

# 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>

# RECORD AND REVELATION

ESSAYS ON THE OLD TESTAMENT  
BY MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY  
FOR OLD TESTAMENT STUDY

Edited by

H. WHEELER ROBINSON

M.A., D.D.

Reader in Biblical Criticism in the University  
of Oxford

Principal of Regent's Park College, Oxford

OXFORD  
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS  
1938

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS  
AMEN HOUSE, E.C. 4  
London Edinburgh Glasgow New York  
Toronto Melbourne Capetown Bombay  
Calcutta Madras  
HUMPHREY MILFORD  
PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

# CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION. By the Editor . . . . .	vii
I. THE NEW SOURCES OF KNOWLEDGE. By J. A. MONTGOMERY, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Hebrew in the University of Pennsylvania, U.S.A. . . . .	i
II. THE LITERATURE OF ISRAEL	
1. The Forms of Oral Tradition. By D. DR. JOHANNES HEMPEL, Professor an der Universität Berlin . . . . .	28
2. The Contents of the Literature. By D. DR. JOHANNES HEMPEL . . . . .	45
3. Modern Criticism. By D. DR. OTTO EISSFELDT, Professor an der Universität Halle-Wittenberg . . . . .	74
III. THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL	
1. The Imperial Backgrounds. By W. L. WARDLE, M.A., D.D., Reader in Old Testament, Manchester University . . . . .	110
2. The Crises. By THEODORE H. ROBINSON, M.A., D.D., Litt.D., Professor of Semitic Languages, University College, Cardiff . . . . .	135
3. Political and Economic. By H. H. ROWLEY, M.A., D.D., B.Litt., Professor of Semitic Languages in the University College of North Wales, Bangor . . . . .	160
IV. THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL	
1. Origins. By ADOLPHE LODS, Professeur à La Sorbonne, Paris . . . . .	187
2. Prophecy. By NORMAN W. PORTEOUS, M.A., B.D., Professor of Hebrew and Semitic Languages in the University of Edinburgh (New College) . . . . .	216
3. Worship. By NORMAN H. SNAITH, M.A., Tutor in Old Testament Languages and Literature, Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds . . . . .	250
4. Ethics. By W. A. L. ELMSLIE, D.D., Principal of Westminster College, Cambridge . . . . .	275
V. THE THEOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT	
1. The Philosophy of Revelation. By the Editor . . . . .	303
2. The Characteristic Doctrines. By the Editor . . . . .	321

### 3. WORSHIP

THE accession of Solomon involved a new stage in the development of Hebrew institutions. His primary duty was to consolidate the kingdom of his father David, and this he sought to accomplish by building up a state on the oriental pattern. Such a policy demanded the solution of two major problems, the one political and the other religious.

The political problem with which Solomon was faced was that of tribal loyalty. No throne could ever be firmly established whilst the individual Israelite's primary loyalty was to his own tribal leaders. It is generally agreed that Solomon had this in mind when, in dividing up the country into twelve districts for taxation purposes, he disregarded in part the tribal boundaries (1 Kings iv. 7-20). By disturbing tribal associations he sought to secure increased loyalty to the throne.

It is, however, with the religious problem, in so far as it affects matters and details of worship, that we are particularly concerned. David sought to make his capital the centre of all Hebrew life. He had secured in Jerusalem a strong site, hitherto free from tribal associations, and therefore from tribal jealousies; a policy since followed in the choice of Washington, D.C., and again of Canberra. He followed this by making it the shrine of the most sacred possession of the People of God, that Ark of Yahweh which was inseparable from the story of great deliverances, prophetic ecstasy, and the solemn awe of Deity. Nevertheless he held to the desert tradition in that he followed the advice of Nathan the prophet, according to whom Yahweh must continue to dwell 'in a tent and in a tabernacle', and not in a house of cedar (2 Sam. vii. 1-7). Solomon broke with tradition here also, for his ambitious building programme included a Temple in addition to royal palaces and strong cities. The pro-

phets were against him. The promise made by Nathan with reference to the building of the Temple (2 Sam. vii. 12 f.; 1 Kings viii. 19 f.), we may take to be a reflection from later times. We hear no word of Nathan the prophet after the accession, nor of any other prophet during Solomon's reign except only of Ahijah the Shilonite (1 Kings xi. 29-40). This prophet was to Jeroboam son of Nebat what later Elisha was to Jehu son of Nimshi. From the very beginning of the sedition each prophet supported the future rebel with an oracle from Yahweh. Indeed, in each case we are given to understand that the thought was first in the prophet's mind, and that the first promptings came from him.

The Temple which Solomon built was primarily a chapel attached to the palace, and the building was doubtless as much to the glory of Solomon as to the glory of Yahweh, since a splendid king must worship in a splendid shrine and deal splendidly by his god. At the same time, the ultimate aim was to make Jerusalem unique as a Holy Place, outdistancing in prestige and sacredness every other shrine in the land. Here Solomon failed. Splendidness does not make a sanctuary. Age and tradition are of far more account, but, above all, there must be in men's hearts the firm conviction that here in time past God has spoken to men, and that therefore He can speak to men here and now. And so the local shrines held their own, especially when Ahijah of Shiloh, the ancient home of the Ark, made common cause with the tribes (1 Kings xi. 29 ff.). Two hundred years had to pass before, in the time of Isaiah, Solomon's hopes for the predominance of his Temple were realized even in part, and it was yet another hundred years, in the time of Josiah, before Jerusalem began to achieve that uniqueness which Solomon desired from the very beginning. The goal itself was reached in the time of Ezra.

The building of the Temple, in itself, as we have seen, an idea alien to the old Yahwism, involved the importation of

foreign workmen and foreign ideas, for Israel herself had neither art nor artisans. It was built after the fashion of Phoenician and Egyptian temples. Its ground-plan was similar to that of the fourteenth-century temple at Shechem, and of Phoenician temples generally.<sup>1</sup> The two pillars, Jachin and Boaz, at the porch of the Temple (1 Kings vii. 21), are paralleled by those found at the entrances to temples at Byblos (c. 1500 B.C.), at Shechem, at Hieropolis, and at Paphos.<sup>2</sup> And so it was in almost every respect. There were steps up to the altar in the temple built by Thothmes III (1501-1447 B.C.) at Beisan. To these parallels may be added rooms for sacred meals, lattice-work at the altar, horns on the altar, lions as decoration, pomegranates and date-palms, the seven-branched tree, lights burning before the god and bread laid out in his presence, a brazen sea supported by bulls, a dark inner shrine, and steps up to the Temple without, with colonnades and porches.<sup>3</sup>

More important than this, and of growing importance in these present days of increased interest in excavations abroad and in matters of worship at home, is the problem of the actual worship itself. What did these Israelites do when they worshipped, either at Jerusalem or in the country, during the four centuries whilst Solomon's Temple was standing? Whom did they worship, and with what rites?

The difficulty of forming any reliable estimate of the worship in pre-exilic Israel is due to the work of those editors, from the Deuteronomists down to the Massorettes, who sought diligently to remove from the Sacred Text everything which did not accord with the strictest and purest monotheism. The measure of their success would be the extent of our failure, were it not for the work of the archaeologist. Even then the balance is not redressed, because the actual material found is very rarely indeed

<sup>1</sup> Lods, *Israël* (1930), p. 103 f. (Eng. Trans., pp. 90-3).

<sup>2</sup> S. A. Cook, *The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archaeology* (1930), pp. 166 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 61, 64, 82, 160, &c.

from the period of the kingdoms. The greatest care is therefore necessary in using the results of such excavations, as also our knowledge of the customs of kindred peoples, as material for piecing together a picture of Israelite worship during this period. What existed in Phoenicia, Syria, Egypt, Babylonia, or anywhere else, at that time or at any other time, is not, in itself, evidence of what existed in Palestine at one particular time. Even if the general myth-pattern of the Near East can be established for one shrine in Syria, as, for instance, at Ras Shamra, we cannot say definitely to what extent it held sway at any one Israelite shrine, least of all at Jerusalem. The plain fact of the matter is that we have not the evidence on which it is possible to come to a definite conclusion.

It is, however, becoming more and more clear that at the local shrines (high places) generally, polytheism and syncretistic cults were the normal state of affairs. The tirades of the Deuteronomists against the high places are fully justified. Their protest was a double one, firstly against the worship of other gods in association with Yahweh, and secondly against the worship of Yahweh with a syncretistic cult. For, whilst it is certainly the case that after the settlement in Canaan Yahweh perforce became an agricultural deity and was worshipped with fertility rites, yet Yahweh took His place in a pantheon and was not universally equated with any particular Baal. This is clear, not only from what we can recover of Canaanite worship generally, but also from the protests of such prophets as Elijah and, in the following century, Amos and Hosea, who were not attached to particular shrines. The cult-prophets, that is those who were attached to particular shrines (e.g. 2 Kings ii. 3, 5), were leading officials there,<sup>1</sup> and were at least as much to blame for the state of affairs there as were the priests (Hos. iv. 5, 9). From all such, Amos vigorously distinguishes himself (Amos vii. 14). Not that

<sup>1</sup> A. R. Johnson, 'The Prophet in Israelite Worship', *Exp. Times*, xlvii. 7 (April 1936), pp. 312-19.



he, or indeed any of the pre-exilic prophets, was against worship at the local shrines, or against sacrifice as such.<sup>1</sup> The case was far otherwise, for Elijah went to great pains to repair the damaged altar to Yahweh at Carmel (1 Kings xviii. 30-3), and himself prepared the bullock for the sacrifice. He has nothing to say against syncretistic cults, for that was the battle of the next century, though even then Amos has to protest against the worship of Kewan and Sakkuth (Amos v. 26), found in Mesopotamia as names for Saturn, and possibly also of Ashimah (Amos viii. 14). The first issue was that of polytheism. Yahweh of Israel must have no rival in His own land. Such was Elijah's protest at Carmel, and later in the time of Ahaziah (2 Kings i. 1-6). The name of the god, of whom Ahaziah sent to inquire, was actually Ba'al-zebul. This had been previously suspected, but is now found in the Ras Shamra tablets (I AB. i. 8, 9, 14, &c.; Virolleaud, *Syria*, xii. 3, pp. 193 ff.) as the name of the god Aleyn as dwelling in the earth, whence flow the life-giving waters and springs. The protest is against the association of Yahweh with the fertility gods of Canaan, and not against his identification with them. We may therefore take the ritual as revealed in the Ras Shamra tablets as the sort of thing, at its height, against which Elijah was fighting in the ninth century. There are innumerable words and references in these tablets which can be paralleled in the Old Testament.<sup>2</sup> The Ras Shamra myths reveal, in spite of many differences, marked similarities with the faded myths which are found in the Old Testament. The same terms for sacrifices appear in both. The Israelites must have been acquainted with all these, but exactly to what extent the cult at Ras Shamra coincided with the cult at any Israelite sanctuary it is impossible to say. We do not know

<sup>1</sup> For the attitude of the eighth-century prophets to sacrifice, see Oesterley, *Sacrifices in Ancient Israel* (1937), pp. 191-213.

<sup>2</sup> J. W. Jack, *The Ras Shamra Tablets* (1935); R. Dussaud, *Les Découvertes de Ras Shamra et l'Ancien Testament* (1937); also articles in *Syria*, from vol. xii, and elsewhere, chiefly by Virolleaud and T. H. Gaster.

what exactly the differences were, for differences there must have been. All we can do is to guess at the similarities. Presumably the cult at Carmel had no place for any god other than Yahweh, since it cannot be supposed that otherwise Elijah would have had anything to do with it, or that Elisha would have called there after the translation of his master (2 Kings ii. 25; see also 2 Kings iv. 25). The same probably applies to the shrine at Shiloh. Here we may expect that there was a minimum of Canaanite influence, limited to the observance of the three great festivals of the agricultural year and such rites as would be essential to an agricultural community. And further, since Abiathar escaped the massacre in Saul's time, and was for ever after strongly for David, we may assume that at Jerusalem in David's time there was little room for any god other than Yahweh. David doubtless worshipped through images, for even eighth-century prophets find nothing untoward in this. Indeed, Hosea regards the absence of obelisk, ephod, and teraphim as a catastrophe of seriousness equal to the loss of king, prince, and sacrifice (Hos. iii. 4). We must therefore expect every gradation from a comparatively pure Yahwism, through syncretistic Yahwist cults, to the most polytheistic, syncretistic cults we can imagine.

What happened at the local shrines is of less importance than what was the state of affairs at Jerusalem. There were certainly elements of sun-worship in Solomon's Temple in pre-exilic days. To say that the Temple was primarily a sun-temple, and was definitely built for such,<sup>1</sup> involves the assumption of too many probabilities. The fact nevertheless remains that the eastern gate of the Temple was considered to be of more account than any other gate. Ezekiel testifies to sun-worship, in addition to the women weeping for Tammuz, in the Temple during its last days (Ezek. viii. 14-16). The ritual protest of the last days of the Second Temple is itself clear proof of what happened in former times. According to the Mishnah (Sukkah v. 4), after

<sup>1</sup> F. J. Hollis (following von Gall), *Myth and Ritual* (1933), pp. 87-110.

the all-night festival and illuminations of the Feast of Tabernacles, two priests marched, blowing their trumpets as they went, to the east gate of the Temple. There they deliberately turned their backs to the east, and said, 'Our fathers, who were in this place, turned their backs to the Temple and their faces to the east, but we lift our eyes to God.' According to R. Jehudah they used to repeat, 'We belong to God, and we lift our eyes to God.' Further, the two pillars at the porch of Solomon's Temple were obelisks, and were associated with sun-worship rather than with the ordinary Canaanite fertility cults. The reforming Josiah removed from the Temple the 'horses of the sun' (2 Kings xxiii. 11). Sun-worship is almost certainly to be recognized as a considerable factor in the far-off origins of two of the agricultural feasts which the Hebrews adopted on their entrance into Canaan, and probably in the third also. The evidence is strong for the Feasts of Weeks and Ingathering, but not so strong for the Feast of Unleavened Bread (see below, p. 258).

We know that Ahaz introduced an altar in the Assyrian style, making it the great altar of sacrifice, and relegating the original brazen altar to a minor position and function (2 Kings xvi. 11 f.). This may be presumed to have involved an Assyrian cult for an Assyrian god. The altar seems to have survived the reforming zeal of Hezekiah, but not that of Josiah (2 Kings xxiii. 12; if this is indeed the same altar, displaced by Manasseh to make room for the two altars he erected).

Again, there was at one time a serpent-cult in the Temple. Hebrew tradition identified the brazen serpent, of which Hezekiah summarily disposed (2 Kings xviii. 4), with that lifted up by Moses in the wilderness. This tradition may or may not have been well founded, for not everything which the Hebrews traced back to Moses was rightly his, but the serpent was certainly worshipped. This was a Canaanite and Semitic cult. A bronze serpent has been found at Gezer, jugs with serpent ornamentation at Beth-shemesh, together with various serpent

representations at Beth-shan (*shan* is from the name of a Sumerian serpent deity), at Taanach, in Arabia, and in Egypt.<sup>1</sup>

In the time of Manasseh (2 Kings xxi. 1-18) most of the old abominations returned. He favoured all the cults of Canaan; he worshipped the sun and all the host of heaven (2 Kings xxiii. 5), and in his day children were 'passed through the fire to Molech' (2 Kings xxi. 6, xxiii. 10). We find, during Manasseh's long reign, and during the short reign of his son Amon, as complete a syncretism in the cult, and as many indications of polytheism, as at any other time, except perhaps only in the last days of the pre-exilic Temple. In the reaction which followed the untimely death of Josiah at Megiddo, things went from bad to worse (2 Kings xxiii. 32, 37, xxiv. 9, 19; Jer. xliv. 17 ff.).

The existence of such a state of affairs is confirmed by the testimony of the Elephantine papyri. These date from the end of the fifth century B.C., and illustrate the life of a colony of Jews near the first cataract of the Nile. For a century they had worshipped in a temple there a pantheon of at least five deities with Yahu (i.e. Yahweh) at the head. Of three goddesses, one is named Ashimah (cf. possibly Amos viii. 14). A second is named Anath-Bethel. Anath is the ancient Semitic goddess of love and war. Bethel is known as the name of a Palestinian god, and is actually referred to in Jer. xlviii. 13 as the god of Israel. A third is named Anath-Yahu, which must mean that Anath was held to be in the same relation to Yahweh as Ishtar to Chemosh (cf. Moabite Stone, line 17). This is stark polytheism. The remarkable facts, however, are that the cult was Israelite, and that these Jews were on good terms with the authorities at Jerusalem. All this can mean no other than that not even in 400 B.C. were all Jews united in the fight for a true ethical monotheism. There can be no doubt that, in spite of the efforts of reformers like Hezekiah and Josiah, the cult which the Babylonians destroyed, when they laid Solomon's Temple in

<sup>1</sup> S. A. Cook, *op. cit.*, pp. 98 ff.

ruins in 586 B.C., was anything but a pure Yahwism. Further, if the revived cult in the Second Temple still admitted the cult at Elephantine as in any way legitimate, then even in the early post-exilic period, before the advent of Ezra,<sup>1</sup> the long battle was not yet over.

We see, therefore, that it is misleading to make any clear-cut statement that there was syncretism or that there was polytheism in Solomon's Temple. The evidence is that at different periods both existed, but to varying degrees and in varied form. In each case the determining factor was the king himself. What took place in the days of Rehoboam, Ahaz, or Manasseh was very different from what happened under Asa, Hezekiah, or Josiah. And there were variations also both among the reformers and among the apostates. One thing is clear, that the state of things in the last days was, if possible, even worse than in the first.

Apart from all special and temporary cults, it is possible to draw a general picture of the ritual at Jerusalem which formed the basis of all that took place during the time when Solomon's Temple was standing. The ritual was based primarily on the three great agricultural festivals which the Israelites found in Canaan.<sup>2</sup> The first was the Feast of Unleavened Bread (*Maṣ-ṣoth*). This was celebrated at the beginning of the barley harvest. Its distinguishing features were: firstly, the eating of unleavened cakes (in order that the produce of the new year might be baked with new leaven, so that any contamination with the old leaven, preserved from loaf to loaf, might be avoided); secondly, the bringing of first-fruits, and thirdly, the waving of a sheaf of these first-fruits by the priest towards and away from the altar. This latter signified the gift to the Giver of all good

<sup>1</sup> We regard the date of Ezra's arrival as 397 B.C., in the seventh year of the second Artaxerxes. See *The People and The Book*, p. 293.

<sup>2</sup> For a description of the special features of these festivals see W. O. E. Oesterley, 'Early Hebrew Rites', in *Myth and Ritual*, pp. 111-46.

things, and the receiving back from Him of that sustenance of earth which He had caused to grow. With this festival there was combined the Passover, originally a nomadic full-moon festival of pre-settlement origin. A victim was taken from the flocks, its blood sprinkled on the doorposts and lintels (earlier, smeared on the tents), and its flesh eaten as a sacrificial meal. It has been suggested that the Hebrew name Pesach is connected with the root *pasach* (limp or dance—see 1 Kings xviii. 26), and that there was a sacred dance connected with the festival.<sup>1</sup>

The second festival was Qaşir (Harvest, later Weeks), celebrated seven weeks later. It marked the end of the barley harvest, and the beginning of the wheat harvest. It was originally a midsummer festival, as the lessons and psalms associated with the festival show.<sup>2</sup> Two loaves baked with leaven were 'waved' before God. Whatever similar customs with two loaves, as against one loaf, may have meant elsewhere, in Israel they were, like the wave-sheaf of Maşsoth, a gift to the Giver of the fruits of earth.<sup>3</sup>

The last festival of the agricultural year, and the greatest of them all, was that of 'Asiph (Ingathering), or Tequphah (turning, i.e. of the year). During this festival, for seven days the Hebrews dwelt in booths, made of 'branches of palm trees, and boughs of thick trees, and willows of the brook' (Lev. xxiii. 40, P; the earlier codes make no reference to the booths, but it is not likely that these were a post-exilic innovation). This festival was the great thanksgiving when all the fruits of the year had been gathered in, that of the vineyards last of all. It was also the New Year festival, when prayers were made to ensure the coming of the former rain, due so soon afterwards, on which the harvest of the next year depended. The Israelites met together, shared with God the goodness He had given, and made merry with Him (1 Sam. i. 3; Judges ix. 27).

<sup>1</sup> Oesterley, *Myth and Ritual*, p. 118.

<sup>2</sup> St. John Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (1921), pp. 46 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Myth and Ritual*, p. 121.

Attempts have been made to establish a close parallel between the pre-exilic Feast of 'Asiph and the Babylonian New Year (*akitu*) festival. The case for this is to be found in *Myth and Ritual* (ed. S. H. Hooke), pp. 1-146. The general pattern involves, (a) the dramatic representation of the death and resurrection of the god, (b) the deification of the king, (c) the recitation or symbolic representation of the myth of Creation, (d) a ritual combat in which the god overcomes his enemies, (e) a sacred marriage, (f) a triumphal procession in which the king plays the part of the god, and (g) a general stress on the importance of the life of the king for the well-being of the community.<sup>1</sup> For our part, we find remarkably little evidence of any of these in connexion with the pre-exilic Feast of 'Asiph, and still less in connexion with the three festivals of Tishri, into which the pre-exilic Feast of 'Asiph was broken after the Exile. Or again, even if Pss. xciii-xcix, which, with other psalms, Mowinckel<sup>2</sup> associated with the New Year Feast as the Coronation Feast of Yahweh, are pre-exilic (a claim which he makes no attempt to substantiate, and one which is open to very serious objection), it is remarkable that nowhere in the Jewish liturgies have they any particular association with the New Year. On the contrary they are Sabbath psalms.<sup>3</sup>

The elements of the post-exilic Feast of Sukkoth or Tabernacles (we have no details of the pre-exilic Feast of 'Asiph) which can definitely be assumed for pre-exilic days are, firstly, the all-night illuminations after the first day of the feast, and, secondly, the great torch dance of that night (Sukkah v. 3, 4; Tos. Suk. iv. 4). These are two of the three outstanding features of the Feast, and, if anything is a survival of the pre-exilic Feast of 'Asiph, then these must be. They are essentially primitive rites, by their very nature bound up with the incidence of the

<sup>1</sup> *Myth and Ritual*, pp. 8 ff., 144 ff. Dr. Oesterley's essay examines the Hebrew Festival in the light of this general pattern.

<sup>2</sup> *Psalmstudien*, ii (1922).

<sup>3</sup> N. H. Snaith, *Studies in the Psalter* (1934), pp. 47-190.

Harvest Moon and with sun-worship. It was in connexion with these rites that the priests made their protest against the sun-worship of their fathers (Sukkah v. 4). The third rite was that of water-pouring (Sukkah iv. 9), a ceremony which must belong to the very first strata of New Year fertility rites.

Whatever be the conclusions which further excavations and research may provide on these matters, there are certain details of pre-exilic Temple-worship of which we can be reasonably sure. There is probable evidence of processions in Pss. xxiv and xlvi. There is a clear reference in Ps. xlii. 4 ('how I led the throng in procession'), and again in Ps. lxviii. 24-6, whilst Ps. cxviii. 27 probably refers to a procession round the altar. These three psalms are probably not pre-exilic, though there is no psalm concerning which there is such a division of opinion as Ps. lxviii. In any case, however, if there were processions after the Exile, then there were processions before it, for these are ceremonies which persist from primitive times, and are not likely to be innovations. In the rites of the post-exilic Festival of Sukkoth, the use of the lulab (palm-branch) and the ethrog (a fruit similar to a lemon) are certainly primitive elements, since both are symbols of fertility. In a similar way, the Ner Tamid, that Continual Light which was never allowed to go out, can be traced back to primitive times, though here it is necessary to point out two things—first, that the only direct pre-exilic evidence is of the lamp at Shiloh which was allowed to go out (1 Sam. iii. 3), and, second, that the only evidence of the continual burning in Israel is from post-exilic times. If therefore we are to hold that, because we know the light was continually burning in the post-exilic Temple, and because we know that such is the universal custom, therefore it was so in pre-exilic Israel also, it must be realized that we are going against the only definite evidence of the pre-exilic custom in Israel.

Undoubtedly there was music and singing in the pre-exilic



Temple. According to 2 Sam. vi. 5, when David brought up the Ark to Jerusalem, he and all the house of Israel 'played before Yahweh with all manner of instruments made of fir wood, and with harps, and with psalteries, and with timbrels, and with castanets, and with cymbals'. Again, they 'brought up the Ark of Yahweh with shouting and with the sound of a trumpet' (2 Sam. vi. 15; cf. Ps. xlvii. 5). Isa. xxx. 29 refers to 'a song as in the night when a holy feast is kept', referring to such a festival as the all-night festivities of the Festival of Sukkoth. References in Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah cannot with safety be used for pre-exilic times; the Chronicler has far too obvious a tendency to clothe the events of other days with the trappings of his own. Nor can we use the titles of the Psalms, since they also probably belong to the days of the Second Temple. In respect of the high places, however, we have such references as Amos v. 23, viii. 10.

There was, as is only too clear, a tremendous gulf between the worship at Jerusalem and elsewhere in pre-exilic times, and the ideas of the best of the prophets and the reforming kings. The story of post-exilic Temple worship is the story of how this gulf was bridged. In the reformation of Josiah we have the attempt to put into practice the ideals of those eighth-century prophets who fought against syncretistic cults and insisted that, sacrifice or no sacrifice, the worshippers must themselves observe the ethical demands of a righteous Yahweh. Josiah destroyed the local shrines; he cleansed the Temple and its precincts of all the more obvious polytheistic and syncretistic elements; he reformed the cult (e.g. the Passover which he kept, 2 Kings xxiii. 21-3). To what extent his reforms involved the centralization of all Yahweh worship in Jerusalem it is difficult to say, since the Book of the Law found by Hilkiah in the Temple probably comprised only Deut. v-xxvi, xxviii, and even in these chapters the references to centralization may be due to later editors. In any case Josiah failed, and the reformation on the basis of

Deuteronomy was carried out by Ezra.<sup>1</sup> In his days the Separation, demanded by Deuteronomy, between the People of God and the 'people of the land' was made, and the foundations of the true worship of Yahweh were laid, with a reformed cult of the One True, Holy, and Righteous God. The result was a compromise between the ideals of prophets like Hosea and Isaiah on the one hand, and of the practices of the priests and the cult-prophets on the other. The last three verses of Ps. li are the expression of that compromise. We find the priestly side of the post-exilic compromise in P. Here, in very many respects, there are considerable changes from pre-exilic days.

In the Priestly Code we find the phrase 'the priests, the sons of Aaron'; in Deuteronomy the priests are equated with the Levites, but in the early days it was not necessary for a man to be a Levite in order that he should be a priest. The situation in the first generations after the settlement in Canaan is seen in the story of the establishment of the sanctuary at Dan (Judges xvii, xviii). Micah appointed his son to act as priest in his 'house of gods', in which were an ephod and teraphim, images which needed a guardian. When, however, the 'young man out of Bethlehem-judah, of the family of Judah, who was a Levite' appeared (Judges xvii. 7), Micah displaced his son, and installed the Levite. Whilst it was legitimate that any man should be a priest, it was nevertheless desirable to have a Levite. It is evident that, whereas originally Levi was as much a tribe as any other of the sons of Jacob (Gen. xxxiv, xlix), already Levi has begun to be regarded as having special functions with respect to sanctuaries. In Deut. xxxiii. 8-11 Levi has ceased altogether to be a secular tribe, and appears as a priestly caste, exercising the

<sup>1</sup> L. E. Browne, *From Babylon to Bethelhem* (1926), pp. 51-5, where the details of Neh. viii, the commands of D, and of P are placed side by side in three columns. The evidence is conclusive, except only in the matter of the eighth day. [Many scholars, however, regard Ezra's law-book as the Priestly Code in part or whole; e.g. Lods, *The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism*, p. 304; Oesterley and Robinson, *Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament*, p. 62.]

priestly functions of giving oracles, teaching, and sacrificing. We know that Simeon ceased at an early date to be a separate tribe, and became part of the tribe of Judah (Judges i. 1-3; compare also Joshua xv. 26-32, 42 with Joshua xix. 1-8). Simeon is not found at all in the catalogue of the tribes and their characteristics in Deut. xxxiii. It is probable that, in view of the association of Simeon and Levi in Gen. xxxiv, when they treacherously attacked Shechem, and the apparent realization of Jacob's fears (Gen. xxxiv. 30 f.) as revealed in Gen. xlix. 5-7, that Levi also became a sub-tribe under Judah. This would account for the Levite of the tribe of Judah who became priest at Micah's shrine.

This disorganization of the tribe of Levi we take to have been prior to the going down into Egypt, as indeed the Shechem story suggests. Moses undoubtedly acted as priest during his lifetime (Ps. xcix. 6; Exod. xix. 14, &c.), so that Levi would tend to exercise priestly functions because of his association with Moses. The word *lawi'a* (almost certainly from the same root as the Hebrew *levi*) has been found in three inscriptions from El-Öla. This was a Minaean colony, some 800 miles from the home of the Minaeans in south Arabia, and about 400 miles from Jerusalem. The word is used of some kind of cult official. The date of the inscriptions is uncertain, but not later than the time of the kingdoms.<sup>1</sup> Meyer (*Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, pp. 88 ff.) suggests, with justification, that since Kadesh is between El-Öla and Jerusalem, the Levites wandered, some to El-Öla and others with the tribes, exercising priestly functions, until in both centres the name 'Levite' ultimately denoted a cult-official. In the Minaean inscriptions the process is complete, as also in Deuteronomy, but in Judges xvii we see the process during its development. Ultimately the Hebrew word *levi* came to be derived from the root *lawah* ('attach'), since, in course of time, no one would have any knowledge of a Levite,

<sup>1</sup> See Gray, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament* (1925), pp. 242-7, for a full discussion.

except in so far as he was attached to a sanctuary. In this way Samuel, who was an Ephraimite (1 Sam. i. 1), came to be reckoned as a Levite (1 Chron. vi. 28), and so also for Obed-edom (1 Chron. xvi. 4 f.), who was actually a Philistine from Gath.

With respect to Jerusalem, we find that, in David's time, Abiathar and Zadok were priests. Abiathar is probably of the house of Eli (chosen in Egypt as guardians of the Ark, 1 Sam. ii. 27 f.), but the descent of Zadok is not known, though in the Chronicles he has come to be recognized as a descendant of Eleazar, son of Aaron (1 Chron. vi. 50-3). At the death of David, Abiathar supported the unsuccessful Adonijah, whilst Zadok supported Solomon, with the result that the sons of Zadok continued as priests at Jerusalem down to the Exile. At Dan, in the far north, the sons of Moses were priests (Judges xviii. 30). Jeroboam son of Nebat is said to have created non-Levitical priests for the northern high places (1 Kings xii. 31). If Josiah slew 'all the priests of the high places' of the north (2 Kings xxiii. 20), and brought the priests of the southern high places to Jerusalem (2 Kings xxiii. 8), then we may assume that the Levites were priests at the southern high places.

According to Deuteronomy, all Levites are priests. This is the situation in Malachi (ii. 4, iii. 3). The Zadokites, however, did not encourage the Levites at Jerusalem (2 Kings xxiii. 9), and in the Priestly Code (Num. xviii. 2-7; Lev. viii) the distinction between priests and Levites becomes clear and final. The intermediate stage is shown in Ezek. xliv. 15, 'the priests, the Levites, the sons of Zadok'. The author of Ezek. xliv proposes an admirable solution from the Zadokite point of view. He confirms the Zadokites as the only legitimate priests (xliv. 15), and proposes menial tasks, hitherto performed by non-Jews to the pious horror of the author himself (xliv. 4-14), for the Levites, as punishment for their alleged responsibility for the whole of the idolatries at the high places.

The most difficult problem in the development of the priesthood is that the post-exilic priesthood is always referred to in the Priestly Code as Aaronic. This is in spite of the fact that, in Num. xxv. 13 (P), a 'covenant of an everlasting priesthood' is made with Phinehas son of Eleazar, from whom the Zadokites of the Chronicler's time claimed descent (1 Chron. xxiv. 3). Not only so, but in this Aaronic priesthood the Zadokites outnumbered the Aaronites by two to one (1 Chron. xxiv. 4). The most satisfactory proposal is by Kennett,<sup>1</sup> that before the Exile the Aaronites were priests at Bethel, and that they occupied Jerusalem when the Zadokites were carried away captives. By the time the Zadokites returned, the Aaronites were in too strong a position to be ousted, even though the Zadokites were superior in numbers. There certainly was an attempt to oust Joshua, the Zadokite high-priest, in the time of Zechariah (Zech. iii), that is, soon after the return of Zerubbabel and his company from Babylon. Since Malachi assumed that all Levites were priests, and because of all the controversy between Jew and Samaritan which continued till Ezra's time, we may assume that the final compromise was not effected until the reforms of Ezra had been consolidated. With regard to the possible association of the Aaronites with Bethel, it is pointed out that the cry of salutations to the bulls which Jeroboam set up (1 Kings xii. 28) was precisely that to the golden calf (Exod. xxxii. 4), of which Aaron definitely was the priest, in spite of his later excuses to Moses (Exod. xxxii. 1-6, 22-5). The name of Aaron is nowhere original in J, and in E his only contact with the Tent of Meeting is to be most severely reprimanded (Num. xii. 1-13).

The post-exilic history of the Levites is one of almost continual change. In the earlier sections of Ezra-Nehemiah they are distinct from the Temple-singers (Ezra ii. 41), but not in the time of the Chronicler (1 Chron. vi. 1, 33, 39, 44). The

<sup>1</sup> 'The Origin of the Aaronite Priesthood', *JTS*, vi (1905), pp. 161-86.

Temple-singers may originally have been the cult-prophets,<sup>1</sup> but probably came to be reckoned as Levites as this description came more and more to be applied to all Temple-servants except only the sacrificing priests. The conclusion of the matter is found in Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* XX. ix, 6, according to whom the Levites received some compensation for all the indignities of the past when, in the time of Herod Agrippa II, they were permitted to wear the white robes of the priesthood.

When we come to consider the question of sacrifice we are faced with the same difficulty as in the case of worship generally. There is very little definite evidence concerning the precise nature of the sacrifices of pre-exilic times, either what they were, or how they were offered. As before, the earlier material has been worked over by editors who thought only in terms of the circumstances of their own day.

Primarily, according to Old Testament sources, there were two kinds of sacrifices in pre-exilic times, gift-sacrifices and communion sacrifices. The general term for animal sacrifice was *zebach*, properly 'that which is slaughtered', since in the earliest times every slaughter of an animal was regarded as a sacrifice to the Deity. The *zebach-shelemim* (or *shelem*), 'peace-offerings', were eaten mostly by the worshipper, a small part being burnt on the altar as the share of Yahweh in the common meal. Some would associate the word *shelemim* with the idea of fulfilment, and so translate 'thank-offerings' (e.g. Lev. iii. 1 RV. marg.). In any case, it was a 'sacrifice for friendship', as is testified in the Ras Shamra tablets.<sup>2</sup> When the animal was wholly burned on the altar, the sacrifice was known as an '*olah* 'whole burnt offering', or '*olah kalil*, where the idea of 'completely' is emphasized (1 Sam. vii. 9). Parallel with this there was the term *minchah*, 'present, tribute', which involved

<sup>1</sup> A. R. Johnson, *Exp. Times*, xlvii, p. 317. Cf. 2 Kings xxiii. 2 and 2 Chron. xxxiv. 30.

<sup>2</sup> J. W. Jack, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

essentially the idea of a gift of homage to the Deity. Before the Exile the word could be used of either an animal sacrifice or a cereal offering, in fact, anything given wholly to Yahweh. For the rest, we depend, so far as the Old Testament is concerned, on post-exilic sources. We are prevented, however, from excluding completely the various types of sacrifices which are mentioned in the Priestly Code. Whilst, in the Old Testament, these terms are found only in respect of post-exilic sacrifices, they are, almost without exception, used as technical terms in the Ras Shamra tablets.<sup>1</sup> The two exceptions are *'āshām*, 'guilt offering', and *chattath*, 'sin-offering'. The word *'āshām* is found, but not in the sense in which the word is used in the Priestly Code. It is used rather in the same sense as in 1 Sam. vi. 3, &c.; 2 Kings xii. 16; Isa. liii. 10, where the ruling idea is of 'compensation', and there is no question of compensation paid to Yahweh, as in the post-exilic ritual. The word *chattath* is solely post-exilic in the Old Testament, and is not found in the Ras Shamra tablets.<sup>2</sup> On the main issue, whilst we have no Israelite evidence of the existence of these other types of sacrifice before the Exile, it is extremely likely that many of them were known to the Israelites, that they formed part of the pre-settlement Canaanite worship, and that the Israelites copied them, either adopting or adapting them. The only exceptions are in respect of the guilt- and sin-offerings.

In post-exilic times there is a complete change from the simple picture, which we hitherto have had, of the pre-exilic sacrificial ritual, a picture which we are now realizing was not so simple after all. The *minchah* is no longer any gift whatever to Yahweh. It is now the cereal-offering which accompanies the whole-burnt-offering. *Zebach* remains the general term for all

<sup>1</sup> J. W. Jack, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-31.

<sup>2</sup> Viroilleaud claims to have found it, but this is not confirmed by other scholars. A similar situation occurs in connexion with the Minaean inscriptions, where Hommel claims to have found the word. See Gray, *op. cit.*, pp. 63 f., 406.

animal sacrifices, part of which only was burned on the altar. An equivalent term is *shelamim*, short for the original *zebach-shelamim*. This term is a general one and includes three classes of offerings, the *todah* (thank-offering), the *neder* (vow), and the *nedabah* (freewill-offering).

There are two general terms for gifts and presents, *qorbanim* (oblations) and *qodashim* (hallowed things). They take the place of the pre-exilic term *minchah*. The *qorban* is a present to Yahweh, and the term includes all those gifts which come to the altar and those which are for the Service of the Sanctuary (cf. Matt. v. 23 f.). The details of the various *qorbanim* are found in Lev. i-vii; Num. vii, xxxi. The *qodashim* are equally gifts to Yahweh, but they comprise that which is the perquisite of the priest. The list of *qodashim* is to be found in Num. xviii. 8-32. It will be realized, however, that a *qorban* can be partly *qodesh* (a hallowed thing), since that part of the *qorban* which is not burned on the altar goes to the priest (Lev. ii. 1, 3). Even the priest's clothes are *qodashim* (Exod. xxviii. 36-8). A *qorban* which is an '*olah* (whole-burnt-offering) has no connexion with the *qodashim*, because the whole of it necessarily goes to the altar. An '*olah* is therefore an '*ishsheh* (fire-offering), which none of the *qodashim* could ever be, since '*ishsheh* is used of that which is burned on the altar.

The *qodashim*, therefore, include all first-fruits, *ma'aseroth* (tithes), *terumoth* (heave-offerings), and *tenuphoth* (wave-offerings). All these went to the priests. There were two classes of first-fruits, *bikkurim* and *re'shith*. The *bikkurim* included the first-fruits of wheat, barley, the vine, figs, pomegranate, olives, and honey. All else were *re'shith*, though the term is used loosely in 2 Chron. xxxi. 4 f.

The two post-exilic expiatory sacrifices, the *chattath* (sin-offering) and the '*asham* (guilt-offering), were made for ritual offences. Neither was wholly burned on the altar; in some cases only the fat was burned whilst the rest went to the priest (e.g.



Lev. iv), and in other cases none at all on the altar, but everything 'without the camp' (e.g. the red heifer, Num. xix). The phrase *reach nichoach* (sweet savour) was used in connexion with an *'ishsheh* to express the idea of expiation, which in post-exilic times was associated even with sacrifices which were properly gift-sacrifices. It is comparable to the term *kipper*, which was used of those ceremonies which were definitely 'to make atonement' for sin.

Every day in the Second Temple the Tamid (continual sacrifice) was offered, both in the morning and 'between the two evenings'. It consisted of an *'olah*, with its appropriate *minchah* and *neseh* (Exod. xxix. 38-41). On the Sabbath an additional offering was made (Num. xxviii. 9), and similarly for all special days and festivals. The other sacrifices were made as occasion demanded.

One of the strange facts concerning the Temple worship is the paucity of the information which has been preserved concerning the use of the psalms in the Temple worship. It is generally agreed that the Psalter was the hymn-book of the Second Temple, but, apart from the psalms for the days of the week, and those for the various festivals, we know nothing of its use.<sup>1</sup> The Psalter was evidently compiled, so far as the first three books are concerned, from a number of hymnaries, two Davidic, one Qorahite, and one Asaphite. Why there should have been a Qorahite hymnary is strange, since the Qorahites did not form one of the three guilds of singers as did the Asaphites.<sup>2</sup> There was also another hymnary, 'The Music-master's', to which cross-references are given. The last two books of the Psalter are formed of various groups of psalms, mostly liturgical, but we have no information of their use except for the Psalms of Degrees, cxx-cxxxiv, which were sung at the Feast of Tabernacles, and the Hallel, which belonged to the festivals.

<sup>1</sup> For details, see Oesterley, *The Psalms in the Jewish Church* (1910), pp. 110-28.

<sup>2</sup> A suggested explanation is given in *Studies in the Psalter*, pp. 39-43.

We know also that on the Sabbath the Song of Moses from Deuteronomy (xxxii. 1-43) was sung, in six sections, on successive Sabbath mornings; and also that in the evening the Exodus Song of Moses was sung, in two sections, with the Song of Israel (Num. xxi. 17 f.) to make a third, so that three successive Sabbaths were accounted for (T.B., Rosh Hash. 31 a; T.J. Meg. iii). The psalms were sung in three sections, and at the end of each section the priests blew thrice with their trumpets, and the people fell down and worshipped (Sukkah iv. 5; Tamid vii. 3). They were sung whilst the drink-offering was being poured out, according to the old saying, 'there is no song except over wine'.

Various attempts have been made to find occasions for the use of other Psalms in the days of the Temple. Volz (*Das Neujahrsfest Jahves*, 1912) proposed a number of psalms as the liturgy of the Feast of Tabernacles, namely, viii, xxvii, xlii, lxviii, xcii, ciii, cxiii-cxviii, cxix (?), and cxx-cxxxiv. Mowinckel proposed (*Psalmstudien*, ii, 1922) numerous psalms as the liturgy for the New Year Feast, as the Coronation Feast of Yahweh, with xciii, xcv-c, and xlvi as the chief. Keet (*A Liturgical Study of the Psalter*, 1928) suggested cxviii as a psalm for the Festival of Dedication. It has been suggested that the Psalter was arranged in its present form in order that it might be recited, one psalm each Sabbath, during a triennial cycle, corresponding to the Triennial cycle for the Reading of the Law in the synagogues with its accompanying Haphtaroth, or Readings from the Prophets.<sup>1</sup> In spite of all these proposals, the question remains unsolved for lack of definite proof. Apart from the information in the Mishnah, Talmud, and Rabbinic writings generally, we have only the picture in Eccclus. i. 11-21, of the closing scenes of the Temple worship in the time of Simon son of Onias.

The change of the Calendar in post-exilic times, when the New Year came to be reckoned in the Babylonian fashion from

<sup>1</sup> E. G. King, *JTS*, v, pp. 203 ff.; St. John Thackeray, *JTS*, xvi, pp. 177 ff.; N. H. Snaith, *ZAW*, li, (1933), Heft 3-4, pp. 302-7.

the new moon of Nisan, involved changes in the autumnal Feast of 'Asiph. The Feast of Passover and Unleavened Bread continued to be observed at the Full Moon, and the Feast of Weeks followed at an interval of seven weeks according to rule, but the Old-Year and New-Year Feast of 'Asiph could not long continue to be observed at the middle of the seventh month. In the end, the pre-exilic Feast of 'Asiph was divided into three separate festivals, Rosh hashShanah (New Year's Day) on the 1st of Tishri, the Day of Atonement on the 10th, and the Feast of Sukkoth (Tabernacles) on the 15th, for eight days now, instead of seven. For the two latter there is no particular difficulty, since the traditional usages and ideas have continued down the years. It is concerning Rosh hashShanah that a problem has arisen in recent times, consequent upon Mowinckel's theory of the Coronation Feast of Yahweh. Can it be held, with any degree of confidence, that Rosh hashShanah is primarily associated with Yahweh the King? Traditionally it has been a day of memorial, trumpet-blowing, and the commencement of the ten penitential days of the Jewish Year. For our part, though Mowinckel builds up a strong case, we find the Kingdom to be only one element in the liturgies of this festival, with other elements such as penitence and Yahweh the Creator at least as dominant.

There remains one outstanding development of Jewish worship during the post-exilic period, and that is the synagogue. Of all the institutions of Jewry, it can be safely said that none has had a greater influence on mankind. Not only has the synagogue service formed the basis of Christian worship,<sup>1</sup> but Islam also owes it a great debt. Tradition, as represented by Philo (*Vita Mosis*, iii. 27) and Josephus (*Cont. Ap.* ii. 17) ascribed the origin of the synagogue to Moses. The facts are that, from the evidence in Philo and in the New Testament, the synagogue had already become established as an institution at the opening of the Chris-

<sup>1</sup> Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy* (1925).

tian era. Already it had attained a position in the life of the Jew, both of Palestine and of the Diaspora, completely independent of the Temple. The two were in no way rivals. The Temple provided a means of worship with sacrifice and all that the traditional ritual could supply, whereas the synagogue provided a worship without sacrifice, in which regular instruction in the Law had a predominant position. That they were in no sense rivals can be seen from Tos. Sukkah iv. 5:

'R. Joshua b. Chaninah said: All the days of the rejoicing at the water-pouring (i.e. at the Feast of Tabernacles) our eyes had no sleep, for we rose early in the morning for the morning sacrifice; thence we went to the synagogue; thence to the college; thence to eat and drink; thence to the afternoon prayer; thence to the evening sacrifice; thence to the rejoicing of the water-drawing (i.e. the all-night feast).'

Apparently, therefore, there was a synagogue in close connexion with the Temple itself, and this is confirmed by the Mishnah (Yoma vii. 1; Sotah vii. 7, 8). Whilst, then, collective prayers may have been recited in conjunction with the sacrifices,<sup>1</sup> yet it is probable that the reading of the Scriptures and such prayers as the Benedictions belonged, together with the regular instruction, to the synagogues, whilst the Temple worship was ceremonial and ritual in form.

According to T. B. Keth. 105 a, there were 394 synagogues in Jerusalem when the Temple was destroyed (T. J. Meg. 73 d says 480). Whether these figures are accurate or not, it is clear that wherever Jews were, in Palestine or out of it, the synagogues were already firmly established and formed a solid centre for Judaism. Thus Jewry survived the destruction of the Temple. Once more the synagogues served the purpose which brought them into being, since it is generally agreed that the beginnings of the synagogues belong to the Babylonian Exile. At that time, and during all the centuries since, the synagogue has been life-centre of Jewry. In course of time appropriate passages were

<sup>1</sup> Dr. M. Gaster, *The Samaritans* (Schweich Lecture, 1923), p. 73.

read in the synagogues at the festivals, in order that the day might be properly observed. This was applied to the four special Sabbaths, until the whole Pentateuch was arranged to be read, Sabbath by Sabbath, in Palestine during a three-year period, and in Babylonia annually. Eventually each portion of the Law had its own Haphtarah, or Reading from the Prophets. Ultimately the Babylonian system triumphed. In order that the common people, whose ordinary speech had long ceased to be Hebrew, might understand the Law, an interpreter gave the meaning of the reading in their own language, neither 'translating with strict literalness' nor 'making additions to it' (Tos. Meg. iv. 41). Already, in the time of Paul, a homily had become the custom, being closed with a benediction at the discretion of the speaker, though later this became expanded, introduced into various parts of the service, and known as a *Qaddish*. After the Hadrian Wars the synagogal services were revised, and there is a continuous tradition down to the present day.

N. H. SNAITH.