

building or the tomb may account for the presence of the other. Shrines now in Mohammedan keeping may once have been Christian, and *vice versa*. Adherents of each great creed frequent shrines belonging to the other. As a counterpart to the belief in intercessory saints, there is naturally great fear of baleful *jinn*s, or evil spirits, and of "the evil eye." And it is saddening, though necessary, to add that, in spite of all these and many other efforts to win favour with God, the people have no real confidence in any, and they find rest and happiness in none.

It is surprising that these ceremonies should so prevail on soil where the Gospel was promulgated during the first Christian century. An observer seeing the actual worship of to-day would never recognize it as that prescribed by Christ, or take one part of it to be the Mohammedanism of the Koran. Human degeneracy is as real as human evolution. Can it be that there was a parallel in the centuries of the Old Testament dispensation? If the Pentateuchal codes, whenever written in their present form, had been published among the Hebrews *early*, and then remained for some centuries generally ignored by the people, would not the condition be almost exactly that which for nearly 2,000 years has been actually existent in Asia Minor?



### Notes on Hebrew Religion.—III.

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

I PASS now to some of the statements as to the early religion of Israel into which Mr. Addis has been led by modern critical professors. It will be remembered that Exod. xxi. 2-6 contains a law which formerly induced him to pin the ear of a Hebrew slave to the door or doorpost of an altar. He has now abandoned that, and writes the following: "The doorposts were also under the protection of penates, or spirits of the household, and so when his master accepted the perpetual service of a Hebrew bondsman, he took him to the doorpost

and pierced his ear with an awl, by that act bringing him to Elohim and introducing him to the family sacra.”<sup>1</sup> It will be convenient to couple with this the assertion of Kautzsch<sup>2</sup> that in this law *Elohim* means an *image* of the God of Israel. The law itself runs: “Then his master shall bring him to *Elohim*, and he shall bring him to the door or to the doorpost, and his master shall bore his ear with an awl.”

The first remark which occurs is that, whatever may have been the origin of the Pentateuch, this law at present stands in a book that admittedly prohibits both images and the worship of all powers save One, and was placed and retained in its present position by a man or men who believed absolutely in those two doctrines. If this law is Mosaic—and the evidence<sup>3</sup> for the authenticity of the whole of the Mosaic legislation is overwhelming—*cadit quæstio*. But on the critical assumption the case is not less strong: for it must be remembered that all the supposititious editors who dealt with this passage were monotheists, and had absolutely no scruples about garbling or cutting out anything they disliked. It follows that they, at any rate, did not take this view of the meaning.

Secondly, the word *Elohim* occurs elsewhere in a legal

<sup>1</sup> H. R., pp. 36, 37.

<sup>2</sup> *Apud* Hastings, “Dict. of Bib.” ext. vol., p. 642b.

<sup>3</sup> Since writing the above I have come across the following note in Dareste’s sketch of Israelite law: “Nous n’avons pas à examiner ici à quelle époque a été écrit le Pentateuque. Ce qu’on peut affirmer, c’est que les institutions dont il nous donne le tableau sont très anciennes, contemporaines de l’établissement d’un pouvoir central. On en trouve d’analogues chez tous les peuples, au moment où ils ont cessé d’être un assemblage de familles pour devenir une nation et former un État. Ce n’est pas non plus une législation idéale, une utopie rétrospective. Il n’y a pas une des lois mosaïques qui n’ait été réellement pratiquée chez des peuples autres que les Hébreux. La plus archaïque de ces lois est celle que nous lisons dans le chapitre xxxv. du livre des *Nombres*” (“Études d’Histoire du Droit,” p. 28, n.). The last two sentences appear to me to need some qualification—*e.g.*, it might reasonably be contended that some other portions of the legislation are as *archaic* (as distinguished from ancient) as Num. xxxv. (I would remark, parenthetically, that on p. 22 Dareste had devoted special attention to this chapter and its parallels in Greek and Icelandic law). Indeed, I gather from pp. 23, 24 that Dareste would say the same of Deut. xxi. 1-9. But the soundness of his general position could not be questioned by any student of comparative jurisprudence who examined the Mosaic legislation with an unprejudiced mind. (See, further, the CHURCHMAN, May, 1906, pp. 286-295.)

passage (Exod. xxii. 7 and 8 [E.V. 8 and 9]). Does Mr. Addis believe that certain cases of theft were tried by the spirit of the doorpost? Kautzsch alleges that in this passage and in 1 Sam. ii. 25 *Elohim* "has no other sense than that of 'Deity.'" <sup>1</sup> We shall deal with the passage from Samuel immediately, but does this writer believe that God tried cases of theft either in Person or by means of an image? And if so, what was the procedure?

Thirdly, this theory involves making Eli say to his sons (1 Sam. ii. 25): "If a man trespass against a man, the spirit of a doorpost (or, according to Kautzsch, "God"—Hebrew *Elohim*) shall judge him; but if a man trespass against the LORD, who shall intercede for him?" It is true that one critic—the late Dr. Kuenen—with characteristic indifference to the known facts, wished to translate *Elohim* in this passage by "God," <sup>2</sup> and understand it of the *oracles* of the various "sanctuaries"; <sup>3</sup> but (α) this rests on the confusion implied in the word "sanctuaries," (β) we know that the great majority of cases were, in fact, tried by the elders, <sup>4</sup> and (γ) justice was administered in the gates. <sup>5</sup>

The rest of Mr. Addis's remarks on animism are similar in character. Thus, he writes: "Moreover, spirits guarded the threshold of temple and house. To avoid their encounter, the priests of Dagon leapt over the temple threshold" (1 Sam. v. 5). <sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 643a, n.

<sup>2</sup> "Religion of Israel," E. T., ii., p. 84.

<sup>3</sup> See the second paper of this series, CHURCHMAN, April, pp. 231-239.

<sup>4</sup> Kuenen—*op. cit.*, ii., p. 83—supposes that some exceptional cases were outside the jurisdiction of the ordinary judge, and accounts in this way for Exod. xxii., but this breaks down when applied to Samuel's speech. It is untrue that all transgressions against men, however serious, were judged by the priest. Nor does Samuel's speech in any way suggest exceptional circumstances. In point of fact, the ordinary criminal justice of the country was not administered either by "God," or an image, or an oracle, or even the spirit of a doorpost. For example, we have an account of the trial of one, Naboth (1 Kings xxi.), which has not received the attention it deserves. The account is also valuable because it shows the Deuteronomic law of evidence (two witnesses) and the Levitical law of blasphemy in operation before the dates to which Deuteronomy and Leviticus are assigned by the critics.

<sup>5</sup> H. R., pp. 8, 145.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 36.

His reference—the passage is too well known to be quoted here—hardly warrants the form of his statement.

Some wonderful ideas on stone worship are to be found in modern books, and Mr. Addis has given us some samples. The notion that the title “rock of Israel” in Gen. xlix. 24 may have originated in stone-worship is regarded by him as “hazardous.”<sup>1</sup> But “in any case, many passages in the Old Testament (*e.g.*, Jer. ii. 27, besides place-names like Ebenezer) show that this form of worship was widely spread. We should add that the word ‘maṣṣeba’ is generally used not for a stone in its rough state, but for a stone erected by man, who then invites the spirit to hallow it by its presence. Moreover, several ‘maṣṣebot’ might be erected together (Exod. xxiv. 4; *cf.* Josh. iv. 20).”<sup>2</sup> It is, of course, common ground that Jeremiah denounces certain idolatrous practices, but as to Ebenezer the position is quite untenable (1 Sam. vii. 12). With regard to the “maṣṣebot,” I challenge Mr. Addis to produce his reasons, if any, for suggesting that in the passages cited—or in any other passages—Moses and Joshua invited a spirit, or spirits, to hallow them by their presence. What spirits were thus to “hallow” the Covenant at Sinai between God and Israel?

There is another passage which is cited in support of this theory. Mr. Addis writes:

“The black stone at Mecca, afterwards built into the Caaba, was the primary and central object of veneration, and like importance was attached to a sacred stone in the time-honoured sanctuary at Bethel. No doubt the feature of early worship is obscured by the editorial process to which the narrative in Genesis (xxviii. 11-22) has been subjected. Still, the original sense of the story, which is a *ἱερὸς λόγος*, or temple myth, comes out clearly in the concluding verse: ‘This stone which I have set up as a maṣṣeba (or sacred pillar) shall be a house (or dwelling-place) of a god.’ In homage to the indwelling deity, Jacob is said to have anointed the stone: unction, being in the East an act of courtesy to a guest, was fitly offered to the spirit in the stone which the worshipper desired to conciliate.”<sup>3</sup>

In order to test the statements contained in this passage, I transcribe Mr. Addis’s translation of those portions of

<sup>1</sup> H. R., p. 27.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 25, 26.

Gen. xxviii. 11-22 which (after allowing for "the editorial process") he attributes to the source to which he ascribes the narrative of the pillar :

"And he lighted on the place and tarried there all night because the sun was set, and he took one of the stones of the place and set it under his head, and slept in that place. And he dreamt, and, behold, a ladder set upon the earth, and its top reached to the heavens, and, behold, the angels of God going up and down upon it. . . . And he was afraid, and he said, 'How dreadful is this place! This is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of the heavens.' And early in the morning Jacob took the stone which he had put under his head, and set it up for a pillar, and poured oil on the top of it. And he called the name of that place Bethel (= house of God). . . . And Jacob vowed a vow, saying, 'If God will be with me and keep me on this way that I go, and will give me bread to eat and raiment to put on, and if I return in peace to my father's house, then . . . this stone which I have set up as a pillar shall be a house of God, and of all that thou shalt give me I will faithfully give thee a tithe.'"

Mr. Addis himself does not here translate Jacob's words, "shall be a house of *a* god," but "shall be a house of God"—a very different thing. I leave it to my readers to determine whether it is fair to speak of an "indwelling deity," or of "the spirit in the stone which the worshipper desired to conciliate," in connection with this passage. Even in these *disjecta membra* we see clearly the God of heaven and earth, Who can give His worshippers bread to eat and raiment to put on, and can keep them in peace on whatsoever way they go.

With regard to Mr. Addis's views as to images,<sup>1</sup> Dr. Orr's remarks<sup>2</sup> should be carefully read. In a review of Dr. Orr's book, Mr. Addis practically repeats his old statements.<sup>3</sup> Thus,

<sup>1</sup> H. R., pp. 94-97.

<sup>2</sup> "Problem of the Old Testament," first edition, pp. 40, 141-147.

<sup>3</sup> *Review of Theology and Philosophy*, vol. ii., No. 3, September, 1906, pp. 155, 156. This is not the only instance in which he has failed to understand Dr. Orr. Thus, in criticizing that accomplished writer's remarks about the Tent of Meeting, he carefully avoids noticing "the other and more crucial JE passages" ("Problem," pp. 168, 169) adduced in answer to a number of critics, of whom Mr. Addis was, happily, not one. He himself has, however, not paid sufficient attention to the state of the text—see Van Hoonacker, "Sacerdoce lévitique," p. 146, *n.*, where a series of transpositions are suggested. I cannot agree with the actual changes proposed by Van Hoonacker, but I think he is on the right track. I hope to return to this subject and deal with Van Hoonacker's transpositions more fully on some future occasion.

he writes: "Images were in common use." The proper answer to this is a direct traverse. Mr. Addis has, unfortunately, failed to follow Dr. Orr's meaning, but let him try this test: let him take his "Oldest Book of Hebrew History"—*i.e.*, JE—and read through it carefully, noting every instance in which worship of any kind is offered. Then let him ask himself in how many cases images were used. He will then doubtless be prepared to withdraw this statement.

In view of all this, it has seemed unnecessary to examine Mr. Addis's observations about sacred wells in detail. They do not appear to be any sounder than the statements that have already been tested.

I now come to a group of questions that may be most suitably discussed in dealing with a few verses of Numbers. We are told in x. 33 that "the ark of the covenant of the LORD<sup>1</sup> went before them" (*i.e.*, the Israelites). It would seem to most people that no doubt could arise as to the meaning of this phrase, but such a belief would only show ignorance of the Higher Criticism. Dr. George Buchanan Gray, who has published an edition of Numbers, writes as follows:

As here, so in Josh. iii. 3 *et seq.* (D), the ark precedes the Israelites, and acts as their guide along an unknown route; but there it is borne by "the priests, the Levites." Here, if we may judge from so fragmentary a record, it is conceived of as moving by itself (*cf.* 1 Sam. v. *et seq.*, especially v. 11, vi. 9 *et seq.*, 2 Sam. vi. 5). The pillar of cloud is certainly thought to move of itself (*e.g.*, Exod. xiii. 21 *et seq.*).<sup>2</sup>

But this is not all; Num. x. 35, 36 run as follows:

"And it came to pass when the ark set forward, that Moses said, 'Arise, O LORD, and let thine enemies be scattered, and let them that hate thee flee before thee.' And when it rested, he said, 'Return, O LORD, to the myriads of the thousands of Israel.'"

Dr. Gray writes on this:

Here, as in ver. 33, the ark starts of itself, and the words which follow may be taken as addressed to it. The ark is the visible form in or by which

<sup>1</sup> This is one of the passages that refute Mr. Addis's assertion (H. R., p. 75) that "the earliest sources call the ark simply the ark of the LORD" (*cf.* xiv. 44).

<sup>2</sup> P. 95.

the LORD<sup>1</sup> manifests His presence, and may therefore, like the angel of the LORD, be addressed as the LORD.<sup>2</sup>

These notes inevitably suggest the following questions :

1. If any reader of a modern history found the words "the guns were ordered to the front," would he judge that the guns were conceived of as hearing, obeying, and moving by themselves ?

2. Would he in such a case crave in aid a passage stating that clouds were seen to move across the heavens ?

3. If, further, he read, "when the guns moved to the front, the band played 'God save the King,'" would he infer that the guns started of themselves, and that they were "the visible form in or by which" the King manifested his presence, and might, therefore, be addressed as the King ?

4. Has Dr. Gray—or, so far as he knows, any member of his school—attempted to check any of these statements by examining the other passages attributed to the same source in the light of these theories ? Such a verse as Deut. xxxi. 15 (assigned by Mr. Addis to the same source, J) would appear to distinctly negative the theory. And did God manifest His presence by means of the Ark on other occasions ? Did the Ark wander in the garden of Eden or speak from Sinai ? Or is this the conception that pervades the Song of Deborah, which Dr. Gray would probably reckon among the earliest extant portions of Hebrew literature ?

Professor Kautzsch, another member of this school, writes as follows : "The LORD and the Ark, that is to say, appear here [*i.e.*, in Num. x. 35 *et seq.*—H. M. W.] as practically identical. Not as though this wooden chest represented the LORD. But His presence appeared inseparably connected with the Ark ; wherever it was seen, there the LORD was, and showed Himself active."<sup>3</sup> Then he proceeds to misunderstand a number of

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Gray used a transliteration of the Tetragrammaton.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 96.

<sup>3</sup> Hastings' "Dict. Bible," ext. vol., p. 628*b*. As usual, I substitute "the LORD" for Professor Kautzsch's transliteration.

other passages.<sup>1</sup> But as he thinks these verses probably belong to J,<sup>2</sup> the question inevitably arises whether he has troubled to consider how (if at all) the assertion that God's "presence appeared inseparably connected with the Ark" can be brought into harmony with the other passages attributed to that source. But perhaps he would prefer to revert to an earlier opinion which he has expressed in another work<sup>3</sup>—viz., that these verses are more ancient than the rest of J. This view rests on nothing more substantial than the averment that "the great antiquity of this verse is clearly seen from the manner in which the holy ark is spoken of as a pledge, not to say a representation, of the personal presence of the LORD."<sup>4</sup> Fortunately, there are a few other passages which Kautzsch assigns to the same period, among them Exod. xvii. 6 and the Song of Deborah. Does he seriously believe that in either of these passages God's presence is "inseparably" connected with the ark? Is it of "this wooden chest" that he writes in dealing with the Song: "In His awful Majesty He left Mount Sinai, His holy dwelling-place, to appear in person on the field of battle (ver. 4 *et seq.*), and His curse deservedly falls upon the city (ver. 23), which 'came not to the help of the Lord amongst the mighty'—the Lord who is the champion of His people"?<sup>5</sup>

Dr. Kuenen wrote of Num. x. 35, 36 that in this passage it was "as plain as possible" that the Ark was regarded as "the abode" of the LORD. That was on p. 258 of vol. i. of the English translation of the "Religion of Israel." But by p. 314

<sup>1</sup> *E.g.*, "In Num. xiv. 42 *et seq.* Israel's defeat by the Amalekites is explained [my italics—H. M. W.] by the absence of the Ark. According to 1 Sam. iii. 3, the youthful Samuel slept in the temple of the LORD at Shiloh where the Ark of God was, and *this is used to account for* the revelation given him by the LORD at night [my italics—H. M. W.]" A reference to the Biblical passages shows that the words I have italicized are based on misinterpretations. Lack of space alone prevents my dealing with the evidential value of the rest of the passages Professor Kautzsch adduces and their bearing on his theory. Many of his statements could be accepted as they stand, but do not help to establish his view.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 628a.

<sup>3</sup> "Literature of the Old Testament," 1898, pp. 3, 4.

<sup>4</sup> At that time, therefore, Kautzsch came very near to thinking that "this wooden chest" *did* "represent the LORD."

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 5.



he had persuaded himself that in the Song of Deborah—which, as already stated, is regarded by the critics as one of the earliest documents we possess—Seir, the land of Edom, had become His “former and proper abode.” What was the relation of Seir and the ark?

But the matter becomes even more complicated when we come to Mr. Addis. He has yet a third fixed abode for God. According to this view, He “was, so far back as our knowledge goes, the God of Sinai or Horeb.”<sup>1</sup> Half a dozen pages later<sup>2</sup> Mr. Addis finds himself involved in a difficulty. “How,” he very pertinently asks—“how was a God who had a fixed abode on Horeb to fight for His people when they were at a distance?” He gives three answers. He thinks that God sometimes “left the mountain and went in person to the help of His people: this, as has been said, is the belief expressed in Deborah’s song.” We may remark that the song deals with Seir, not Horeb, so that this explanation only involves fresh difficulties. Secondly, Mr. Addis says that, “according to an old section in the Pentateuch (Exod. xxiii. 20),” God “sent His angel to lead them on their way.” But this, unhappily, conflicts with the third explanation. According to this last theory, the Ark “secured the presence” of God. “There, as nowhere else, the LORD was present.”<sup>3</sup> But, then, what about all the other “fixed abodes,” at which, apparently, God must have been less present? And what need for God to leave Sinai, or for the angel of the LORD to replace Him, if in fact He was already present “as nowhere else”?

I had noted for comment many other passages of Mr. Addis’s volume, but any further refutation of his views would be needless.<sup>4</sup> What has been said must surely be sufficient to

<sup>1</sup> H. R., p. 68.

<sup>2</sup> P. 74.

<sup>3</sup> P. 75. Cf. Mr. Addis’s note on Num. x. 33-36 (“Documents,” i., p. 160), where we are told that the LORD “lived” in the ark!

<sup>4</sup> It may, however, be well to subjoin a note of some views that have already been refuted. H. R., pp. 60, 61, “The sojourn at Kadesh,” *vide* CHURCHMAN, June, 1906, pp. 355-359; H. R., p. 251, “year of release and Sabbatical year,” *vide* “Studies in Biblical Law,” pp. 14, 15; H. R., p. 252,

suggest the necessity for reconsidering many portions of the book that have not been touched on in these articles.

---

[I would take this opportunity of correcting two *errata* on p. 555 of the CHURCHMAN for September, 1906. Ten lines from bottom, "p. 137" should read "p. 137 *et seq.*," and Lev. xxvii. 30, 31" should be "Lev. xxvii. 32, 33."]



## The New Theology and Protestant Orthodoxy.

BY THE EDITOR.

THERE is, perhaps, no Bishop on the bench whose utterances command more earnest or widespread attention than those of the Bishop of Birmingham. His personal character, great scholarship, perfect frankness, and welcome fearlessness combine to give weight to his pronouncements, and those who are the farthest removed from his ecclesiastical and theological position are among the first to admit the freshness and suggestiveness of his contributions to present-day discussions. It is not surprising, therefore, that Bishop Gore's addresses on the "New Theology," which were delivered during Lent in Birmingham Cathedral, received general attention, and were reported in full in several papers. With much that the Bishop said on the Person and Work of our Lord in relation to current criticism we are, of course, in heartiest accord. Nothing could well be clearer or more convincing than his statements on several of the fundamental articles of the Christian creed. It is when he comes to diagnose the situation created by the New Theology that we are compelled to part company from him, and to express our conviction that his diagnosis is not only inaccurate, but misleading. According to the report of the address in the *Birmingham Post*, the Bishop considers that

---

"year of jubilee," *vide op. cit.*, pp. 5-11, 94-98 (*cf.* CHURCHMAN, May, 1906, pp. 292, 293); H. R., pp. 282, 283, "firstlings and tithes," *vide* CHURCHMAN, July, 1906, pp. 425-430, September, 1906, pp. 548, 549, 554, 555; H. R., pp. 283, 284, "Levitical cities," *vide op. cit.*, pp. 17-22, CHURCHMAN, July, 1906, pp. 422-425.