

which he attempts to belittle our own "sordid age" (as he has called it) in comparison with the Middle Ages. This book will be read by hundreds of Church-folk who are laudably anxious to know something of our own past, but who would have no chance of checking the author's statements, even if he himself had supplied proper references. It is therefore important to enter a prompt *caveat* against his implications on all points of conflict between medieval and modern ideals.



### Notes on Hebrew Religion.—II.

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

A LARGE portion of Mr. Addis's book really depends on the views he holds on "shrines." It happens, however, that he has stated these more clearly in a recent article than in his "Hebrew Religion," and it is therefore advisable to refute much of what he has written in a discussion of a passage of that article. It will be necessary to consider once more some of the matters treated in an article on the "Jewish Attitude towards the Higher Criticism" that appeared in the *CHURCHMAN* for December, 1905. No answer has been put forward to that article, in spite of the clear challenge it contained. On the other hand, further reflection has enabled me to strengthen some of my positions very materially, and to go some way further towards reconstructing the historical background of the laws.

The Book of the Covenant sanctions altars at various places: "An altar of earth shalt thou make unto Me . . . in every place where I record My name I will come unto thee and bless thee." Deuteronomy admits that there has been inevitable, and therefore excusable laxity in the past; but when once the LORD has chosen a place from all the tribes (*i.e.*, Solomon's Temple), sacrifice is to be offered there and only there. The Priestly Code assumes that sacrifices can be offered only at the central shrine, but supposes that this rule prevailed from the beginning. The patriarchs had offered no sacrifice—nor could they, since as yet the Tabernacle with its altar was not

erected. How does Dr. Orr meet this contradiction? He asserts that the Book of the Covenant permits altars in various places, provided they had been sanctified by "special appearances or revelations of God," whereas Deuteronomy gives the general rule. But how is it that one code mentions the exception as if it were the general rule, without the remotest hint that it is dealing with exceptional cases? Why does Deuteronomy state the general rule at great length and with vehement reiteration, and convey no intimation that any exception was permissible? Moreover, the prohibition in Deuteronomy was unknown for ages after the time of Moses. The most pious kings down to Hezekiah's time sacrificed at the high places. Elijah complained that the altars of the LORD in Northern Israel had been overthrown; he himself, without any special revelation that we hear of, sacrificed on Mount Carmel; and the LORD, instead of being displeased, sent fire from heaven to consume the victim. The priestly writer comes into still more violent collision with his predecessors, and indeed with all attested history. For him, sacrifice begins with Moses; he never mentions any sacrifice offered by the patriarchs, etc.<sup>1</sup>

It is very certain that no member of the Wellhausen school has ever succeeded in grasping the meaning of the Book of the Covenant, or Exod. xxxiv., which many of them (including Mr. Addis) regard as being even earlier.

I proceed to set out the legal passages of J and E that are material to be considered in this connection.

"The feast of unleavened bread shalt thou keep. . . . And thou shalt observe the feast of weeks, of the *bikkurim*<sup>2</sup> of wheat harvest, and the feast of ingathering at the turn of the year. Three times in the year shall all thy males appear before the Lord God, the God of Israel . . . and the sacrifice of the feast of Passover shall not be left till the morning. The first of the *bikkurim* of thy ground shalt thou bring to the HOUSE of the LORD thy God" (Exod. xxxiv. 18, 22, 23, 25, 26, J.).

"An ALTAR of earth mayest thou make to Me, and mayest sacrifice thereon thy *burnt-offerings*, thy *peace-offerings*, thy *sheep* and thine *oxen*: in all the place (or in every place) where I cause My name to be remembered, I will come to thee and bless thee. Three times thou shalt keep a feast to Me in the year. The feast of unleavened bread shalt thou keep . . . and the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Review of Theology and Philosophy*, vol. ii., No. 3, September, 1906, pp. 156, 157.

<sup>2</sup> This word is translated "first-fruits," or "first-ripe fruits." Another word, *reshith*, is also translated "first-fruits." Careful study proves beyond all possibility of doubt that in the Pentateuch these two words denoted different offerings, which were differently prepared, offered at different seasons, and consisted of different materials. *Bikkurim* is associated with the Feast of Weeks, which is even called "the day of the *bikkurim*" (Num. xxviii. 26), *reshith* with the sixteenth day of the first month (Lev. xxiii. 10-15).

feast of harvest, the *bikkurim* of thy labours, of that which thou sowest in the field, and the feast of ingathering. Three times in the year all thy males shall appear before the Lord GOD. . . . The first of the *bikkurim* of thy ground thou shalt bring in to the HOUSE of the LORD thy God" (Exod. xx. 24; xxiii. 14, 15, 16, 17, 19).

Careful study of these passages must surely satisfy any impartial observer that if *altars* are legitimate for certain purposes, there exists side by side with them a *house* of the LORD to which all males are to repair three times in each year. There is no possibility of identifying the altar of earth with the house. We have too many instances of the erection of altars in the history for any doubt to be possible on that head. There was a form of covenant, for the conclusion of which the erection of a heap of stones or altar was essential. Samuel and Saul built altars that bore not the faintest resemblance to houses. The altar erected by Elijah on Mount Carmel could not by any chance be mistaken for a house.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, it must be carefully noted that the "*bikkurim* of thy labours, of that which thou sowest in the field," could not be described as either a burnt-offering, a peace-offering, a sheep, or an ox, so that Exod. xx. could not apply to this offering.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Van Hoonacker thinks ("Lieu du Culte," pp. 29 *et seqq.*) that in Exod. xx. "thy burnt-offerings and thy peace-offerings" are a later interpolation. There is always a very strong presumption in favour of the Massoretic text, and in this instance the power to offer burnt-offerings and peace-offerings on a mere lay altar is vouched for by the examples of Moses, Joshua, Samuel, Naaman (with Elisha's approval), and others.

<sup>2</sup> This reasoning, it may be noted, disposes of the idea that Deuteronomy introduced an innovation in enacting that "the three annual feasts were to be kept at the central shrine" (H. R., p. 192). If on the Feast of Weeks *bikkurim* were to be offered, and if *bikkurim* were to be presented at the *house*, it follows that the Israelite was under an obligation to attend at the *house* on the Feast of Weeks (see also Van Hoonacker, "Lieu du Culte," pp. 3, 4).

We may go further. Given the fact that the three festivals were to be celebrated at the house of the LORD, it is clear that some sacrifices other than the offering of *bikkurim* would be offered there. Indeed, a sacrifice of the Feast of Passover is expressly mentioned in Exod. xxxiv. It appears clearly from Exod. xxxiv. 19, 20, that firstlings were to be sacrificed (presumably at Passover), and it will not be suggested that the three festivals were intended to be celebrated without any other animal sacrifice. This is very important in its bearing on the interpretation of Exod. xx., for it makes it clear that that passage does not contemplate that all sacrifices of animals should be offered at local altars. Is it possible to go further, and say what

The truth is that Mr. Addis has been utterly misled by the Wellhausen school. He, too, formerly called the altars of Exod. xx. "sanctuaries," and then when he came to the slave law of Exod. xxi. 2-6, translated *Elohim* by "God," and explained it as referring to the "local sanctuary."<sup>1</sup> He has now abandoned this view of the slave law in favour of a theory which will be considered later on; but in all essentials he is still dominated by the views of men who could not distinguish a house from an altar, or an unlawful heathen high place from either.

Before leaving this law it will be convenient to notice two other points. The altars of earth or stone that it sanctions are such as could be erected in any field in a few minutes, and they would have no horns for a refugee to grasp. But surely no impartial reader would suppose that it was to such altars as these that men fled for sanctuary (Exod. xxi. 14). In his edition of the Hexateuch Mr. Addis speaks of the altar as "the altar of the local sanctuary." As, however, the legislation of JE nowhere legalizes local "sanctuaries" or "shrines," but only rough erections of earth or unhewn stones for certain limited purposes, this construction of Exod. xxi. 12-14 is obviously impossible.<sup>2</sup> But if anyone still feels any doubt as to the matter, he will probably be able to remove it by a close study of

---

sacrifices are within the purview of Exod. xx.? One further step may be taken. The law admittedly deals with lay sacrifices: it is, moreover, clear that in the Mosaic age, and for centuries after, laymen were in the habit of offering sacrifices at many seasons of rejoicing (*e.g.*, the proclamation of a king) and for purposes of private worship. I am therefore of opinion that this law is designed to regulate those occasions on which it was customary for sacrifices to be offered by laymen. The statement (H. R., pp. 98, 191) that originally all slaughter of animals fit to appear on the altar was sacrificial will not bear investigation either, though it is supported by Van Hoonacker ("Lieu du Culte," p. 31). See Gen. xviii. 7, xxvii. 9-14, xliii. 16; Exod. xxi. 37 (xxii. 1); 1 Sam. xxv. 11, xxviii. 24; 1 Kings xix. 21. In Judg. vi. 19, Gideon "made ready a kid." Presumably this involved killing it, but the narrative certainly does not favour the notion that the preparation included any form of sacrifice.

<sup>1</sup> "The Documents of the Hexateuch," vol. i. (1892), p. 143. I have repeatedly exposed this: "Studies in Biblical Law," p. 26; the *CHURCHMAN*, December, 1905, p. 804; September, 1906, pp. 552, 553.

<sup>2</sup> H. R., pp. 191, 192. See "Studies in Biblical Law," pp. 22, 23; Van Hoonacker, "Lieu du Culte," pp. 17, 18. Suppliants caught hold of the horns of an altar (1 Kings i. 50, ii. 28).

Josh. ix. 27, a verse assigned to the supposititious J. We there read in Mr. Addis's arrangement of the text that Joshua made the Gibeonites "hewers of wood and drawers of water for THE ALTAR (*not* the altars) of the LORD to this day."<sup>1</sup> Surely it must be admitted that this cannot refer to such an altar as that erected by Elijah on Carmel, or, indeed, to any altar under lay control.<sup>2</sup> It can only mean the national altar connected with the house of the LORD.

It must also be noticed that by the general admission of the critics themselves the altars of Exod. xx. are under *lay* control. It cannot be said that we have legislation which legalizes or even contemplates the possibility of local priesthoods. The laws give absolutely *no* support to the theory of country Levites or priests ministering at local "shrines." If Mr. Addis wishes to find laws that recognize the existence of Levites or priests in the provinces—though *not* in charge of local "shrines"—he must turn to the supposititious Deuteronomic and priestly documents,<sup>3</sup> but that will scarcely help the theories of his school.

Coming now to Deuteronomy, I cannot agree that chapter xii. prohibits the erection of lawful altars. Let us consider the matter a little more closely.

It is common ground that the Deuteronomist, whether he was

<sup>1</sup> "Documents," i., p. 219. Throughout I take Mr. Addis's "Documents" as fairly representative of the critical view, for the purpose of meeting my opponents on their own ground.

<sup>2</sup> As to the ambiguity of the word "altar," see the CHURCHMAN for December, 1905, p. 802 note; and see Josh. ix. 23, together with Mr. Addis's note on the chapter. A word should be added in explanation of the narrative of the altar in Josh. xxii. 10-34. This was a structure made after the pattern (ver. 28) of the great altar of burnt-offering. Anybody who contrasts the directions for this in Exod. xxvii. 1-8 with the various lay altars—*e.g.*, Manoah's rock, Naaman's earth, the stone at Michmash, Elijah's altar—will see how impossible it must have been for any contemporary to confuse the two types, or to suppose that the altar of Josh. xxii. fell within the provisions of Exod. xx.

<sup>3</sup> Deut. xxi. 5; Lev. xiv. 35 *et seqq.* We are now in a position to see how Mr. Addis came to write (H. R., pp. 100, 101): "But the fact that there were many legitimate shrines each with its body of priests put the existence of a high-priest in the post-exilic sense out of the question." This involves first calling a lay altar a "shrine," and then forgetting that this shrine was merely an altar, and under lay control. Naaman's "two mules' burden of earth" is a very good example.

Moses himself or a literary forger, had before him (1) the law of Exod. xx. sanctioning a plurality of altars of the LORD, and (2) a history which contained instances of the application of that law. It is also common ground that lay altars were in use in his age. Further, the law-giver knew that altars and high-places were not identical.<sup>1</sup> In these circumstances what does he do? He never prohibits altars of the LORD, but he thunders against heathenish "places." That would in itself be strange enough, for it is difficult to think that if the purpose of Deut. xii. had indeed been to repeal Exod. xx. 24-26, there would have been no reference to the altars which it was intended to abolish, no prohibition of the very act that it was designed to prevent. Nor would it be possible to treat this simply as a *casus omissus*, for *ex hypothesi* it was the very purpose of the law. This argument may be put even more strongly by concentrating attention on a single point. There was a form of covenant entered into by (*inter alia*) the erection of an altar and the sacrifice of burnt-offerings and peace-offerings. By this ceremonial the covenant at Sinai had been executed; the present text of Deuteronomy, in a passage attributed by the critics to E (xxvii. 5-7), directs a similar ceremonial to be observed for the ratification of the Deuteronomic covenant itself, and according to Mr. Addis a Deuteronomic writer narrates the fulfilment of this command in Josh. viii. 30-35. In the face of these passages how can it be said that Deut. xii. prohibits Israelites from entering into such covenants? Not only so. The law-giver goes much further. He himself proceeds to recognize and regulate these very altars in xvi. 21, 22. This passage is utterly destructive of the theory that in chapter xii. he intended to prohibit them. What legislator would abolish in one breath what he proceeded to recognize in the next?

Beyond that we are largely in the region of conjecture. If we could recover the true historical background of these laws, all difficulties would probably vanish; but at present this can only be done to a limited extent. However, our materials help us

<sup>1</sup> See as to this the CHURCHMAN for December, 1905, p. 801.

a little further, and by applying the test of actual cases we can make some slight advance towards understanding the legislation. In the first place, then, it must be noticed that this law never prohibits a *bama* (high-place) by that name. It contains a very forcible enactment for the destruction of heathen "places" with various accessories, and (ver. 4) a prohibition to "do so to the LORD your God"; but it does not expressly deal with any *bama*. That suggests the following comment. It is true that some *bamoth* would certainly fall within the scope of this law, but does it follow that all the places that are called *bamoth* were unlawful? We have seen that both Deuteronomy and Exodus recognize the legality of lay altars, provided they conform to the requirements of the law. But would an altar that was otherwise lawful become unlawful simply because it was called a *bama*? Surely not. Steps, an *asherah*, a pillar, or any other prohibited accessory, would render such an altar illegal, but not a mere name. When, therefore, we read that Samuel erected an altar and find it subsequently called a *bama*, we cannot infer that it was necessarily contrary to the law of Deuteronomy. Next, we may apply another test. We know from 1 Sam. xx. 5, 6, 29, that family sacrifices were not uncommon. Now, does Deut. xii. profess to deal with such sacrifices? I think not. The subject-matter of the law relates (1) to sacrifices, etc., *instituted by Moses* ("all which I command you," ver. 11) with special reference to the danger resulting from the existence in Canaan of heathen high-places; and (2) to slaughter for food—a provision that had been rendered necessary by Lev. xvii. From all this we ought probably to infer that this law was never meant to touch sacrifices that rested, not on Mosaic commands, but on the customary law. At this point I wish to suggest one or two other questions. Sabbaths and new moons were admittedly celebrated at the time when Deut. xii. was composed. How comes it that no provision is made for any sacrifices on these occasions if it was intended to sweep in all Israelitish offerings? Were they to pass entirely without sacrifices? And, again, was all sacrificial worship really to be confined to three occasions in the

year? How in such circumstances was religion to be kept alive?<sup>1</sup>

It would seem, therefore, that the practice of the age of Samuel conforms far more nearly to the true requirements of the Law than is generally supposed. We see periodical pilgrimages to the religious centre by Elkanah, but we also see lay sacrifices offered locally at altars (not houses) in cases where such sacrifice was customary. We find non-sacrificial slaughter (1 Sam. xxviii. 24), but we also find that in a camp where the Ark was present the usual form of slaughter sanctioned by Deuteronomy for places remote from the religious centre (and for those places only—"if the place . . . be too far from thee," xii. 21) was illegal, and accordingly an altar was erected (1 Sam. xiv.). At the same time, it must be remembered that the law of the annual pilgrimages was only to become fully binding when the state of the country rendered it possible for the inhabitants to leave their homes without danger (Exod. xxxiv. 24; Deut. xii. 10).

This lengthy discussion has been rendered necessary by the persistency of the critics in bringing forward statements which have already been refuted. However, it has enabled us to dispose of all the principal matters which Mr. Addis regards as innovations made by Deuteronomy.<sup>2</sup> Before passing finally away from the topic, we may traverse some further statements made in this connection. "Moreover, Deuteronomy was the first instance of a Hebrew book which was sacred and canonical. It is the earliest part of the Hebrew Scriptures, the first instance of a law professing to have divine authority and regulating the religious life of the nation, or, rather, the whole life of the nation on a religious basis, etc."<sup>3</sup> As J and E (including the Book of the Covenant) were, in the belief of Mr. Addis himself, older than Deuteronomy, and reduced to writing before that work was forged,<sup>4</sup> it is evident that these statements fall to the ground.

<sup>1</sup> The preceding argument really disposes of the reasoning on p. 186 of the January number of the *Quarterly Review* as to the supposed incompatibility of Elijah's conduct with the demands of Deuteronomy.

<sup>2</sup> H. R., pp. 190-192.

<sup>3</sup> H. R., pp. 192-194.

<sup>4</sup> H. R., p. x.



In the light of our present knowledge, the following lines read strangely :

On many questions of capital moment—such, *e.g.*, as the dates at which the documents composing the Pentateuch were written down . . . there is practical unanimity among men whose knowledge entitles them to judge. This agreement has been slowly attained : it has been severely tested by discussion, nor is there the slightest ground for thinking that it will ever be seriously disturbed.<sup>1</sup>

Is it too much to hope that the day may come when Mr. Addis will recognize that this statement is a good deal *too* clear ?



### Harnack on the Synoptic Problem.<sup>2</sup>

BY THE REV. T. J. PULVERTAFT, M.A.

**D**R. HARNACK, in his monograph on “Lukas der Arzt,” dealt a heavy blow to those who impugn the early date and historicity of the writings of “the beloved physician.” In his new book he discusses with his accustomed fullness the “second source”—known as Q of the Synoptic Gospels. As is well known, St. Mark forms the crown of the Synoptic record of our Lord’s life and teaching, but many of the richest jewels in the crown are derived from a document which largely, although not entirely, consists of the sayings and addresses of our Lord. The portion of the non-Marcian text common to the other Synoptics constitutes one-sixth of St. Luke’s Gospel and two-elevenths of the first Gospel. With the second Gospel in our possession, we are able to determine the method and character of the use made of it by the other Synoptists, and Harnack endeavours, from an exhaustive analysis and discussion of the non-Marcian common part of St. Matthew and St. Luke, to reconstruct the foundation document, and to determine its date and historic value.

<sup>1</sup> H. R., pp. 11, 12.

<sup>2</sup> “Sprüche und Reden Jesu,” von A. Harnack. Leipzig, 1907.