Genesis xxvii. 40 allusion is made to the constantly repeated subjugations of Edom by Judah, alternating with successful revolts on the part of the former" (p. 464).

What is this proof text that Moab, Ammon and Edom have been already subjugated? It is the blessing pronounced upon Jacob, "Let thy mother's sons bow down to thee." Where is allusion made to the repeated subjugations and revolts of Edom? In the blessing of Esau, "By thy sword shalt thou live, and thou shalt serve thy brother." But this boldly assumes the question in dispute, namely, that they cannot be predictions. And frontier wars are being waged with the Syrians about Gilead, because Jacob and Laban set up a pillar of witness between them. We are not told how to explain by historical events a similar treaty of peace between Isaac and the king of the Philistines.

But our point is Wellhausen's attitude, hostile to the miraculous, emphatically incredulous of the prophetic.

Surely we are better entitled to start with exactly the opposite presumption, not by any such *petitio principii*, but for a solid reason which the above extract will illustrate.

Since it is clearly felt that these would be prophetic if they were written previous to the event, they afford a measure of the amount of coincidence which must be postdated, unless prophecy is to be admitted. Are there no passages fraught with much more startling coincidence, with suggestion at least as profound and obvious, the force of which cannot be evaded by any possible change of date? Sweep away at a stroke all controversy about Old Testament dates, concede more than raging lunacy will demand, and place every manuscript upon a dead level of one century before Christ, and you still retain predictions—which of course have been explained away, but which are at the lowest estimate far more definite and startling than those for which it is felt to be necessary to seek out a convenient date, predictions moreover quite subversive of the Judaism which nevertheless cherishes them in her bosom. A prophet is to arise like Moses, who not only inaugurated an epoch but founded a religion and a commonwealth, who found his people slaves and left them freemen. A new priesthood, fatal to the law, is to arise after the order of a king of the accursed race of Canaan. One whom God has forsaken and brought into the dust of death, whose hands and feet are pierced and his raiment parted by lot, is to praise God in the midst of the congregation, and all the ends of the earth are to remember and return to the Lord. A crowning sacrifice is to atone for sin, a human sacrifice, yet the victim, after pouring out his soul unto death, shall prolong his days and divide the spoil with the strong. A man is brought nigh unto the Ancient of Days. Lastly, there resounds from Genesis to Malachi the promise that the narrowest, most

exclusive, and most race-bound of all creeds shall bless all the families of the earth. Will any one deny that a date, posterior to what the Church regards as the fulfilment of these passages, is required for them at least as urgently as for Jacob's pillar of witness? But it is impossible to satisfy the requirement.

Moreover Wellhausen asserts that the prophets did not make the peculiar character of the nation: "on the contrary, it made them" (p. 432). But here are prophecies upon a vast scale, diametrically opposed to that peculiar character, of a date which laughs at the *ex post facto* explanation, and fulfilled. Who uttered them? Were they made by the peculiar character of the nation? Are they not much more obvious than those above quoted, the date of which it is felt necessary to shift? Wellhausen's treatment of the 53rd of Isaiah fills one with pity for any unfortunate critic, arguing in such wise on behalf of orthodoxy, who should fall into the clutches of Wellhausen.

Approaching the documents therefore with a rational but fixed persuasion that the prophetic element cannot be eliminated, we find that we have not only blunted a hostile weapon, but have also established an enormous presumption upon the orthodox side. A literature which drank the waters of miraculous inspiration can scarcely mislead us in its account of the dealings of God with man.

Nevertheless the new theory offers a great relief to sceptical minds. By attributing Deuteronomy to the time of Josiah, and the Law to the return from exile, a number of prophecies are converted into *ex post facto* ventriloquisms, and one can waive aside easily enough the theophanies and interferences of Deity.

It is a fact then that believers in the miraculous origin of Christianity approach Old Testament subjects with minds far less biassed than their opponents. They are sure that

nothing which may be discovered about the origin of the Pentateuch can really contradict their faith in Jesus, while their opponents know very well that their attack upon Moses is essential to their disbelief in St. John.

What is the decisive point, the central position, in the present controversy? Wellhausen himself has told us what he considers it to be :

"The firemen never came near the spot where the conflagration raged; for it is only within the region of religious antiquities and dominant religious ideas,—the region which Vatke, in his *Biblische Theologie*, had occupied in its full breadth, and where the real battle first raged, that the controversy can be brought to a definite issue" (p. 12).

It will be a bad sign then if we find hesitation, inconsistency, or overstraining here.

Now the dominant idea in this sphere is that of sacrifice, and upon this subject Wellhausen has a carefully elaborated theory. "With the Hebrews, as with the whole ancient world, sacrifice constituted the main part of worship" (p. 52). "It is quite in harmony with the naïveté of antiquity that as to man so also to God that which is eatable is by preference offered. . . . In doing this, the regular form observed is that a meal is prepared in honour of the Deity, of which man partakes as God's guest" (p. 62). This is a statement of the origin of the rite, the earliest form of it; and so he adds, "it is of course true that 'in his offering the enlightened Hebrew saw no banquet to Jehovah,' but we hardly think of taking the enlightened Protestant as a standard for the *original character*¹ of Protestantism." We may ask in passing, Why not? On the assumption that a religion is Divine, we must do so. To take the unenlightened worshipper as a standard is to beg the whole question at stake, which is, whether the religion is above the race, lifting the people towards the Giver, or is lower, because the

¹ The italics are ours.

people invented it when they were less developed. The passage is a fair sample of the insidious process which first inserts as a postulate what is thereupon to be evolved as a demonstration. But our present concern is simply with the fact that sacrifice is held to have originated in festivity, shared with the god. Therefore, "when a sacrifice is killed, the offering consists not of the blood but of the eatable portions of the flesh.¹ Only these can be designated as the 'bread of Jehovah,' and, moreover, only the eatable domestic animals can be presented. At the same time, however, it is true that in the case of the bloody sacrifices a *new motive ultimately* came to be associated with *the original idea of the gift*" (p. 63). We have the same doctrine of the origin of sacrifice presently repeated more distinctly.

"In the early days worship arose out of the midst of ordinary life, and was in most intimate and manifold connexion with it. *A sacrifice was a meal*, a fact showing how remote was the idea of antithesis between spiritual earnestness and secular joyousness" (p. 76).

"Arising out of the exigences and directed to the objects of daily life, the sacrifices reflect in themselves a correspondingly rich variety. Our wedding, baptismal, and funeral feasts, on the one hand, and our banquets for all sorts of occasions, on the other, might be adduced as the most obvious comparison, were it not that here, too, the divorce between sacred and secular destroys it" (p. 77).

Such then is the origin of sacrifice; the solemn consciousness of sin has evaporated; there is only a glad feast shared with the deity.

How long did this state of things last? "The law which abolished all sacrificial seats, with a single exception, severed this connexion" between the sacred and secular in sacrifice (p. 77). And it is the essence of the new theory that this law came into being in the decline of the monarchy.

It needs no technical training to comprehend all this. It is a simple and coherent theory.

¹ Nevertheless, on p. 71 we read that "according to the praxis of the older period . . . it was the rule that only blood and fat were laid upon the altar, but the people ate the flesh."

But if there are two narratives in the Jewish history which cannot be other than primitive, they are the sacrifice of Isaac and of Jephthah's daughter. Neither of them can possibly have been performed or conceived under the influence of the later ritual. Wellhausen quotes them among other cases of human sacrifice "extraordinary or mythical" indeed, but distinctly related to "the older practice" (pp. 69, 70), and in sharp contrast with the Priestly Code, to which he presently turns.

Now a human sacrifice is utterly destructive of the whole theory that a sacrifice was a meal. The offering to God by preference of what is eatable, the banquet shared by Jehovah and His supplicant, the joyous feast from which any sense of sin is absent, all these belong to the same period and mode of thought with Abraham and Jephthah, only upon the supposition that these persons were cannibals.

The difficulty is aggravated when we are told that Jephthah "probably expected a human creature and not an animal to meet him" (p. 69). He was not entangled in the odious necessity for such a sacrifice; he planned it.

As we linger about this conflagration which the firemen will not approach, we are startled by the results of compliance with the good old rule, Always verify your quotations. We read just now that, according to the praxis of the older period, "where a sacrifice took place there was also eating and drinking (Exod. xxxii. 6; Jud. ix. 27; 2 Sam. xv. 11, *seq.*; Amos ii. 7)." Now what are these examples, quoted to show the character of orderly Jewish worship, according to the early praxis (p. 71)?

The first is the festival for Aaron's calf. The second and third are the seditious movements of Gaal against Abimelech, and of Absalom against David. The fourth is a wickedness which is then and there coupled with incest. As well might one quote the description of a Calvinistic service in Geneva to show what went on in St. Peter's at Rome.

In the same way we read that "in what is demonstrably the oldest ritual (Jud. vi. 19) the sacrifice is delivered to the altar flame boiled" (p. 62). But the reference is to the hasty and clandestine "present" of Gideon to the angel at the wine-press,¹ in which it would be harsh indeed if any ritual were demanded. As well might one appeal to a street preaching service to illustrate the ritual of the Abbey.

"There is a difference as to the ritual of the most solemn sin-offering between Exodus xxix., Leviticus ix., on one hand, and Leviticus iv. on the other" (p. 75). That is true; but the alleged contradiction is, in fact, a subtle and excellent example of the evidence from undesigned coincidence. In the fourth of Leviticus the normal rule for that sacrifice is given. In the ninth, that book takes part with Exodus, apparently against itself; but on closer inspection we find that it is now stating, like Exodus, the special proceeding upon the consecration of priests; and the modification of the sin-offering in these circumstances, consistently stated in both books, finds a curiously exact parallel in the modification of the Litany of our own Anglican Prayer-Book upon the occasion of consecrations and ordinations.

"According to Amos iv. 5, leavened bread was made use of precisely at a peculiarly solemn sacrifice" (p. 69). Turning to Amos, one discovers with surprise that such an offering is one which multiplies transgressions, and in reward for it God has given them cleanness of teeth, "yet have ye not returned to Me." It is therefore a strange example of what is orthodox in ritual. But we have good reason to welcome its citation. For in direct opposition to the contention that no place had yet obtained a monopoly of ritual sanctity, Amos there asserts that to come to Bethel is to transgress, and to Gilgal is to multiply the offence.

Again, the words, "in every place where I cause My

¹ For the use of *בית היין* in a wholly non-ceremonial sense see, among scores of passages, Jud. iii. 15, almost immediately before.

name to be honoured will I come unto thee," assume a multiplicity of altars as a matter of course. And "a choice of two kinds of material is also given, which surely implies that the lawgiver thought of more than one altar" (p. 29). Now the passage is found in Exodus xx. 24-26, at a time when it was inevitable that the tabernacle should be fixed in many places. In contrast with the special and awful revelations upon Sinai, the approach of Deity to Israel elsewhere is announced. And the choice of earth or stone for an altar does not surely require both to exist contemporaneously. In assuming that God Himself is to indicate His acceptable places, the passage is far more consistent with the old theory than with its rival. And with so clear a meaning at hand for it, Wellhausen must at least, before imposing upon it his own rendering, say how, upon that supposition, it escaped the jealous supervision which, as we are taught, has patched and darned the existing documents, cutting out words and inserting half lines, until it resembles nothing but the coat of an Irish beggarman. There are many passages in the prophets, perfectly familiar to every reader, which speak contemptuously enough of the sacrifices which were then offered. The question is whether the writers despised sacrifice as such, holding the institution to be non-Mosaic and superstitious, or only scorned the formal offering of insincere and graceless worshippers. On this subject Wellhausen speaks with perfect confidence.

"Jeremiah is unacquainted with the Mosaic legislation as it is contained in the Priestly Code," and the proof is his words (vii. 21), "I said nought unto your fathers . . . in the day when I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings and sacrifices," (pp. 58, 59). But, on any showing, Jeremiah was not ignorant of Deuteronomy, and there we find express commandments to offer, at the appointed central place, burnt-offerings and sacrifices (xii. 6). For what other object, indeed, are

we bidden to believe that it had recently been forged? But if Jeremiah could speak thus with Deuteronomy in his hands, and indeed "in the work of producing Deuteronomy he had taken an active part" (p. 489), it is surely too much to argue that he would not have spoken thus if he had seen Leviticus. It is assumed, quite in the same confident manner, that Isaiah denies the Divine institution of sacrifice because he asks, "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices?" (p. 58.) But Isaiah is distinctly rejecting the formal and unworthy offerings of hands which are full of blood.

In fact, Wellhausen himself furnishes us with the best and most conclusive refutation of this whole line of argument. For he tells us (p. 501) that "the Psalms are altogether the fruit of this period," *i.e.* altogether post-exilian, and written when the domination of the Torah was complete. And did not the sacrificial worship pass for being specifically Mosaic in the days of the second temple? How then are we forced to believe that Isaiah "could not possibly have uttered" the above sentence "if the sacrificial worship had, according to any tradition whatever, passed for being specifically Mosaic" (p. 58), when the author of the fifty-first Psalm, a writer of the later and more formal period (as we are taught) could say, "Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it: Thou delightest not in burnt offering" (ver. 16)?

But the true meaning of all such phrases becomes clear when the Psalmist adds that as soon as a spiritual reconciliation is effected, "Then shalt Thou delight in the sacrifices of righteousness, in burnt offering and whole burnt offering" (ver. 19).

It would be much easier to believe that worship was only localized during the later monarchy, if the existence of the tabernacle could be argued away, because it "expresses the legal unity of the worship as a historical fact" (p. 34). We

are told therefore that it was a later myth, "the copy, not the prototype, of the temple in Jerusalem" (p. 37); and no account is taken of Mr. Ferguson's well known demonstration (Smith's *Bible Dict.*) that all the measurements in the shrine of Solomon are doubled from dimensions convenient for a tent, and can scarcely be explained in a stately, permanent building but by presupposing such a model. To make good his contention, we are told that because a redactor considered that the high places, "the Bamoth, were permissible prior to the building of Solomon's temple, the tabernacle therefore did not exist for him" (p. 49). Yet we are assured that "it is certain that the prophet Isaiah did not labour for the removal of the Bamoth" (p. 25), although it will not be denied that the temple existed for him. If he tolerated high places while the temple stood (and this is the hypothesis), why should the redactor's tolerance of them at a former period imply that no tabernacle could have existed? It will not be denied that Isaiah recognised the privilege of coming with a pipe unto the mountain of the Lord (xxx. 29).

It has often been observed that Luther's discovery of a Bible and its forgotten teaching affords a curious parallel to Josiah's discovery of the law. It does more: it refutes entirely the contention that the Pentateuch must have been obeyed had it existed previously; for the whole Roman system, from end to end, was inconsistent with the apostolic teaching. Yet Luther did not forge the New Testament.

A sharper refutation still may be found in Wellhausen's admission, twice over, that the very practices which are so inconsistent with the existence of Josiah's book, were as rife as ever after it certainly existed. "We again see Bamoth appearing on all hands, even in the capital itself. Jeremiah has to lament that there are as many altars as towns in Judah" (p. 27). "Although Deuteronomy was not

formally abolished under Jehoiakim, nevertheless it ceased to have practical weight" (p. 489).

We really cannot grant all that is claimed for the "scientific" value of this method, which first proves by the presence of certain abuses that Deuteronomy did not and could not exist, and then coolly proceeds to assume that these abuses are quite consistent with its existence, its publication, its ratification by prophet, priest, and king.

It seems like a *reductio ad absurdum* to tell us that according to the Priestly Code "the patriarchs, having no tabernacle, have no worship at all" (p. 38).

If our author overstates the difficulties of the orthodox belief, he understates the difficulties of his own. For see how the matter stands. The conservative theory takes the documents as being, upon the whole, authentic. The Revolution answers that the state of public worship, during certain periods, is inconsistent with that view. But whatever is quoted as evidence to the contrary must be declared spurious and an interpolation, often without a shred of evidence except its inconvenience to the Revolution.

Joshua xxii. is a late figment in the interests of the Code, because it shows that an altar east of the Jordan awakened the fierce resentment of the tribes (pp. 37, 38). But this graphic and vital story may not be dismissed by the wave of a German hand; and Ewald had no notion of placing that "splendid picture" at so late a period, or ascribing it to so poor a motive (ii. 233).

King Hezekiah is said to have made an effort to abolish the high places; "but the attempt, having passed away without leaving any trace, is of a doubtful nature" (p. 25). "Little importance is to be attached" (p. 47) to a circumstance very difficult to invent, the taunt of Rabshakeh, "If thou say, We trust in the Lord our God: is not that He, whose high places and whose altars Hezekiah hath taken away, and hath said to Judah and to Jerusalem, Ye shall

worship before this altar in Jerusalem?" (2 Kings xviii. 22; Isa. xxxvi. 7.) The whole picture of this truculent lieutenant is evidently drawn from the life.

The denunciation of Jeroboam's altar by a prophet from Judah is an "unblushing example" of historical worthlessness (p. 285).

The prayer of Solomon is an invention (p. 274).

He passes unmentioned, as far as I can find, the remarkable question of Micah, which uses high places and transgressions as identical terms: "What is the transgression of Jacob? is it not Samaria? and what are the high places of Judah? are they not Jerusalem?" (Mic. i. 5.) And yet Micah is quoted again and again, as if his freedom of spirit implied ignorance of the Code.

Once more we ask, How shall we explain the whole tone of books admitted to belong to the post-exilian period, but which exhibit a spirit very different from the hardness and formality ascribed to that period by the theory? "From the exile there returned not the nation but a religious sect" (p. 28). The cultus in the olden time had resembled a green tree; now it is timber, artificially shaped and squared. "The sacrificial ordinances, as regards their positive contents, are no less completely ignored by antiquity than they are scrupulously followed by the post-exilian time" (p. 82).

What are we to think then of Zechariah? He is a writer of the period which followed upon the exile ("520 B.C.," p. 399), and he is quoted repeatedly as illustrating the tendencies of that epoch. But no account is made of the important fact that he is throughout and consistently a teacher, not of Levitical rigidity and formalism, but of something very like the freedom of the Gospel. There is no attempt to explain the strange fact that in him priesthood and royalty coincide (vi. 13), and the accursed race of Canaan is adopted and cleansed, so that the Philistine becomes "a chieftain in Judah" (ix. 7). This is very un-

like the supposed process of hardening and exclusion which characterized that period. It is argued to be sure that "in Zechariah the pots in the temple have a special sanctity (Zech. xiv. 20)" (p. 71). Alas! the meaning of Zechariah is not this, but flatly, diametrically, and demonstrably the reverse of this. His announcement is that the sanctity hitherto confined to certain vessels shall extend to all the vessels in the temple, and not only so, but to every pot in the land. And the sacred inscription upon the priests' mitre shall in that day be also "upon the bells of the horses, HOLY UNTO THE LORD." These horses are mentioned in connexion with the pilgrimage of Egyptians and other Gentiles to worship Jehovah. And all they that sacrifice shall come and take of these common vessels to seethe the consecrated meat in. The abolition of racial distinctions, so that there shall no more be a Canaanite in the house of the Lord, to profane it, the Philistine having become as a chieftain in Judah (ix. 7), and the consecration of "every pot in Jerusalem" as much as of an altar bowl, is the announcement of this passage, not the "special sanctity" of a few articles. And it is in truth a triumphant refutation of the notion that what once was free had then become hard and rigid, that the living branch was now converted into timber.

So is the book of Job. At the beginning of the poem, the patriarch offers sacrifices in obedience to his own pious instincts; he is the chief favourite of God; throughout his troubles no priest, no ritual, no centre of worship is hinted at; and at the end, when the sin of his friends must be expiated, they offer up their own burnt offerings; and he is accepted as their intercessor. But Job is a layman, a Gentile, a man of Uz, and all his worship is irregular. Let it be supposed that it were otherwise convenient to assign an early date to this remarkable work. What use could then be made of it? How could we be pressed with

the argument that at this period the law of Moses was obviously unheard of? In fact, there is scarcely a phenomenon conceivable, which would more completely refute the contention that freedom and elasticity vanished from religion with the captivity, than this book.

Lastly, what about the Psalms? They are "altogether the fruit of this period" (p. 501); that is to say, of the post-exilic time, when there was no longer a "nation, but a religious sect" (p. 28), when "what holiness required was not to do good, but to avoid sin," when "individualism was moulded into uniformity," when "a man saw that he was doing what was prescribed, and did not ask what was the use of it" (p. 500).

All this is so unlike the Psalter, that it becomes necessary to shade the picture down, and it is worth while to notice the change of tone, and also how short a way it goes toward meeting the necessities of the case. "The kernel did *not quite harden into wood* inside the shell; we must even acknowledge that moral sentiment gained very perceptibly in this period both in delicacy and in power. This also is connected with the fact that religion was not, as before, the custom of the people, but the work of the individual. A further consequence of this was that men began to reflect upon religion. The age in question saw the rise of the so-called 'Wisdom,' of which we possess examples in the Book of Job, in the Proverbs of Solomon and of the Son of Sirach, and in Ecclesiastes. . . . The Proverbs are remarkable in their pale generality only because they are of Jewish origin" (p. 501).

There is something wonderful in the dexterity with which these contradictions are shaded into a merely verbal harmony. On one page the routine of the temple is like a lullaby, hushing all individualism to sleep, teaching men to ask nothing more of themselves than mechanical obedience, so that "the ever-growing body of regulations

came to be felt as a sort of emancipation from self." In the next page, we are told that the kernel did not entirely harden; and this passes for a sufficient explanation of a vast literature, every line of which is a protest against the description which we have just read. It is then and thus that we are asked to believe that "individualism made religion more intense. This is seen strikingly in the Psalms, which are altogether the fruit of this period."

Was it then a religion which "was not the custom of the people but the work of the individual," which sang, "The Lord will bless His people with peace" (xxix. 11); "Be glad and rejoice, ye righteous" (xxxii. 11); "I have not concealed Thy lovingkindness from the great congregation" (xl. 10); "I went with the throng, . . . a multitude keeping holy-day" (xlii. 4); "Make a joyful noise unto God, all the earth" (lxvi. 1); "Let the peoples praise Thee, O God; let all the peoples praise Thee" (lxvii. 5)? Was it individualism which sang, "Bless ye God in the congregations, even the Lord, ye that are of the fountain of Israel: there is little Benjamin their ruler, the princes of Judah and their council, the princes of Zebulun, the princes of Naphtali" (lxviii. 26, 27)? Indeed there is nothing more notable than the adaptation of these ancient songs of what is said to be individualism grown intense to the congregational worship of the Christian Church.

Or can it be said that they betray the stiff legalism of the period? "Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it" (li. 16). "I will praise the Lord with a song; . . . and it shall please the Lord better than an ox, than a bullock that hath horns and hoofs" (lxix. 30, 31). And we have already seen the installation of a Canaanite order in the priesthood by the oath of God (cx.).

Lastly, how far are they from merging the nation in the Church, or from the desperate and well-nigh hopeless nationality of the later time.

A king is set upon the holy hill of Zion, and the uttermost parts of the earth shall be his possession (ii. 6, 8) ; the enemies are beaten small as dust, and great deliverance is given to the king (xviii. 42, 50).

Sharp arrows are in the heart of the king's enemies ; all his garments are odorous ; stringed instruments out of ivory palaces gladden him ; his bride is all glorious ; the daughter of Tyre brings a gift ; the procession of virgins rejoices ; and her children shall be princes in all the earth (xlv.).

Again, the king shall have dominion from sea to sea ; the kings of Tarshish and of the isles, of Sheba and Seba, nay, all kings shall do him homage (lxxii.).

If it is only possible to remove the Psalms to the post-exilian period, at least it is only so on condition that there breathes through that epoch a fresh air, and stirs in it an exuberant energy and fulness of life, wholly inconsistent with the benumbing, ossifying, and petrifying spirit which is ascribed to it by theories like these.

G. A. CHADWICK.

THE EIGHTY-SEVENTH PSALM.

THE 86th Psalm, as we saw last month, is not one of the most original psalms, and yet no one but a spiritually enlightened man could have entwined such tender aspirations and sweetly humble petitions. To friends of missions the psalmist ought to be especially dear, for he has given us in the ninth verse one of the most distinct prophecies of the conversion of heathen nations. God, he assures his fellow worshippers, has made all nations of the world, and not merely the Israelites. Consequently there must be a kind of filial yearning after God in the minds of the heathen.