

of your friends known to one another, the disappointment, that somehow they do not coalesce. Something of the same sort happens in literature. There is sometimes an incompatibility, a "je ne sais quoi," between the critic and his poet. Mr. Benson admires Keble's "simplicity," "gravity," "propriety" (good taste). But is this all? To those who know the poet's personality, even to those who have only seen him in the elder Richmond's portraiture, it seems preposterous to be told that he was "a stern Puritan," priggish with children, deficient in the sense of beauty, or, strangest of all, that anything else than love was the keynote of his song.



Notes on Hebrew Religion.—I.

By HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B.

THE recent appearance of a popular book¹ on Hebrew religion by Mr. Addis suggests the desirability of reviewing some of the principal theories that have gained acceptance in the critical schools. Such a course is the more necessary because we are told in the preface that the volume "is simply an attempt to provide the general reader with a *clear statement of fact*² on the history of Hebrew religion down to the middle of the fifth century B.C." Not only so, but honesty and sincerity are stamped in the clearest characters on every page of Mr. Addis's work. If the book does not carry conviction, the failure will assuredly not be due to any doubt of the author's purpose. It must not be thought that in saying this I am indulging in any conventional expressions of courtesy. On the contrary, I have no intention of suppressing any point that ought to be made for the purpose of showing that the book is unreliable. But if Mr. Addis's work influences others as it does

¹ "Hebrew Religion, to the Establishment of Judaism under Ezra," by W. E. Addis. Williams and Norgate, 1906. This will be cited as "H. R."

² My italics.

me, it will cause very great surprise that so honest a writer should accept so many incredible statements, and should pay so little heed to all who do not agree with him. Is the capacity for discovering truth confined to a single school of theological philologists? Have the followers of Wellhausen and Kuenen a monopoly of learning and ability?

The first criticism I have to make concerns the trustworthiness of Mr. Addis's guides in matters of fact. The book abounds in statements that could not have been made in the first instance—for Mr. Addis frankly states that his work is not original—by any impartial inquirer who took the trouble to investigate the available data with ordinary care and accuracy. Instances of this will meet us from time to time, but I proceed at once to give some illustrations of the truth of my statement. On p. 46 we read: "Amulets, too, played a notable part in Semitic worship. *For this reason*¹ the Hebrews decked themselves with ornaments (Exod. xi. 2, xii. 35) when they set out for Sinai." There is no foundation whatever in the text to which Mr. Addis refers for this statement as to the *reason*. Moreover, Exod. iii. 22, xii. 36, would seem to suggest that the motive of the acts narrated was to spoil the Egyptians. Further, "jewels of silver and jewels of gold and *raiment*" cannot reasonably be regarded as amulets or as articles used for purposes of worship. Nor does this palpable misinterpretation of the Hebrew text derive the slightest confirmation from the only other sentence Mr. Addis devotes to the subject: "Indeed, the Syriac word for earring means, literally, 'holy thing,' and a South Arabic word for 'pearl' is said to have a similar derivation."

On p. 29 we are told that "it is plain from the reiterated denunciations of the Hebrew prophets that tree-worship, or the worship of spirits living in trees, was an inveterate habit of the Israelites. They loved to gather for sacred rites 'under every luxuriant tree.'² . . . Even David (2 Sam. v. 22 *et seq.*) took

¹ My italics.

² I here omit some sentences which will be dealt with later.

the rustling sound in the Beca trees as an omen, and we are reminded of that most ancient oracle in Greece where men sought to know the mind of Zeus 'from the leafy oak tall of stature.'" And in an article which has appeared since the publication of the book, Mr. Addis says that "the sacred character of trees in Israel appears . . . from the fact that . . . David before battle (2 Sam. v. 22 *et seq.*) took an omen from the rustling in the balsam trees."¹ This is contradicted by the Biblical text. The passage in Samuel is thus rendered in the Revised Version :

And the Philistines came up yet again, and spread themselves in the valley of Rephaim. And when David inquired of the LORD, he said, Thou shalt not go up: make a circuit behind them, and come upon them over against the mulberry trees (*or* balsam trees). And it shall be, when thou hearest the sound of marching in the tops of the mulberry trees, that then thou shalt bestir thyself: for then is the LORD gone out before thee to smite the host of the Philistines. And David did so, as the LORD commanded him, etc.

The first thing that appears from this passage is that David worshipped the LORD, and not the trees or their spirits; the second is that he resorted to "inquiry of the LORD" as the method of obtaining directions. The statement that "the sacred character of trees in Israel appears from the fact that David took an omen from the rustling" cannot therefore be supported.

On p. 289 it is asserted that in the supposititious priestly code "the sacrifices, once left to the generosity of individuals, were now offered in the name of the whole congregation, so that in Num. xxviii. and xxix. we have an elaborate scale of sacrifices adapted to the five feasts." There is, of course, a list of public sacrifices in Numbers, but how would Mr. Addis reconcile the notion that *the* sacrifices (*i.e.*, all the sacrifices) were offered in the way he suggests with the evidence of "P"? The first three chapters of Leviticus contain elaborate rules of the procedure to be followed in the case of burnt-offerings, meal-offerings, and peace-offerings being brought to the religious centre by individuals. The procedure, it need scarcely be said,

¹ *Review of Theology and Philosophy*, vol. ii., No. 3, September, 1906, p. 156.

implies and rests on the fact that individuals sacrificed. The fourth chapter contains laws regulating the procedure to be followed in the case of sin-offerings, and also enacting rules by which individuals were to bring such sacrifices in certain cases. It is needless to press the matter further. Let anybody who doubts read through "P," and note the passages dealing with individual sacrifices.

In justice to Mr. Addis some considerations must be urged which tend to explain his position. First, the preface informs us that the book makes no claim to originality. In reading it I could not help recognising a great deal of material that occurs in other books, and though it is to be regretted that Mr. Addis should have repeated many statements that were made by their original authors with the most unpardonable recklessness in the first instance, yet he may justly plead that he was merely popularizing what had been accepted by many writers whom he has hitherto regarded as competent scholars. I say advisedly "has hitherto regarded," because I cannot conceive that any fair-minded man who looked at the question *in the right light* could possibly continue to hold that view. It is morally certain that if Mr. Addis desired reliable information on a point of English law or history he would not apply to a friend who was eminent only as an English lexicographer or philologist, and precisely the same principle holds in regard to Hebrew law. A man may be a great authority on Semitic philology without being able to form any opinion that shall be worthy of consideration on the true import of a Hebrew law, or even the force of a technical term. This point is so clear that further insistence on it is probably unnecessary. Secondly, Mr. Addis's guides often go wrong through ignorance of the *kind* of accuracy that is required in work of this nature. Thus, to take an instance that will prepare for an argument to be developed later, it may seem a small matter to refer to an *altar* as a "shrine" or a "sanctuary." That such a course could be misleading has never occurred to any of the critics. But let any reader take concrete

instances of the erection of altars—Moses in Exod. xxiv., Joshua at Mount Ebal, Saul after Michmash, Elijah on Carmel—and try the effect of substituting “shrine” for “altar” in an English version. Will he venture to say that the meaning is unaffected? Or, again, in speaking of the jubilee year, Mr. Addis writes: “All Hebrew slaves were to go free.”¹ To him this must have seemed a concise and accurate statement of the effect of the provisions contained in Lev. xxv. No critic—except Professor Van Hoonacker, whose brilliant abilities place him in a class by himself—could be expected to discover that Lev. xxv. does not deal with any Hebrew slaves, still less with all Hebrew slaves. In ancient Israel, as in other ancient communities, slavery could arise in many different ways, of which the most important was birth.² If, therefore, we found in Lev. xxv., “If thy brother be sold unto thee,” etc., we might perhaps think that at any rate *some* slaves (*i.e.*, those acquired by purchase) were within the scope of the law; but we could not even then suppose that it related to *all* Hebrew slaves. That, however, is not the text with which we have to deal. The enactment provides only for the case of thy brother *waxing poor and selling himself*. Clearly a man who was already a slave could not *wax poor and sell himself*. It follows that the law does not apply to *any* Hebrew slaves, but to insolvent freemen, and that Mr. Addis’s statement cannot be supported.³ Nevertheless, he had every reason to think that it was absolutely accurate.

¹ H. R., p. 252.

² *E.g.*, Gen. xiv. 14, 15, xvii. 12, 13, 23; Exod. xxi. 4; Lev. xxii. 11; Jer. ii. 14; Eccl. ii. 7. It would seem, from Exod. xxi., that the rule was that children followed the condition of a slave mother, and belonged to her owner. This may be the legal background of Ps. cxvi. 16: “I am thy servant, *the son of thy handmaid*.” In deference to Mr. Addis’s classical tastes, we may compare Soph. O. T., 1062-3: ἐὰν τρίτης ἐγὼ μητρὸς φανῶ τριδουλος; and Gaius, i. 82: *Ex ancilla et libero jure gentium servus nascitur*. With regard to freemen the Hebrew rule was different. This is proved by Lev. xxiv. 10-23, where the wonderful judgment turns chiefly on the fact that the accused—the son of an Egyptian man and an Israelitish woman—was a stranger (see “Studies in Biblical Law,” 84-94).

³ See “Studies in Biblical Law,” pp. 5-11, and *cf.* F. E. Peiser, “Urkunden aus der Zeit der dritten babylonischen Dynastie,” 1905, P. 110, and Berl. Ms., V. A. Th., 4920.

But even when all allowances have been made, much remains that cannot easily be defended. Exod. xxi. 2-6 provides that if a Hebrew slave desire to remain with his master six years after purchase, he is to be taken to *Elohim* and have his ear bored. In 1892 Mr. Addis published a book in which he said that this meant to the "local sanctuary."¹ Now he avers that *Elohim* means the penates, the spirit of the man's own household.² Both theories will be examined later, but I would here point out that they are mutually destructive. If the ceremony took place at the local "sanctuary" it had nothing to do with the penates, and *vice versâ*. But why did Mr. Addis put forward such a view without evidence and without argument in a book designed for general readers, when he himself had supported a totally different view in an earlier work? Or what possible reason can he, or his guides, have for saying:³ "The 'terror of Isaac' was a title of the deity who dwelt at Mizpah, or perhaps at Beersheba"?⁴

A second criticism, which is closely allied to the first, relates to the inability of the whole Wellhausen school to weigh evidence. As a result, they are apt to publish hypotheses that are absolutely unsupported, and also to state as facts the most improbable theories that rest on no substantial ground. One instance of each must here suffice. On pp. 22-24 Mr. Addis puts forward what are admittedly a number of guesses—and are properly marked as such—as to the meaning of the various mourning customs. These culminate in the following: "Even the wailing acquires a new import, when we learn that the Arabs cried to the spirit of the dead, 'Be not far off.'"⁵ One is irre-

¹ "Documents of the Hexateuch," vol. i., p. 43.

² H. R., pp. 36, 37.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

⁴ He himself translates Gen. xxxi. 42 thus: "Unless the God of my father, the God of Abraham, and the awful God of Isaac, had been with me [Where? at Mizpah or at Beersheba?], surely now thou hadst sent me away empty. God has seen my affliction, and the labour of my hands, and gave His decision last night" ("Documents," i., p. 62). How does he reconcile this verse—the whole of which he attributes to a single source—with his present averment?

⁵ H. R., p. 23.

sistibly tempted to ask Mr. Addis whether the wailing of English babies also acquired a new import for the author of this suggestion when he learnt Arabic. If an English boy were found weeping, would it be reasonable to infer that he was imploring some spirit—perhaps the spirit of the birch—not to be far off? And would anybody reason from this that the English of to-day are addicted to tree-worship? It all looks absurd enough when the methods of the Wellhausen school are applied to a civilization we know intimately; but why is it less absurd when they choose ancient Israel as the background of their theories?

For my second example I return to Mr. Addis's remarks about sacred trees:

One such grew in the sanctuary of the LORD at Shechem (Josh. xxiv. 26), like the palm tree which flourished (Odyssey, vi. 163) by Apollo's birth-place and shrine at Delos. Apparently it is the same tree which is called the "oak of the soothsayer" (Gen. xii. 6), or "of the diviners" (Judg. ix. 37), and at all events the name given clearly indicates the sacred character attributed to trees.¹

Now, first, the inference is unjustifiable. An examination of an English gazetteer reveals place-names compounded with the word "devil," such as Devil's Apronful, Arrows, Beef-tub, Bellows, Elbow, Jumps, Chair, Quoits, Throat, Garden, Staircase, Punchbowl. Can any inferences be drawn as to the religion of contemporary Englishmen? Many similar arguments might of course be adduced. At the first glance, therefore, it appears that even if the same tree is meant in all three passages, the name does *not* indicate that a sacred character was attributed to it by either Abraham or his descendants. Secondly, our author himself formerly thought that the Genesis tree "must have been the seat of a Canaanite tree oracle."² On his present assumption it clearly can have been nothing of the sort to the Israelites in the time of Joshua, since it is then found in a sanctuary of God; nor can soothsayers then have been in

¹ H. R., p. 29. Here, and in all future quotations, I substitute "the LORD" for Mr. Addis's transliteration of the Tetragrammaton. A free use of the Name of God is objectionable to almost all Jews.

² "Documents," i., p. 19.

possession of it. Thirdly, there is not the faintest suggestion in any of the texts that the Israelites ever treated it as sacred, or consulted any soothsayer connected with it. A reference to the *Odyssey* shows that the inference drawn in that case is equally far-fetched. In all these instances suggestions have been made which are unsupported by a scintilla of evidence, and are in themselves highly improbable. Indeed, we may go further, and say that the probabilities are strongly the other way. If when Abraham was in the land the tree already bore this name from Canaanite associations, most readers would infer that we have to do with a name, and nothing more, when we find it used by the Israelites later on.

A third criticism inevitably suggested by the book before us is that Mr. Addis—like so many other members of the school to which he belongs—does not pay sufficient attention to the work of authors with whom he does not agree. The most notable instance of this is his treatment of the writings of Professor Van Hoonacker, of the University of Louvain, a scholar whose works on the Pentateuchal legislation,¹ though bearing traces of the fact that their author is not a lawyer, stand in marked contrast to the writings of Wellhausen, Kuenen, and Robertson Smith.² For myself, I gladly take this opportunity of acknowledging my debt to this accomplished writer for many of the views to be set forth in these articles, a debt which is none the less real because his work has sometimes directed my investigations into paths that led to results differing somewhat from his own. I have frequently been amazed at the excellence of the results attained by this great professor in dealing with the most technical and difficult subjects, especially when I have borne in mind the unsatisfactory condition in which M. Van Hoonacker found Biblical studies, and the numerous pitfalls that await a non-legal writer.

The next general observation deals with another matter. It

¹ "Le Lieu du Culte dans la Législation rituelle des Hébreux," 1894, "Le Sacerdoce Lévitique dans la Loi et dans l'Histoire des Hébreux," 1900.

² A writer in the *Quarterly Review* (No. 410), January, 1907, pp. 173-196, also lays himself open to this criticism.

has already been explained that the Wellhausen school cannot be expected to treat historical points successfully; but unfortunately many of its members also indulge in all the worst vices of the philological school. At one time¹ we are asked to draw inferences about tree-worship from the fact that a word that denotes a particular species of tree—"elah"—"evidently resembles the root 'el,' *i.e.*, God." At another² we are invited to note the peculiar strength of the tribal tie among the Semites, on the ground that singular nouns are frequently used as collective names—*e.g.*, Israel, Edom, etc. "To them the tribe was one with the concrete unity of a living person."³ Yet four pages later Mr. Addis feels himself in a position to "confidently affirm that it was the worship of the LORD which made the Hebrew tribes one in time of war, till slowly and long after Deborah's time they were moulded into a single commonwealth."⁴ If that be true of Deborah's time and after, what becomes of the theory that Israel was "one with the concrete unity of a living person"?

Some observations that might have been made under one of the preceding heads deal with a subject that is in itself so important that it should be noticed separately. It is the fashion to deny that Moses was a monotheist. Monotheism is supposed to have been an invention of Amos and his successors.⁵ Thus, Mr. Addis writes of the Mosaic age: "Monotheism is the birth of a much later time: it makes its earliest appearance on the pages of the literary prophets, and even then, in its initial form, is rudimentary and indirect."⁶ "The bond between God and the Hebrew kingdoms was natural. Amos, on the other hand, is first in a line of prophets who struck a higher note."⁷ These statements may be brought to a very simple test.

¹ H. R., 28. None of the points here treated are original to Mr. Addis, but it is convenient to deal with them in connection with his book.

² *Ibid.*, p. 51.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 51, 52.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 56.

⁵ So the *Quarterly Reviewer*, to whom reference has been made, pp. 195-6.

⁶ H. R., p. 76.

⁷ H. R., p. 141. The religion is supposed to have been a mere tribal worship of the tribal God (p. 5). It is common ground that the mass of the Israelites were frequently unfaithful or unable to rise to the conceptions of Moses, but Mr. Addis's statements go far beyond that.

Let Mr. Addis, instead of reading Kuenen and Baudissin, take his "Oldest book of Hebrew history"—*i.e.*, the supposititious JE—and carefully note all the passages that bear on the question. He will discover at the outset that this God who, in the opinion of his guides, was but one of many gods, and subject to local limitations, made earth and heaven; that He caused it to rain and formed men and all animals (not Israel alone); that men (not Israelites) began to call on His name; that to Him Noah sacrificed; that His might extended to Shinar, to Aram-naharaim, to Egypt—in a word, to every country with which the narrative deals; that He was God of the heaven and of the earth, and Judge of all the earth; that to Him His worshippers offered supplication in whatsoever land they might be. If, further, it be remembered that to ascertain an author's meaning his work must be read as a whole, and that it is never safe to rely on a text wrenched from its context, it will be easy to put satisfactory interpretations on passages which speak of God's descending or of His being the God of the Hebrews.¹ Having got as far as that, the next step is to turn to the narrative which tells how the LORD entered into special relations with Israel. A proposal to enter into a covenant followed by acceptance will be found there. That proposal is based on the statement that "all the earth is Mine." Next, the law of Exod. xx., which apparently limits lay sacrifice to "all the place where I shall cause My name to be remembered"—*i.e.*, to the land of Canaan—should be considered. Then it will be clear both why men said to David, "Go, serve other gods," and why in the same age it was possible for Absalom to make a vow to God in Geshur, but to *sacrifice* in the land of Israel alone (2 Sam. xv. 7-12). From the days of Moses onwards sacrifice was legitimate only in the land of Canaan—save, of course, during the desert period—and this remained so till the end of Old Testament times.² The most interesting illustration of this principle is to be found in the case of Naaman the Syrian (2 Kings v. 15-18), and a few words

¹ As to Cain (H. R., p. 80), see "Studies in Biblical Law," p. 105.

² On Isaiah xix. see "Studies in Biblical Law," pp. 81, 82.

should be said about it. Naaman recognised that there was "no God in all the earth but in Israel." So far did this go that he regarded it as wrong to bow himself in the house of Rimmon, *even in the country where Rimmon was specially worshipped*. It must be conceded that here we have monotheism, not monolatry. The existence of no God but One, the worship of no God but One in whatsoever land one may be—that is monotheism pure and simple. But Naaman recognised that the *sacrificial* worship of that God could only be rightly performed in the land of Canaan. Hence the request, "Let there be given to thy servant two mules' burden of earth; for thy servant will henceforth offer neither burnt-offering nor sacrifice unto other gods, but unto the LORD." This earth would presumably possess "exterritoriality"—to borrow a convenient term from international law—*i.e.*, it would be regarded as being a part of Canaan, even when physically situate in Damascus. But the special character attributed to the Holy Land in no wise interfered with the recognition of the LORD by all who were true to the faith of Abraham and Moses, as being everywhere the one and only real God. It should be added that in the chronological table at the beginning of his book Mr. Addis says that J and E were perhaps reduced to writing (*not* composed) between 850 and 750 B.C., while he dates Amos about 760 B.C. and Hosea between 746 and 734 B.C. Having regard to the passages of JE, to which attention has been drawn, Mr. Addis will doubtless see that his position with regard to monotheism and the bond between God and the Hebrew kingdoms is quite untenable. Moreover, 1 Kings xix. 14 proves that Elijah, too, based the special relationship of God and Israel on the covenant, so that it cannot fairly be said of him "that he was not indeed a monotheist, even implicitly after the fashion of the literary prophets."¹ The bond of a covenant

¹ H. R., p. 131. After what has been said it is perhaps unnecessary to examine the idea that in the days of Moses "the Hebrews had not passed much, if at all, beyond the animistic stage" (H. R., p. 77), or to ask Mr. Addis to reconcile this with pp. 55-64.

rests on sworn compact, and negatives the suggestion of a "natural" link between God and people.

The last general criticism I desire to make before proceeding to the discussion of details is that large portions of the book will fall with the critical positions that are throughout assumed. Thus, the remarks on pp. 46-48 and 81-84 about feasts, to take only one instance, go by the board with the Wellhausen theories. This relieves me of the duty of considering large sections of the book with which it might otherwise be necessary to deal.



Fast^{ing}.

BY THE REV. CHARLES RUMFITT, LL.D.

IT is much to be wished that the Godly discipline of the primitive Church might be restored again" (Commination Service). There has been no generation of which this pious wish might be more appropriately entertained than the present one. The Church is in danger of repeating the Prophet Ezekiel's description of pride, fulness of bread, and abundance of idleness (Ezek. xvi. 20), or that of Habakkuk, of pride, covetousness, intemperance, and idolatry (Hab. ii.). The Church is rich; it lives luxuriously; it is not sufficiently separate from the world; it is, like Lot in Sodom, too much at home in the world; self-denial is very little and very seldom practised. Hence, its spiritual life is thin, and its power weak, and the respect it receives from the world less. The seasons are by very many kept in name only, or made into worldly festivals, and they are properly observed by very few. It behoves everyone, therefore, who is anxious that the life of the Church should be deep, and its power in the world Divine, to bring himself up to a higher level at this season, by self-examination and discipline, and to seek to influence others to do the same.