



3 1761 03561 5616



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE BIBLE AND MODERN THOUGHT

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE EVOLUTION OF
THE CHRISTIAN
MINISTRY. (The
Modern Churchman's
Library.)

THE BIBLE AND MODERN THOUGHT

BY THE REV. J. R. COHU, M.A.

RECTOR OF ASTON CLINTON, BUCKS
SOMETIME FELLOW OF JESUS COLLEGE, OXFORD

AUTHOR OF "THE OLD TESTAMENT," "THE GOSPELS," AND "ST. PAUL"
IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN RESEARCH," "OREMUS," "THROUGH
EVOLUTION TO THE LIVING GOD," "VITAL PROBLEMS
OF RELIGION," "THE EVOLUTION OF THE
CHRISTIAN MINISTRY," ETC.

167941
12/12/21

NEW YORK
E. P. DUTTON AND COMPANY

1920



THE BUREAU OF STANDARDS
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

STANDARD
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES
DIVISION

All rights reserved

PREFACE

A NEW book on "The Bible and Modern Thought" calls for some words of explanation. Its publication has come about in this way. In 1908, I published "The Old Testament in the Light of Modern Research." Troubled and perplexed by the moral and intellectual difficulties of the Bible, I had found much light poured on its pages by the writings of, *e.g.* Robertson Smith, Driver, Wellhausen, etc., and, with a convert's zeal, I wanted to help others in their perplexity. Reviewers were unduly kind, the book was on "popular" lines, the edition soon sold out, and I was pressed for another. I refused, because an eminent and friendly reviewer had meanwhile sent me, at my request, a long list of *corrigenda* which opened my eyes. I resolved to suppress the book, devote ten years to further study, and then rewrite it on entirely new lines. I wish it to be clearly understood that, although this book covers the same ground and bears a similar title, the whole subject is so differently treated that the two works have nothing in common and might well have been written by independent authors.

In its present form I cannot claim the book as entirely my own work, and for this reason. After I had completed the MS. in 1918, Prof. C. F. Burney and Mr. C. G. Montefiore graciously allowed me to submit it to them for revision. Each of them read the MS. critically throughout, and each also sent me close on a hundred sheets of notes and suggestions which

have materially improved the original. Prof. Burney's notes covered practically the whole book, except Chaps. I, II, III, V, and the two chapters on the Jewish Law and its influence; Mr. Montefiore devoted himself mainly to the chapters and passages directly bearing on Judaism. Moreover, they have greatly assisted me in reading all the proof-sheets. Of course, neither of them is responsible for the shortcomings of this book. With all their unstinted labour of revision and correction, their invaluable notes and suggestions, they have respected my individuality¹ and merely corrected what was wrong, toned down what was too harsh, suggested what was lacking. Such as it is, they have materially added to the value of the book, and it may now possibly deserve the praise they give it.

"The Bible and Modern Thought" is intended for educated laymen, students, and ordination-candidates. As its title implies, its aim is to place before the reader the present attitude of Modern Thought towards the vexed problems of the origin, composition, and historical trustworthiness of the Old Testament. "The Old Testament scholar who would keep abreast of his subject must spread his nets wide if he is to gather in the available material for his studies" (cf. St. Matt. xiii. 52). I can honestly say that, in my endeavour to keep abreast of modern Biblical scholarship, not only have I read practically all the classical books, English and foreign, on the subject, but I have also spent many years in trying to learn what God is teaching us through Science, Comparative Religion, Anthropology, Folk-lore, etc. I have done my utmost to make these pages simple, lucid, and interesting, and I do hope that the book will be found readable. One chapter, however, defies all attempt at simplicity, viz. Chap. IV., especially pp. 41-55. Here, "truth is obscure, and simplicity fallacious," for it is impossible to differentiate between the documents (J, E, D, H, P)

¹ *E.g.*, Dr. Burney does not share my views on the Decalogue, and especially on the ephod, nor Mr. Montefiore my estimate of Ezekiel.

which constitute the Pentateuch, or to present the problem in an accurate form intelligible to the reader, without entering into technical details which may try the patience of some readers. Yet these dry pages are of vital import, for here lies the key to the whole problem of the so-called five "Books of Moses." For the benefit of the general reader, and at Mr. Murray's suggestion, a fly-leaf, explanatory of the symbols (J, E, D, H, P) commonly employed to denote these source-documents, will be found at the beginning of this book for easy reference.

My standpoint is not radical, neither is it likely to be called conservative, but a writer is bound to speak up to the level of his convictions. My one humble, earnest, reverent desire has been to promote, so far as in me lies, the interests of true religion.

J. R. COHU.

ASTON CLINTON :

July, 1920.

CONTENTS

PART I

INTRODUCTORY

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. A BIBLE HARD TO READ TO-DAY	3
II. THE POETRY OF THE BIBLE NOT OUR PROSE	14
III. TRUTH OF IDEA TRUER THAN TRUTH OF FACT	25
IV. MISLEADING ORDER AND TITLES OF BIBLICAL BOOKS	33
V. EARLY MAN AND HIS CREED	56
VI. BABYLONIA, ITS INFLUENCE ON ISRAEL	70

PART II

DAWN OF ISRAEL'S HISTORY

VII. MOSES	95
VIII. PERIOD OF THE JUDGES	109

PART III

HISTORICAL ISRAEL

IX. SAUL TO AMOS. (<i>c.</i> 1050-760 B.C.)	123
X. AMOS, HOSEA, ISAIAH, AND MICAH	141
XI. THE BOOK OF THE LAW, AND JEREMIAH	164

CHAPTER	PAGE
XII. THE CAPTIVITY; EZEKIEL; II ISAIAH	181
XIII. THE RETURN FROM EXILE; THE PRIESTLY CODE	199
XIV. MORAL AND SPIRITUAL VALUES OF PRIESTLY CODE.	214
XV. (I) THE "HOLY WRITINGS": INTRODUCTORY. . .	238
XVI. (II) THE "HOLY WRITINGS" EXAMINED: PSALMS	253
XVII. (III) THE "HOLY WRITINGS": JOB, ECCLESIASTES, PROVERBS	266
XVIII. (IV) THE "HOLY WRITINGS": CANTICLES, RUTH, ESTHER, LAMENTATIONS	289
XIX. MESSIANIC HOPE—DANIEL AND APOCALYPSES . .	306
INDEX	337

KEY TO THE SYMBOLS J, E, D, H, P

As stated and explained in Chap. IV., pp. 41-55, the Hexateuch (*i.e.* *Gen. to Josh.*) is not by one author, but a composite work, formed out of several documents wide apart in date and representing distinct stages of development. These various groups were gradually welded together, till at last the Hexateuch assumed its present form about 450-400 B.C.

J = the Jehovistic narrative, so called because it regularly uses the term Jehovah (or Yahweh) for God. Date *c.* 850 B.C.

E = the closely cognate Elohist narrative, so called because it prefers *Elōhīm* for the Divine Name, never using Jehovah till Exod. iii. 14 sqq. (where God reveals it to Moses), and very sparingly after that. Date *c.* 750 B.C. J (of Judah origin), and E (of Northern Kingdom, or Israel, origin), are independent parallel narratives drawing mainly on a common stock of tradition.

JE = J and E skilfully welded together into one narrative. The symbol JE is used when it is not possible, or not necessary, to distinguish the two sources. Date *c.* 700 B.C. or shortly after.

D = Deuteronomy, the "Book of the Law" discovered in the Temple in 621 B.C. It was written some little time before its discovery.

H = the "Law of Holiness," *i.e.* roughly speaking, *Lev.* xvii.-xxvi. It is the oldest part of the Priestly Law, and its kernel; "holiness" is its keynote; its date is the age of Ezekiel, say, *c.* 580 B.C.

P = the Priestly narrative, the work of the legalistic school of the latter part of the exile and later, though based on older material. Date *c.* 500 B.C.

[For C, E², JED, and full details of the above symbols, refer to Index.]

PART I
INTRODUCTORY

THE BIBLE AND MODERN THOUGHT

CHAPTER I

A BIBLE HARD TO READ TO-DAY

SIXTY years ago Englishmen knew and loved their Bible well. It was to them God's own Word, written, indeed, by human pens, but edited in heaven and miraculously dictated to men on earth. And as our fathers read the Bible, their own sense of its quickening power was proof positive of its heavenly source. So it was man's daily companion and daily bread, his one guide and stay, the Book of books. "Read to me," said Sir W. Scott on his deathbed. "What book would you like?" asked Lockhart. "Need you ask? There is but one book."

Do men know and love their Bible as well to-day? No! say all the churches. They point to empty churches and unread Bibles in proof of Religion at a low ebb. Is this true, or the whole answer? Materialist our age may outwardly seem, irreligious at heart it is not. God, Life, Duty are in men's thoughts to-day as never before. They may hold Church-going and Bible-reading at a discount, but may not the Bible's own enlightening spirit in their hearts be the clue to their questionings both of its letter and of our creeds? For centuries England has so steeped her soul in the Word of God that its spirit is now part and parcel of her spirit. Men's hearts tell them that the God of the Bible, a God of sincerity and truth, asks of us personal convictions, not lip-service.

For a man to profess beliefs which his heart and mind do not endorse is, in their eyes, akin to sacrilege and degrades and darkens the man's own soul. Hence to-day, when Bible or creed contradict verified facts of science, history, or conscience, man's heart pulls in one direction, his head in another. He feels acutely the wrench of breaking with his old creed, but his principles forbid him to force his head to keep step with his heart when the two clash.

Tens of thousands of "God's good men" to-day still treasure every syllable of the Bible as God's own Word; they feed their souls on it, and they are more than satisfied. Like Cowper's peasant woman, they "just know, and know no more, their Bible true," and its God-given treasures are dearer unto them than thousands of gold and silver. But most thinking men to-day cannot adopt this simple attitude to the Bible. How can they with the stupendous revolution in our ideas during the last sixty years, a revolution which affects our whole outlook on the Bible? Evolution has given us a new knowledge of Nature which makes even the man in the street look askance at the Genesis Creation-story. Science, with its Reign of Law, has taught man to pull a wry face at the word "miracle." Modern scholarship compels even the most orthodox to question some of the Bible's historical facts and to challenge its ascription of the Pentateuch to Moses or the Psalms to David. The study of other creeds and their sacred books has opened out the long vistas of Comparative Religion, and proved that all religions, the wide world over, have the same roots, a strong family likeness, and all claim a divine origin. Chief stumbling-block of all, the morality of the Bible is at times imperfect. Men ask: How can God have inspired such Hymns of Hate as Pss. cix. 6 sqq., cxxxvii. 8 sq.? How can God have given strict orders to kill enemy captives: "man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep"? How can God approve of deed upon

deed condemned by our conscience, yet which the Bible applauds as done in His name and service?¹

These moral and intellectual difficulties trouble, and should trouble, men to-day. Their plea is this: If the Bible is God's Word, it should be flawless. We open it, and what do we find? Its science and history often inaccurate, its morality at times low, its very conception of God not infrequently repelling. How can such things be in God's own Book? And, as a rule, men ask the question in no cynical or carping spirit, but craving for light and guidance. "Understandest thou what thou readest?" asked Philip of the Ethiopian officer. "How can I except some one should guide me?" was the reply. Thousands of thinking men are saying the same thing to-day of the Bible that officer was reading. At heart they are athirst for God, but their intellectual and moral questionings create a yawning gulf between twentieth-century minds and a right understanding of the Bible. Yet this gulf can be spanned. Christ Himself bridges it for us. In so many words, as we shall presently see, He tells us: You read your Bible and understand not, because you read it amiss. Ascribing every word of it to God, you all unconsciously wrong Him. You stumble at its moral and intellectual shortcomings, forgetting the darkness and "hardness of men's hearts" then, forgetting that man's reason and conscience were not as educated then as yours is, or should be, after 3000 years more of God's light and training.

We want to read our Bible as Jesus read His. Follow His lead there and your view of Inspiration

¹ Of course, it is grossly unfair to gauge either O.T. or N.T. by what it is at its *lowest* level. Cf. Montefiore (*Liberal Judaism and Hellenism*, p. 32 sqq.), "The O.T. *does* contain the law of retaliation and hymns of hate; it *does* say that God 'hated' Esau; it *does* describe God's awful punishments on His foes, etc. But these things are no more the *only* teachings of the O.T. than the dull, obscure, or indecent passages in Shakespeare are the only things in his works"; and he rightly retorts that we do not only remember the N.T. "everlasting fire," "devil," and "goats," and forget its great and noble things.

will broaden, all your difficulties will vanish of themselves. His only Bible was the Old Testament; there was no other. No man ever revered His Bible more than Christ did. For Him it enshrines God's own Word. In every emergency it was His food and stay. He steeps His very soul in its spirit. Its words are on His lips at every turn. It was His final court of appeal: "it is written."

But Christ by no means looks upon all the Bible as the final Word of God, nor upon all its pages or books as of equal value. If He had, would He have restated large portions of it and cancelled others altogether? Practically¹, He personally adopts three distinct attitudes in dealing with the (1) Prophets; (2) Moral Law; (3) Ritual Law.

(1) *The Prophets*, e.g. Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, He wholeheartedly endorses. They are for ever telling us: Religion is character and a life of service in which love of God and love of man go hand in hand; God infinitely prefers this loving service to many rites and sacrifices. This prophetic teaching is exactly Christ's own view: "Not every one that saith unto Me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of My Father which is in heaven" (Mt. vii. 21). Even as He assures us (Mt. xxv. 34 sqq.) that, at the last Day, His one test of us will be our possession or lack of a warm heart going out of self in ministering love to our fellow-man. Again, Christ is wholly at one with these prophets in their

¹ Of course, this must not be taken *au pied de la lettre* as if Jesus, consciously and deliberately, had mapped out His attitude towards the Prophets, the Moral Law, and the Ceremonial Law, in the definite way stated above. He did not. Jesus and His disciples looked upon the Hebrew Scriptures exactly as did the Jews themselves. All we imply is that in the light of His inspired meditations, His experience, His conflicts, His teaching, etc., He intuitively reached, as His own, the positions which we ascribe to Him above on the strength of a mass of evidence given in the Gospels. Even though to Him, as to all Jews, the Law was Mosaic (and the Psalms Davidic) and inspired, more assuredly inspired still were the intuitive teaching and convictions that swelled up from the depths of His heart regarding the Law. The general statement in the text holds good, but must not be pressed as to details, e.g. Christ would not see eye to eye with much in Ezekiel or parts of Jeremiah.

conception of God, their worship of God in spirit and in truth, their value of heart-motives as far above external actions, their lofty inspiring principles. To their progressive teaching He set His seal, completing it by bringing their scattered rays to a focus, still further illuminating it with a bright light of His own creation.

(2) *The Moral Law.* Here Christ makes distinctions. (a) The Ten Commandments He restates, or rather, amplifies. In their application, He stresses inward motives as alone giving real value to the outward acts. Of course, He endorses the spirit of the Ten Words, but corrects their partial statements with His: "It hath been said to them of old, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt do no murder, but *I* say unto you" (Mt. v. 27 sqq. R.V.). He does not set in their place new *rules* to be literally obeyed, but, in the spirit of Jer. xxxi. 31 sqq., states universal heart-searching *principles* to guide man's heart and make him a law unto himself.

(b) The old moral laws on, *e.g.* oaths, divorce, retaliation, Jesus radically transforms in a way that condemns much of it (Mt. v. 31 sqq.).

(3) *The Ritual Law.* Still more radical is Christ's treatment of the ritual and ceremonial law, *e.g.* the ceremonial cleansing of vessels and washing of hands, the distinction between clean and unclean meats, the tithing of herbs, etc. Christ sweeps much of this law aside with a ruthless hand, and for this reason. As He openly tells us in Mk. vii. 2-23, religion is a character and a life in which heart-motives alone count, while the ritual law, divorced from the spiritual elements of religion, converts it into the due performance of outward rites and ceremonies, and tends to deaden men's consciences and turn them into self-satisfied Pharisees. It would be an exaggeration to say that Christ will have none of the ritual law: "Ye pay tithe of mint, anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment,

mercy and faith ; *these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone*" (Mt. xxiii. 23). Similarly He tells His disciples : "the Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat : all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do" (Mt. xxiii. 2 sq.). His disciples certainly took Him at His Word, for they were strict observers of this law (cf. Ac. xxi. 20 sqq.). But Christ's attitude to the Priestly Code, with its scrupulous attention to Sabbaths, meats, "cleanness," tithes, was, as a rule, so radical and independent that it shocked Jewish susceptibilities terribly.

Surely, Christ's own attitude to the Bible gives us our clue to Bible-Inspiration and our other difficulties. Would Christ have thus restated or set at nought much of the Mosaic Law—the holiest part of the Bible to Jews—had He believed the Bible to be the actual Word of God, every jot and tittle of it? For Him it enshrined God's Word. Every jot and tittle of it had its day and its use and its goal (Mt. v. 18), but the Gospels clearly show that our Lord does not by any means regard all parts of the Bible as of equal value.

Christ and our moral difficulties.—Christ was not blind to the moral shortcomings of the Bible. Thus He will have none of either Ex. xxi. 23, "Life for life, eye for eye," or Deut. xxiii. 3-6, Love thy friend, hate thine enemy to the tenth generation.¹ Again, when the Jews appealed to Deut. xxiv. 1 (see R.V.) to justify their lax divorces, Christ plainly tells them : Yes, that may have been excusable with Jews of that day "because of the hardness of their hearts" (Mt. xix. 8), but shame on you if, with all the fresh light God has poured on you in the thousand years

¹ He does endorse Lev. xix. 17 sq. : "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart. . . Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people ; but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" ; one of the noblest passages in the O.T., and out of the Priestly Code, too. It is almost, though afar off, anticipatory of Jesus' Golden Rule, were it not so particularistic (but see xix. 34, for love to strangers). Both Lev. xix. 18 and the Sermon on the Mount deal with private, not public, enemies.

since Moses, your moral sense has not outgrown this primitive moral code. Or again, when a Samaritan village treated Christ discourteously, James and John, wanting to copy Elijah, said: "Lord, wilt Thou that we command fire to come down from Heaven and consume them, as Elias did?" Christ, shocked, "turned and rebuked them" for the bare thought (Lk. ix. 54 sq.).

Hence, if we are to read our Bible as Christ read His, two facts clearly stand out from His attitude to it: (1) His restatement and cancelling of large sections of it spell death to our seeing the eternal Word of God in its every chapter and verse; (2) From His speaking of this deed and that law as well and good in their day "because of the hardness of men's hearts" then, but as deeds and laws which the conscience of a later age should condemn and not copy, it is plain that He sees in the Bible a Progressive Revelation, the record of God's education of man. St. Paul looks at it exactly in the same light when he speaks of the Law as "our schoolmaster unto Christ."

"Remember their date and the state of culture then," is Christ's key to the Bible's moral difficulties. It is the key to much more. Logically driven home, what does Christ's "because of the hardness of men's hearts," in justification of this imperfect law or that immoral deed, imply? An imperfect law or immoral deed in the Bible clearly proves that, even under God's inspiration, the human element comes in. Inspired men are not dummies, mere passive channels of God's communications; they remain their own full selves—all their faculties intensely quickened¹—and "we have this treasure in earthen vessels" (2 Cor. iv. 7). In a word, both Christ and St. Paul see in the Bible man's progressive education under God as schoolmaster. Here is our clue to Inspiration.

How does a teacher educate his pupils? Is his pupil's mind a passive receptacle into which he is to

¹ *I.e.* heart, reason, fancy operative at their highest power and intensity, as in the intuitions and creations of genius in the poet or artist.

pour all he himself knows? Such cramming produces an abnormal memory in the pupil, but inevitably throttles thought, crushes originality, stunts the whole mental growth—and character too. Education—the very word says so—is educing or drawing out the pupil's own powers, coaxing his faculties into full play, actualising his possibilities by stimulating him to full self-expression. Education is self-development under judicious prompting. The teacher is there to watch, guide, prompt, stimulate;¹ the pupil must do all the rest. The tutor who solves his pupil's problems is his worst enemy; the teacher who braces him painfully to solve them for himself, his best and only friend. Throughout, he gauges his pupil's actual knowledge, starts on that and leads him stage by stage from his old truth to new, so that the new is but the old transfigured into a higher truth. From start to finish, the master sees, as the pupil does not, the far-away ideal goal to which he is leading the pupil; so there is unity of direction and unity of idea in all the teaching. There are no "double truths," one for the child and quite another for the adult. Their form may differ, the root-idea is the same. The seed and flower are all of one piece.

This is precisely God's method in His education of man, what we mean by Inspiration. He guides, prompts, stimulates man's own thoughts, suggests the line they are to follow, and leaves it to the man to do the rest. God's revelation does not come in the form of a ready-made thought, a vision full and complete,² but as a quickening suggestion hinting at the direction which man's thought must follow, and needing man's thought if the revelation is to take articulate form.

¹ Cf. Socrates' "maieutic art or midwifery," the name he gave to his plan of eliciting from others what was in their mind without their knowing it; obliging others by his questions to open out their minds, "find themselves," "bring to the birth" the latent thought of which they were unconscious (Plato, *Thai.*, 151 C., 161 E.).

² An Isaiah, St. Paul, etc., show that the train of thought is so often subconscious that, when the conclusion flashes on the prophet, he views it as a supernatural vision, voice, or communication.

Clearly, the God-revelation must needs receive its colouring and character from the character and emotions of the mind in which it is produced; it must also needs reflect the mental and moral atmosphere of the age and place of its birth. This is Inspiration, well defined by Dean Stanley as "a divine impulse given to man's own thoughts." Hence God's revelations to man are never communications mechanically or miraculously imparted from a far-away heaven. They are the thoughts of man's own spirit quickened and suavisely influenced from within by God's Spirit. And Inspiration is for all, not for the few. No man is without the "Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world." God spake to Bible-prophets exactly as He speaks to us all now, but more clearly because their hearts were more attuned to, and therefore more receptive of, His Spirit. How spirit—God's Spirit or man's spirit—thus directly speaks to spirit, we cannot tell. It does, and neither life nor death, nor height nor length nor breadth act as a barrier. But this direct action of spirit on spirit lies in a region of which even the *natural* features baffle human science.

If Inspiration is this, then the Bible is both the most human and the most divine of books. Divine, because, in the Bible, the Voice of God's own Spirit it is which speaks to us from hearts so full of His Spirit that in His Light they see light. Human, because in the Bible God's message comes to us in and through man. Herein lies both the Bible's strength and its weakness. Truth is never so effective as when incarnate, and, as the most intensely human of books, the Bible is all the more helpful just because it is the heart-experience of *men* of God. None the less "we have this treasure in earthen vessels." It is God's message coloured by the human mind through which it passes. The Bible contains God's Word, but all of it is not the Word of God.

NOTE ON INSPIRATION

To-day many ask : Must we confine Inspiration to the Bible? Is *Canticles* inspired, and *Paradise Lost* not, *Ecclesiastes* divine, and the *Vita Nuova* human? Is not such a verdict the outcome of an arbitrary canon, a leaden rule, on a par with the artificial distinction which calls, *e.g.* preaching sacred and healing secular?

Timely and well-grounded is this protest against the "provincial departmentalism" of theology, its tendency to divide what God has united, placing this in the category of the Divine, and that outside the Divine pale. For undoubtedly this artificial distinction has a prejudicial and narrowing influence upon the conception we form of God and His universe, and our idea of the sphere and method of the working of God.

If "every good gift and every perfect gift is from above" (Jas. i. 17); if "there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit" (1 Cor. xii. 4); if St. Paul includes "healing" (= medicine), "wisdom" (= philosophy), "knowledge" (= letters), "miracles" (= (say) great scientific discoveries), "prophecy" (= inspiring eloquence), under Inspiration, then can we deny Inspiration to geniuses in poetry, music, philosophy, art, science, literature? Isaiah says of the ploughman: "His God doth instruct him to discretion, and doth teach him" (Is. xxviii. 26); and if the craft of Bezaleel (Ex. xxxi. 3 sq.) and the sagacity of Solomon (1 Kgs. iv. 29), as well as the spiritual insight of Isaiah and St. Paul, were direct from God, as the Bible tells us, then our arts and trades, our discoveries and inventions, our wisdom and knowledge are "gifts" of God's Spirit, "inspired." Surely there is One and only One source of Truth, Goodness, Knowledge, if the Universe is one organic whole and God the source, goal and meaning of it all. Place this or that outside God's sphere, and God's universe becomes a house divided against itself. A God who is an absentee from any part or interest of His world, or despises anything that He has made, is now an impossibility for rational theology. Therefore, we are told, we cannot deny God's Inspiration to-day to Shakespeare, Lister, Huxley, Handel, or a great many more, and only give it to Bible-writers.¹

¹ Every religion makes the same claim for its "Scriptures," *e.g.* Indians say theirs fell straight down from heaven, or were "breathed out" by Brahma; Persians said their *Avesta* was directly communicated to Zarathustra by Ahuramazda's word of mouth, like the Law at Sinai; Islam holds the *Koran* to be the earthly copy of an original heavenly text, revealed to Mohammed

With all this we fully agree. Inspiration (in its application to creations of genius) no one can define. We feel it, we know it when we see it, but it eludes definition, even as its exact frontier defies delimitation. The common sense of mankind declines to limit its application to Bible-writers, as the universal use of the word "inspiration" for all works of creative genius clearly shows. Goethe is right, these fruitful and inspiring genius-creations are "gifts from above, pure children of God," and their creators "the agents of the Supreme Ruler of the world, vessels found worthy to receive a divine inspiration"; and he adds, "I find many leaves written by such God-favoured men, both ancient and modern, quite as beautiful and useful and indispensable to mankind as many Bible-books."

Yet the common sense of mankind, the acclamation of souls in every creed, face to face with the Holy Books that form their daily food and stay, be it O.T., N.T., *Veda*, *Avesta*, or *Koran*—seem to be instinctively right in recognising degrees and kinds of Inspiration, though all inspiration is one in essence and in aim: "There *are* diversities of gifts, though the same Spirit." All said and done, not food, not health, not knowledge, not art, not happiness, not power, but Character, is the human goal. And by driving home to man's heart their pure moral teaching on God, Life, Duty, bidding us "lose life to find it," Bible-writers have done more for Character than all other influences put together, humanly speaking. Therefore the common sense of mankind sees, and rightly sees, in the Bible a "double portion" of God's Spirit and calls it *the inspired Book par excellence*.

during his ecstasies by the Angel of Revelation. At bottom, these views all spring from the deep-rooted popular idea that, under inspiration, men of God were in such a state of passive ecstatic unconsciousness that their personality counted for nothing; they were, as St. Gregory and Justin Martyr call them, merely the "lyre," "flute," or "pen" of the Holy Spirit, who dictated to them the exact words to say or write down. This idea is with us still and dies hard.

CHAPTER II

THE POETRY OF THE BIBLE NOT OUR PROSE

Intellectual difficulties of the Bible.—Intellectually, we are out of touch with our Bible because (1) its poetry is not our prose; (2) its history and science are often not true to fact; (3) its first two chapters clearly contradict each other, and this tendency runs through the whole Bible; (4) many of its books look like literary forgeries.

This states the case bluntly and overstrongly; but these intellectual difficulties are there and repel many modern minds. The three following chapters discuss these points in the above order.

(1) *Bible poetry and imagery.*—The Bible is a Hebrew creation. We think and speak mainly with our heads; with these old Hebrews, heart and imagination think and speak as well as brain. So there is much more colour, feeling, music, imagery in their speech than ours. In a word, poetry is their speech, bald prose ours. Hence it is not too much to say that a number of what are called Bible difficulties would never have existed had Western minds realised the tendency to highly poetical and allegorical forms so natural to Hebrew writers.

“In prophets and psalmists,” writes Professor Robertson Smith, “we have the most glowing utterances of emotional minds.” We forget how differently head and heart speak. As Theodore Watts tells us¹:—
“In grief or pain at its tensest, when man is all feeling,

¹ Art. “Poetry” in *Encycl. Brit.*, 9th ed. (*abridged*).

one 'wild sea of emotion,' no words avail, only moans. When man's heart is still aglow with feeling, but imagination and thought dwell there too, his 'sea of emotion curdles into warm thoughts,' and poetry, steeped in colour and music, but embodying ideas, is his speech. If man is all head, the 'sea of emotion' goes; his ideas cool, clear themselves of feeling altogether, and prose of fact is his speech."

Prose of fact, with words as mere colourless counters of as definite value as OH_2 (= water) in chemistry, is the ideal of a scientific age where intellect is all in all. In Bible days, when heart and imagination were as alive as brain, poetry was man's natural speech, and it is the mother-tongue of us all. Poetry is man's natural speech so long as he has ears to hear the song of the birds, the whisper of the leaves, the voice of wind or sea, the song or wail of the human heart's joy or sorrow, and eyes to see "the lilies of the field, how Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed as one of these."¹ Poetry does what bald prose never can do: (a) no sooner does it speak than the whole scene rises vividly before the hearer's imagination in all its warm colour and clear outline; (b) as the self-utterance of the whole man—heart, imagination, brain—it appeals to the hearer's senses, feelings, imagination, thought, and moves him to be and to do. In a word, prose of fact produces a literature of *knowledge* that teaches, poetry a literature of *power* that moves. And De Quincey's words are true: The meanest of authors that *moves* stands above all who merely *teach*, for to-day's literature of knowledge is soon superseded by the better knowledge of to-morrow, while the literature of power that moves is "triumphant for ever so long as the language exists in which it speaks."

¹ Cf. Tennyson: "Little flower—but if I could understand what you are, root and all, and all in all, I should know what God and man is"; and Wordsworth: "To me the meanest flower that blows can give thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears." Cf. Linnæus on seeing the unfolding of a flower: "I saw God in His Glory passing near me, and bowed my head in worship."

A concrete illustration may give point to these general remarks. About 1100 B.C. took place the battle of Megiddo. Prose of fact describes it thus :— The Israelites are sore oppressed by the Canaanites leagued together under Sisera. The plain of Esdraelon is their headquarters whence they make raids north and south. Israel is strangely helpless and disorganised. It was as if neither shield nor spear could be found among their 40,000 men. At last Israel finds its Joan of Arc in Deborah. In Jehovah's name, she summons the tribes to fight for God and the right. Ephraim, Benjamin, Zebulun, Issachar, Naphtali, respond loyally ; Reuben, Gad, Dan, Asher, stay at home. She sets Barak at the head of Israel's army. He marches against the kings of Canaan under Sisera's command by the brook Kishon. Sisera's huge army and his 900 chariots of iron strike terror into Israel's smaller force of infantry. Fortunately, a terrific storm breaks into torrents of rain. The horses and chariots of Sisera sink deep in the mud and throw the rest of his host into disorder. So the foe falls an easy prey to the impetuous onrush of the agile and now eager highland Hebrew footmen. Sisera takes to flight, hides in the tent of Jael, wife of Heber the Kenite, a neutral. She professes friendship, acts the kind hostess, and kills him in his sleep.

This is how Hebrew poetry pictures it : Scene I. : Jehovah, the Lord of Storm, comes, from Sinai His home, to His Israel's rescue : "*Lord, when Thou wentest forth out of Seir, when Thou marchedst out of the field of Edom, the earth trembled, the heavens dropped (or 'rocked'), yea, the clouds dropped water. The mountains quaked at the presence of the Lord, even that Sinai, at the presence of the Lord, the God of Israel.*" Scene II. : The desolation of Israel under its foreign oppressor : "*In the days of Jael, the highways were unoccupied, travellers walked through byways ; the inhabitants of the villages ceased. Until that I Deborah arose, that I arose a mother in Israel ; then was war in the gates, was there a shield or*

spear seen among 40,000 in Israel?" Scene III.: The tribes summoned, some come readily, others hold back: "My heart is toward the governors of Israel that offered themselves willingly among the people. Bless ye the Lord. . . . Out of Ephraim came down they whose root is in Amalek; 'after thee, Benjamin,'¹ among the peoples. Out of Machir (= Manasseh) came out governors, and out of Zebulun they that handle the marshal's staff. And the princes of Issachar were with Deborah. As was Issachar, so was Barak (= Naphtali); into the valley they rushed forth at his feet. For the divisions of Reuben there were great searchings of heart. Why abodest thou among thy sheepfolds, to hear the pipings for the flocks? Gilead (= Gad) abode beyond Jordan, and why did Dan remain in ships? Asher sat still at the haven of the sea and abode by his creeks. Zebulun was a people that jeoparded their lives unto the death, and Naphtali, upon the high places of the field. . . . Curse ye Meroz, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof, because they came not to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty." Scene IV.: The battle in a terrific storm: "The kings came and fought, then fought the kings of Canaan in Taanach by the waters of Megiddo; they took no gain of money.² They fought from heaven, the stars in their courses fought against Sisera. The river Kishon swept them away, that ancient river, the river Kishon. O my soul, thou hast trodden down strength. Then did the horse-hoofs stamp by reason of the pransings, the pransings of their strong ones." Scene V.: Jael: "Curse ye Meroz. . . . Blessed above women shall Jael be, the wife of Heber the Kenite, blessed shall she be among women in the tent. He asked water and she gave him milk, she brought forth butter in a lordly dish. She put her hand to the nail, and her right hand to the workman's hammer. And with the hammer she smote Sisera, she smote through his head, yea,

¹ Cf. Hos. v. 8 = Benjamin's battle-cry.

² *I.e.* (a) they were no mere mercenaries or (b) accepted no ransom, but slew without quarter. The old explanation: "they got no spoil or profit in this campaign," is now discounted.

she pierced and struck through the temples. At her feet he bowed, he fell, he lay down; at her feet he bowed, he fell; where he bowed, there he fell down dead." Scene VI.: Sisera's mother awaits his triumphant home-coming: "The mother of Sisera looked out at a window and cried through the lattice, Why is his chariot so long in coming? Why tarry the wheels of his chariot? Her wise ladies answered her; yea, she returned answer to herself, Have they not found, have they not divided the spoil? A damsel, two damsels to every man. To Sisera a spoil of divers colours, a spoil of divers colours of needlework, of divers colours of needlework on both sides, meet for the necks of them that take the spoil." Finale: "So let all Thine enemies perish, O Lord, but let them that love Him be as the Sun when he goeth forth in his might."¹

This *Te Deum*—among the oldest passages, if not the oldest, in the Bible; almost if not quite contemporary with its events (Driver and Cheyne)—is a good sample of the dramatic and inspiring power of the bulk of Old Testament literature. It is a literature of power because it mirrors the Hebrew genius. The Bible is the creation of Hebrews born of a passionate and imperious Arab stock. Nomad shepherds in the desert for ages, living a hardy and precarious life in the open, the Hebrew race grew up self-reliant, versatile, imperious, nature-loving, and never lost the passionately emotional Arab temperament² apt to tense outbursts of love and hate, rage and grief, pride and scorn. Their tough wrestle with Nature in the inhospitable wilderness, where they had to adapt themselves to the changes and chances of each day,

¹ The text in the middle of the poem has suffered greatly, but the poetic art and inspiration of this very old Song are of the highest kind. Its value to the historian is immense; it clearly indicates the independence of all the tribes, the subjection of those along the Great Plain to the Canaanite kings with their walled cities and formidable chariots, the summons "to the help of Jehovah." Judah and Simeon, isolated in the South, are ignored.

² Cf. King, *Schweich Lect.*, p. 10. "Throughout the settled Hebrew community as a whole the spark of desert fire was never extinguished, and by kindling the zeal of the Prophets it eventually affected nearly all the white races of mankind."

gave them a wondrous faculty of self-adaptation to any environment and a vast reserve of power for any emergency. But it also fostered the tendency to subordinate everything to the action and feeling of the moment and see only one thing at a time.

This imperious will, glow of imagination, reserve of power, love of Nature, and lack of the organic sense, are all stamped on Hebrew literature from the Song of Deborah (c. 1100 B.C.) to the last psalm (c. 150 B.C.). Hence its poetry and power. But it also has the defect of its qualities. These old Hebrews are weak where we are strong and strong where we are weak. Subordinating head to heart, thought to action, truth of idea appeals to them far more than truth of fact (Ch. III.), they are lacking in speculative reflection, their critical faculty is all but undeveloped, they know nothing of historical or scientific exactness. Uncritical and apt to see only one thing at a time, they lack the sense of organic unity and hang absolutely inconsistent pictures side by side without any sense of their incongruity, *e.g.* their two accounts of the Creation, the Flood, the election of Saul as king. So in their judgment of men and things, they are often one-sided and extreme.

On the other hand, in all that makes for character and conduct, all that concerns God, Life, Duty, where heart and will are a far truer guide than brain, they come easily first, *e.g.* their "Wisdom Literature" and lofty prophetic ideals. In the realm of spirit we are but echoing to-day what these seers saw intuitively close on 3000 years ago. Speaking of the Old Testament as a whole, it is eminently fresh and graphic, full of shrewd observation of Nature and men, and works on the reader, not by elaborate description, but by dramatic presentation of character and action. Poetry is its natural speech. Its first history was all in song, *e.g.* the Book of Jashar. Its earliest "prophesyings" were sung to the accompaniment of "psaltery and tabret and pipe and harp."

Throughout, it sees everything through the atmosphere which floats before the poet's eyes. The *Psalms* are the world's Great Lyric. *Song of Songs* is simply a love-poem. *Lamentations* (cf. David's elegy, 2 Sam. i.) is pure elegiac poetry. *Job* is a dramatic poem. *Ruth* is a graceful idyll. *Esther*, and largely *Daniel* and *Jonah*, are of the nature of poetical romances. *Amos*, *Hosea*, *Micah*, *Isaiah*, *Jeremiah*, not only embody poems, but throughout have the deep emotional basis, the artistic form, the true rhythm, the glowing imagination, which constitute poetry. *Genesis*, portions of *Exodus* and *Numbers*; *Joshua*, *Judges*, *Samuel* often read like pages of Homer.

Hebrew word-pictures are mainly from Nature. Born and bred in the desert for ages, they knew and loved Nature in all her moods, as sailors the sea. Practically up to Moses' day she was at once their mother, home, house of God, and actually their God. In the infancy of the race, Hebrews, as all other races (cf. even classical Greece and Rome), were nature-worshippers. Sun, Moon, Wind, Earth, Sky,—real living persons with human feelings and passions—were their gods. This belief died hard. Right up to the Captivity, as Deut. iv. 19 and xvii. 3 prove, popular Hebrew religion harked back to the worship of "sun, moon, stars and all the host of heaven." Of course, Israel had long outgrown this superstition, but language is very conservative, apt to retain old expressions and ideas (cf. our "sun-rise, sun-set") long after they are emptied of their original meaning. Even when the Sun had long ceased to be in Hebrew eyes a gigantic Being, or the Wind a god with wings, the old phrases of Hebrew nature-worshipping days are retained: "*The Sun cometh forth as a bridegroom out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run his course.*" "*He rode upon a cherub and did fly, yea, He did fly upon the wings of the Wind.*" More often, Jehovah's supremacy ousts the old nature-gods and makes them His servants or tools: "*Who coverest*

thyself with Light as with a garment; who stretchest out the Heavens like a curtain"; "who layeth the beams of His chambers in the Waters; who maketh the Clouds His chariot; who walketh upon the wings of the Wind; who maketh Winds His messengers, His ministers a flame of Fire." Thunder, lightning, and earthquake, as at Sinai, are still symbols of Jehovah's Presence":¹ "The earth shall tremble at the look of Him; if He do but touch the hills they shall smoke." "Tremble, thou earth, at the presence of the Lord. What ailed thee, O thou sea, that thou fleddest, or thou Jordan, that thou wast driven back? ye mountains, that ye skipped like rams, or ye little hills, like young sheep?" Mere poetry on our lips, these word-pictures were very real to old Hebrews. It was their old faith baptised into Jehovah.

Nature also supplies exquisite similes: "The godly like a tree planted by the waterside"; "He shall feed me in green pastures"; "ye shall be as the wings of a dove covered with silver, and her feathers with yellow gold"; "Thy wife as the fruitful vine upon the walls of thine house, thy children like olive-branches." "As panteth the hart after the water brooks." But Hebrew fancy invests even the commonest things of daily life with grandeur and beauty: "In the hand of the Lord there is a cup, and the wine is red; it is full mixed, and He poureth out of the same. As for the dregs thereof, all the ungodly of the earth shall drink them and suck them out." "Thou hast anointed my head with oil, and my cup shall be full." "The Lord shall light my candle." "Moab is my washpot, over Edom will I cast my shoe."²

Such expressive imagery appeals to us all. Far harder is it for sober undemonstrative Englishmen to enter into the passionate emotions and equally impassioned words and gestures of Hebrew hearts.

¹ *I.e.* as the Storm-God whose voice is heard in the crash of the thunder (Ps. xxix.), and who manifests himself in the lightning-flash, in fire and in smoke and earthquake.

² Cf. Ps. cvii. 23 sqq. for a storm at sea.

Oriental emotions are much more *physical* than ours, and physical terms and actions alone can voice them. In great fear, it is literally true of an Oriental that "*his heart melts within him and becomes as water*"; "*the joints of his loins are loosed and his knees smite one against another.*" In acute grief he does "*lift up his voice and weep.*" "*I will howl; I make a wailing as the jackals and mourning as the owls.*" Their grief is not only vocal, they beat their breasts, tear their hair and beard. So of their hate and rage: "*My heart was hot within me, the fire kindled, and I spake with my tongue,*" puts it mildly; more true to life are: "*They hiss and gnash the teeth,*" "*grin like a dog,*" "*clothe themselves with cursing as with a raiment.*" For an ideal Hymn of Hate read Ps. cix. It is the "*grin of a dog,*" like the snap of a terrier before he fleshes his teeth. The same thing holds of their love, joy, pride, scorn. In this intensity of feeling lies the immense Hebrew driving-power for good or ill. This heart of fire, with an imperious Hebrew will behind it, is the stuff that produces saints or devils, a Hymn of Hate or a Ps. li, an Isaiah's whole-hearted zeal for God or a David's awful sin. "*There is in my heart a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I cannot contain*" (Jer. xx. 9). No wonder that such enthusiastic souls, under the Spirit's impulse, feel themselves seized *physically* with overpowering force, as by a mighty hand, see visions, hear audible voices, and act at times as though beside themselves.¹

Emotionalism also explains Oriental love of hyperbole, flowing from a heart so full that words are too tame for it: "*I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven and as the sands upon the seashore*"; "*the cities are very great and walled up to heaven.*" The phenomenal

¹ As Sanday notes, there was something of the Indian *fakir* in these emotional prophets, and their dramatic symbolic actions show it, e.g. Isaiah walks for three years naked and barefoot (Is. xx. 1-6), Jeremiah wears a yoke of wood upon his neck (xxvii, xxviii), Ezekiel lies for months on one side with limbs bound (iv. 3-17),—these acted parables would naturally drive home their meaning in a way that speech never could.

ages of the patriarchs¹ and the gigantic size of men before the Flood, or the Tower of Babel whose top is to reach unto heaven, do not impress Orientals as they do us. It is so much their normal way of speaking, their equivalent of a superlative. No Oriental would take literally: "*Give to him that asketh of thee, and from him that would borrow turn thou not away*"; "*if any smite thee on the one cheek, turn to him the other also*"; "*it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God*"; "*if thy right eye cause thee to stumble, pluck it out and cast it from thee,*"² any more than he would read as actual fact: "*The stars in their courses fought against Sisera,*" or, "*Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon, and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon.*" More than one miracle lies at the door of poetical Hebrew hyperbole.

Ruskin said at Oxford: "To my Bible I owe the best part of my taste in literature and the most precious, indeed, the essential part of my education." Our English Bible gave John Bright "that robust, powerful and vigorous style in which he gave fitting expression to the burning and noble thoughts he desired to utter." Setting aside altogether, for the moment, the Bible's religious value, it is our best educational asset. It supplies, and places within

¹ A striking parallel to this, and to much else in early *Gen.*, is found in a Sumerian document (c. 2000 B.C.) just unearthed at Nippur. It bears on the Creation, Antediluvian history, and Deluge. (See King, *Schweich Lect.*, 1916.)

² Cf. "*If any man hate not his father, mother, wife, children, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be My disciple.*" "*Be ye perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect.*" It is just this tremendous trumpet-call, this enthusiastic and confident appeal to man to do what he cannot do, that fans the divine spark in him into flame, enabling him to work miracles. Just because Christ moved among men seeing the image of God in every man, full of enthusiasm and faith in man, demanding the noblest achievements of the most unlikely, He turned weaklings into heroes and sinners into saints. By kindling a man's enthusiasm for a supreme ideal, you spur him forward upon the road towards it, and as he goes forth upon his arduous quest, glad and eager, heedless of all danger and all lower enticements, "*losing life he finds it,*" and Jacob is transfigured into Israel. But, strange as it sounds, only the impossible ideal transfigures the actual. Ideals that can be fulfilled are no ideals at all. "A man's reach must exceed his grasp." "*Be ye perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect.*"

every cottager's reach, the very qualities in which our temperament and system of education are most lacking, imagination, the sense of beauty, power of expression. Both for its judgments of value and its words of power, our English Bible is the one book we cannot do without.

(*Note.*—In quoting the Psalms in this chapter, the Prayer-Book version has been used, because most of us are so familiar with it, and because of its finer rhythm. In the *Song of Deborah*, the R.V. is mainly followed, but some passages retain the A.V. renderings.—J. R. C.)

CHAPTER III

TRUTH OF IDEA TRUER THAN TRUTH OF FACT

THE second Bible difficulty on our list, "The science and history of our Bible are often not true to fact," is perhaps the greatest stumbling-block to-day, and for this reason. Truth of fact is the gospel of our scientific age. To state what is not true to fact is the twentieth-century sin of sins, "stamps the authority behind the statement as *false* and at once brands it beyond redemption in our eyes." Now the Bible sets truth of idea far above truth of fact. Let us define these terms.

"*Truth of fact,*" or "*judgment of existence.*" Our age rightly prides itself on its determination to see everything in the coldest and whitest of lights exactly as it is; also on its accuracy of statement so that its assertions may tally exactly with actual fact. This is "truth of fact." Our motto to-day is:—Accept nothing on trust and base your statements on none but positive facts. Sift, weigh, measure, analyse, verify all your evidence. Allow neither likes nor dislikes, sentiments of religion nor dogmas of authority, to colour or distort your clearness of vision, and follow fearlessly wherever verified facts lead. Till your evidence affords a solid basis for a positive conclusion, suspend your judgment; if you suggest a possible conclusion, mark it with a note of interrogation, or candidly say "I don't know."

Thus a "truth of fact" or "judgment of existence" is exact correspondence between thought or statement and what is or has been: *e.g.* $2 + 2 = 4$; the *Lusitania*

was torpedoed; water seeks its own level. The cold white light of Intellect is its final court of appeal and it knows no other. Truth of fact must be capable of proof on such clear and positive evidence that, when this evidence is examined and weighed by competent and unbiassed minds, there can be no disagreement as to the verdict.

This passion for truth of fact is our age's great contribution to civilisation, God's gift, lesson and revelation to our generation. It has revolutionised knowledge in every department, made it infinitely more exact and reliable, and enabled us to harness Nature's forces to man's service by carefully observing the uniform methods (= laws) according to which they work. This zeal for the naked truth has also made our age fearlessly honest and sincere; hence it is a note both of material and moral progress.

"Truth of idea" or "judgment of value."—Science confines itself to what it calls the world of reality. It will deal with none but material or objective facts which lie within the range of the senses and the intellect. If I ask science: What of my heart-motives, my ideals, my sense of duty and responsibility? it shrugs its shoulders, and either questions that kind of reality or bluntly says: Knowledge to-day has to do with the brain, not the emotions; it deals with solid facts and knows nothing of that fanciful or subjective side of the picture.

What then? If I accidentally shoot a man, are the gun and corpse alone real, and my remorse not real? If I jump into a rough sea to save a drowning man, is the sea real and the man real, but the sense of duty that prompts my action not real? In the war, were the deeds of bravery and atrocity real, but the ideals of right, chivalry, humanity, inspiring our self-sacrifice not real? True, the remorse, the sense of duty, the inspiring ideals are subjective facts outside the range of Science's intellect, but is Intellect the whole of man? Surely, I am Heart and Will as well as

Brain, and heart and will have big claims of their own. "What I am and what I do," says Jacob Boehme, "all depends on what I set my affections upon." The affections stimulate the will to make for a certain goal; if the will says Yes, then it sets the intellect to think out ways and means to that goal. Now if it is the heart that prompts and the will that steers the course, while intellect is only called in to find ways and means to *their* ends, then a right heart and will are every whit as vital as their servant's clear brain. Those old Hebrews are right: "Keep the heart with all diligence (lit. 'above all that thou guardest'), for out of it are the issues of life." In man or nation, it is the ideals which kindle the heart and stimulate the will, the aspirations after "whatsoever things are true and honest and just and pure and lovely and of good report," that raise the whole level of life or make the line of human progress swerve upwards. We see them moulding beautiful characters, inspiring men to do and die for a great cause, stimulating great and noble enterprises. These aspirations and ideals, this sense of high duty and responsibility, which have their seat in the heart and will, we call "judgments of value," "truths of idea." They fall within the province of Religion and Ethics, even as "truth of fact" comes under Science. We want both, but a character-building Bible naturally exalts judgments of value.

In "judgments of existence" exact correspondence of statement with fact is vital; in "judgments of value" it is quite immaterial. Obviously, if the captain's chart, the doctor's formula, the statesman's data, the engineer's plans do not exactly correspond with things as they are, they court disaster. Not so with judgments of value. The warm heart and good example of Christ's Good Samaritan inspire me just the same whether such a man ever existed or not. So far as their appeal to the human heart goes, it matters not one jot whether Abraham, Jacob, Joseph

are actual persons¹ or ideal types. Our Lord's parables prove that the deepest truths of the human heart can often be more truly and forcibly expressed by story or fable than by the most logical and literal statement of fact.²

Bearing in mind these two points: (a) For character, truth of idea is more real and vital than truth of fact; (b) truth of idea is independent of truth of fact for its embodiment or setting,—we can now deal with the objection so often levelled at the Bible: "Its history and science are not true to fact." The objection is perfectly just, and we are not serving the best interests of either God, Truth, or the Bible itself when we indignantly, in our mistaken zeal, give the lie to this plain fact. Edification, judgment of value, not objective history or science, is the Bible's aim. The Bible is the record of man's moral education by God, culminating in Christ's revelation, and the record is so framed as to enable us to understand the whole of God's will for us. No other book has so influenced mankind and civilisation in the way of character and rightness of life. This is its one aim—edification. We must read it in the spirit in which it was written, with eyes open to its priceless judgments of value. But we must not ask it for an absolute truth of fact which it does not profess to give. It is *not* there for several reasons, *e.g.*: (1) Our modern conception of history, with its exacting demand for accuracy, is but some fifty years old and the child of our scientific spirit and methods. No ancient historian faced history from its critical standpoint. Even a Thucydides and a Tacitus unblushingly place fictitious

¹ See Burney, *Judges*, cix. sq.

² The deepest heart-readers—poets, seers, prophets—all embody truth in story or symbol. Thus when Plato wished to embody some truth deep in the mystery of being, he would instinctively glide into what he called "myth" or "truth embodied in a tale"; *e.g.* *Gorgias*: "Listen, as story-tellers say, to a very pretty tale which I daresay you may be disposed to regard as a fable only, but which, as I believe, is a true tale, for I mean to speak the truth. . . . Perhaps there might be reason for your contemning such tales, if by searching we could find out anything better or truer."

speeches in their characters' mouths. Early history is essentially artistic and written with a moral or political aim. (2) For a large portion of their history, truth of fact was an impossibility to Bible-writers. Even the earliest books of the Bible (*c.* 800 B.C.) were written hundreds, often thousands, of years after the events they record. At times they incorporate older narratives, but certainly for the period up to Moses, for instance, they have little but folk-lore to go upon; and up to the monarchy, though we have crossed the borderline between history and legend, we have still much that is legendary.

Even if the Bible-writers had had our scientific training and the most reliable material for their facts, it is more than likely, and greatly to be hoped, that they would have written exactly as they did, setting judgments of value far above truth of objective fact, and for this reason. The bent of their peculiar genius marked out Israel's world-mission. God's gifts to Greece were thought and taste; she specialised in these, and became man's teacher in philosophy, art, literature. God's gifts to Israel were will and heart: she specialised in these, and religion and ethics were her special province: "salvation is of the Jews." With their strong sense of moral responsibility, character and conduct were in Hebrew eyes, not three-fourths, but the whole of life: "Fear God, and keep His commandments, for this is the whole (duty) of man" (Eccl. xii. 13). Moral geniuses, experts in judgments of value, they were born to move man's heart and mould his character. They have done it, and are doing it in their Bible as much as ever to-day, just because they were true to their genius.

Can we expect or wish men of this type to write history like ours to-day? Thank God they did not! Let us see how they actually do write it. God, Life, Duty is their one theme. History is an open page in which they clearly read God's handwriting in His education of man. Before their eyes, as in a drama,

lies the whole scene. The nations are the actors. Israel especially do they watch with bated breath, longing to prompt him. To them each moment in the drama is pregnant with vital issues. They know how each act must inevitably end, long before the curtain drops, for they know God's invariable rule. Jehovah is a righteous God ruling His world on moral lines. Eternal right and truth must eventually triumph, self-destructive wrong and error go to the wall. Thus, with a holy and righteous God and a stiff-necked sinful Israel before their eyes, an Amos, Hosea, Isaiah foresee the Captivity long before it comes. Where other Israelites see in the invading Assyrians powers of darkness sacrilegiously swooping upon God's Israel, they see in these foreign foes Jehovah's own chosen agents to stamp out Israel's delusion and wrong: "You only have I known of all the families of the earth; *therefore* I will visit upon you all your iniquities" (Amos iii. 2).

Such men are ever *interpreters* of history, not chroniclers of bare facts. A fact interests them only in so far as it is the outward expression of some idea or principle which constitutes its soul and renders it intelligible. In their eyes this inner meaning is all that matters. Even when they are dealing with the history of their own day with all its facts staring them in the face, they see the facts, but facts as facts interest them not at all. They want to get at the heart of the facts, at the root-idea which lights up the fact and gives it its full significance. Of one fact they are quite sure:—God, not Chance, is at the helm of His universe with hand ever on the tiller. If man makes history, God far more. Will and character, human and divine, are stamped deep on every page of man's history. Man can promote or retard, never frustrate, God's eternal plan. Our good is His ally; even our evil subserves His ends to its own undoing.

Reading history in this light, is it strange that the one clear lesson it is ever preaching in their ears, and

they in ours, is ever the same: God, Life, Duty? Hence it is that even *Kings*, composed by men who had the fullest records of their period and were themselves all but abreast of it, is written from what we should call a purely moral and religious standpoint.

Still more is this the case with their history of Israel before Moses' day. Here the material at their disposal is very meagre, mostly tradition and folk-lore. Living in an uncritical and credulous age, they probably shared the popular belief in the truth of the old songs, traditions, legends and stories of olden times, still current in their day. But they approach them exactly as they do contemporary facts, not caring for fact as fact but probing to the heart of the story for its inner meaning. They seize the truths of idea, the judgments of value lying buried under this crude mass of folk-lore, and these stories leave their hands with their clay turned into gold. Thus they take primitive Babylonian myths of the Creation and the Flood, seize the truth these stories were groping after all along, and make them vehicles of eternal verities which man can never outgrow. So with the stories of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph.¹ They found traditions of these national heroes, handed down from mouth to mouth for ages and treasured by the Hebrew race. Out of these floating stories these seers recall the patriarchs to life in a form that appeals to all that is truest in the human heart. Not that these prophetic writers, J or E, ever stop to point a moral. They are far too sympathetically in living touch with their national heroes for that. Their creations are real living men in flesh and blood, a series of life-like portraits without parallel even in the Bible, so dramatically presented that, all unconsciously and all the more effectively, they drive home to our hearts the very judgments of value the author intended.

¹ See Burney, *Judges*, p. cix., as to how far these names represent "tribes under the guise of individuals," and footnote, p. 34, *inf.*

Of Biblical history before Moses we no more ask "Is it all true?" than we ask if our Lord's story of the Prodigal Son or of the Good Samaritan is actually true. Such stories are eternally true. Well may Carlyle write of these old Bible-writers: "They are the only true *seers*, interpreting the entirely *indubitable* Revelation of the Author of the Universe. There is a terrible *veracity* in every line of the Hebrew Bible. But how can Dryasdust interpret such things, the dark chaotic dullard, who knows the meaning of nothing cosmic or noble, nor ever will know? Poor wretch, one sees what kind of meaning he educes from man's history. Unhappy Dryasdust, thrice unhappy world that takes Dryasdust's readings of the ways of God."

But a word of caution. The Bible-writers preferred truth of idea to truth of fact; wisdom has been justified of her children and we can implicitly steer our course by the Bible's judgments of value. BUT we must not ask it for absolute veracity of fact. "What we have to learn is to give to history what belongs to history and to idea what belongs to idea." Three-quarters of the theological wranglings and of modern unbelief would never have arisen if men, especially theologians, had borne this in mind. The Bible's value rests not at all on its science or its historical dates or details. Our salvation in this life and the next does not in the least hang on our accepting as literal and eternal truths its story of the Creation, its biographies of the patriarchs, its ascription of this law or that book to Moses, Solomon, David, Paul or Peter. Its value lies wholly on its spiritual side, in its judgments of value; and "our full persuasion and assurance of their infallible truth and divine source is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit bearing witness to them in our own hearts."

CHAPTER IV

MISLEADING ORDER AND TITLES OF BIBLICAL BOOKS

THE third and fourth difficulties on our list are these:—(3) The two very first chapters of the Bible flatly contradict each other, and this tendency runs through the Bible; (4) Many Bible-books look like literary forgeries. We hope to show that (3) is largely due to the wrong chronological order of our Bible-books, while (4) has much in it to elicit praise, not blame, for it flows from a high ideal and a true principle.

(3) *Chronological order of our Bible-books.*—We speak of “The Bible” (=Book) in the singular as if it were one Book. In a sense it is. From cover to cover there is a wondrous unity underlying all the Bible’s variety. Read in the right order, each book dovetails into the next, and the various books seem so many chapters of one author giving us the story of his life, but written at different stages of that life as his spiritual experience and mental horizon broadened. Yet we know that the Old Testament is the work of a large number of independent writers from 850–150 B.C. How, then, are we to account for the wondrous unity? There is but one answer. The Bible *is* the story of his own life and education as given us by one Servant of God, Israel, at successive stages of his life; moreover, behind that life-education and the writers of its record stands all the while One guiding Master-Mind, the divine Educator. So (1) the education itself is all of one piece, an organic whole; (2) the long record of it, the work of many different

pens, also forms one book and not a disconnected library. This is why we instinctively speak of the Bible as the *one Word* of God, not as the *words* of many voices.

But the term "Bible" is of late origin. For hundreds of years after Christ men spoke, not of "The Bible," but "the bibles," "the books" (Dan. ix. 2), "the holy books," "the scriptures" (= writings), "the holy scriptures." This really best expresses the actual fact that the Bible does consist of a vast number of independent writings setting forth Israel's progressive education, at God's hand, at different stages of its life. We want to trace these different stages. We shall not rightly understand God's education of man, or appreciate Israel's own history or character, till we trace this education step by step from Israel's infancy onward. The Bible's aim is to set these various stages clearly before us. Roughly stated, they are as follows :—

(a) The Hebrews came from Babylonia to Canaan ¹ (after a

¹ We follow the view of Jastrow (*Heb. and Babn. Tradns.*, viii. and 23, etc.). —Dr. Burney (*Judges*, pp. cvi. sqq.) and others uphold the following view of Israel's ancestors (patriarchal names stand in it for *tribes*):—The Hebrew westward movement forms part of a larger Aramæan movement lasting centuries. The Heb. movement begins with "Abraham" (c. 2100 B.C.) from Ur to Harran and then to S. Canaan (Beersheba). Next arrives the Aramæan tribe Rebekah, which united with "Isaac," Abraham's "son"; the issue is two tribal groups, Esau-Edom and "Jacob." They dwell together awhile in S. Canaan, but Edom's hostile pressure forces "Jacob" across Jordan eastward again, where, later, the tribe unites with fresh Aramæan elements (= Jacob's wives). Ultimately, the whole tribal body moves once more towards Canaan, compelled by the westward pressure of other Aramæan migrators (= the pursuit of Laban), with whom a friendly treaty and boundary is formed. The Hebrew group, modified by fresh accessions, re-enters Canaan, no longer as "Jacob," but "Israel." The "Habiru" of the Tell el Amarna Letters, c. 1375 B.C., Burney identifies with Hebrews, *i.e.* the Israel, Edom, Moab, Ammon of later days.

This school also maintains that not all Israel, but only a few tribes (*i.e.* the house of Joseph and, for a while, Simcon and Levi) were in Egypt under Moses. The elements ultimately forming the other tribes entered Canaan, not with the Exodus tribes, but gained their heritage there by other means and at other periods. Gad, Dan, Asher ("handmaid tribes") belong to the group "sons of handmaid and not full wives," *i.e.* inferior tribes, probably because not of pure Israelite race, as long since dwelling among Canaanites. In J's account of the settlement, Asher, Naphtali, Dan do not appear as recent and successful invaders, *i.e.* they had not gone into Egypt but maintained a

long sojourn in the desert), and brought with them much of Babylonia's "popular" religion, a kind of nature-worship with its many gods, spirits, and superstitions. We know next to nothing of them up to Moses' day.

(b) Moses mainly laid the foundation of Israel's knowledge of one God, Israel's national God (*i.e.* monolatry = worship of *only one* god among many; not yet monotheism, = worship of *the one and only* God). The Sinai Covenant first gave Hebrew religion a higher moral element, the seed of all its after-development. The Hebrews were then a mixed rabble, very rude, clannish, superstitious—the Arab strain strong in them still.

(c) Their settlement in Canaan introduced them to civilisation, also to new gods and superstitions. Moreover, their centuries of war, while effecting a settlement in the land, kept them rude in character; and their fusion with the Canaanites made them material in their ideas of God, apt to revert to their old polytheism, for Canaanite religion and culture were largely Babylonian in type.

(d) Philistia's crushing defeat of Israel in Samuel's day produced an intense patriotic and religious revival. From it arose new religious leaders, schools of prophets, religious and national reformers. But popular religion is still crude and materialistic, mere sacrifice with superstitious (often licentious) rites at any one of the thousand altars and high places scattered throughout the land.

(e) From 760 B.C. arise a succession of great prophets who try to wean Israel from its superstitious worship of Jehovah to real heart-worship and right life. Old ideas and habits are too deep-rooted and they make little headway in their own day.

(f) Between 700–600 B.C., these prophets (backed by Jerusalem priests) try to abolish the many local shrines and high-places, hotbeds of superstition and vice, and to centralise all worship in Jerusalem. Hezekiah (727–698) begins this reform, with little success; Josiah (621) fairly succeeds.

(g) The Captivity (586–538) deepens Hebrew religion and

precarious footing in Canaan. Burney tends to include Issachar and Zebulun among the tribes left in Canaan, and in the actual conquest of Canaan he follows J, who only records *conquests* of (1) Judah and Simeon by a northward move from Kadesh-Barnea, and (2) the house of Joseph under Joshua from E. of Jordan.—This school's view has two great advantages: (1) it adheres closely to Genesis tradition; (2) it is supported by valuable external evidence and recent "finds," Babylonian, etc. (see Burney, *Judges*, cviii.).

creates an intense reverence for the law. No longer a nation, Israel after the Exile is a Church under priests and scribes ; worship is now definitely centralised in Jerusalem. But contact with other nations has broadened some Jews, while synagogue-worship has weaned many more from mere ritual cultus and spiritualised their religion. After 400 B.C. prophets wane, practically cease ; men have to learn God's revealed will from the study and meditation of the written " Law and the Prophets."

Hence after the Exile we have side by side (1) pronouncedly legal and ecclesiastical writings ; (2) a reflective and broad-minded " Wisdom " literature ; (3) spiritual psalms ; (4) apocalypses based on prophetic writings.

This is the story the Bible-books tell us of Israel's religious education, when they are placed in their natural or chronological order. But as at present arranged, the Bible is apt to confuse and mislead the reader, for the different stages are all mixed up anyhow. The very first chapter of the Bible is of the period of the Exile and gives us the views of c. 500 B.C., while the next chapter is some 300 years earlier.

The Books of Moses, so-called, give us an excellent illustration of this haphazard arrangement and the wrong perspective it creates. Instead of being one organic whole and a good picture of Israel in Moses' day (c. 1250-1200 B.C.)¹, we find in these Mosaic Books three distinct layers of religious thought, in themselves widely apart in date (c. 850-750 B.C. ; 650 B.C. ; c. 500 B.C.), and one and all very far in advance of the elementary religious views of Moses' day. At the end of this chapter the problem of the Mosaic Books is fully discussed, here we briefly indicate the three layers of religious thought, each of which exactly corresponds

¹ "We know that the Exodus probably took place under Mineptah (1225-1215), successor of Ra'messe II. (1292-1225)," the Pharaoh of the oppression. As we also know, by aid of Assyrian chronology, the approximate date of Solomon's accession (c. 970), this enables us to correct the artificial chronology of 1 Kgs. vi. 1, giving 480 years for the period from the Exodus to the building of the Temple in the fourth year of Solomon's rule, whereas it can only have been about 250 years. (From Burney, *Judges*, p. liii.)

with a well-known stage in the actual religious history of Israel long centuries after Moses :—

Roughly speaking (i) a large portion of *Gen.*, *Exod.* xx. 22–xxiii. 33,¹ and many sections of *Exod.* and *Numb.* give us the Hebrew religious outlook of the earlier prophetic school (see (d) and very early (e) *sup.*), just before Amos' day. This older portion is known as J and E.²

(ii) Deuteronomy exactly represents stage (f) above, when the prophets wanted to centralise all worship in Jerusalem. Its religious outlook is deeply spiritual. Its date is c. 650 B.C. For brevity Deut. is called D.

(iii) In practically all *Lev.*, and in much of the legislation of *Exod.* and *Numb.*, we see worship definitely centralised; there is but one sanctuary (Tabernacle) and one altar, and all the legislation has an eye to this centralisation. Moreover, it represents this centralisation, with all the ordinances as to worship, ritual, sacrifice, priesthood, etc., as ordained from the very first by God through Moses at Sinai. In a word, both in its laws and historical setting, this section breathes, throughout, the priestly spirit and religious atmosphere of the ecclesiastical age (see (g) *sup.*) which gave it birth about 500 B.C. This Priestly Code is known as P.

The same wrong order and confusion pervades the whole Bible. Hence the following chronological scheme, based mainly on Robertson Smith, Driver, and Cheyne, may prove useful :—

(A) *Oldest literature*—

Lyric poems. Song of Deborah; David's elegy;

¹ This is known as the "Book of the Covenant" (C). *Exod.* xxxiv. 11–27, a very ancient fragment, is the "Little Book of the Covenant," and many scholars believe that this may possibly have been the original Ten Commandments.

² In our chronological scheme (p. 38, *inf.*) we refer to this section I. as J and E, because as stated pp. 48 sqq., this oldest section was written by "Jehovah" writers and "Elohim" writers. [The old narratives of *Judg.*, and certainly I Sam. i.–xii., if not further, are essentially of a piece with J and E of the Mosaic Books (see Burney, *Judges*, xxxviii.).]

are all but contemporary with their events.

Some four or five psalms *may* possibly be David's.

Prose. The 2 Sam. ix.-xx. and 1 Kgs. i.-ii. document consists, mainly, of a single very early source narrating the court-history of David, and almost certainly written by a contemporary.¹

(B) *Early monarchy* (850-750 B.C.). *Vivid and dramatic prose-narratives*, e.g. of Pentateuch,² J and E, i.e. "The older strata of Gen., Exod., Numb., Josh., Judg., and 1 Sam.—the work of prophetic schools in the Southern (=J) and Northern (=E) kingdoms, which in all probability originally formed two continuous history books. Also the later elements in 2 Sam., and the oldest portions of *Kings*."

(C) *Earlier writing prophets, and historical works of their school* (760-586 B.C.): Amos (c. 760-750); Hosea (c. 750-737); Isaiah (740-700); Micah (724—); Deuteronomy (c. 650); [the editorial framework of Judg. and 1 and 2 Sam., which brought the books into the form in which they have come down to us]; Zephaniah (c. 627); Nahum (610-608); Ruth (?); Jeremiah (626-586); Habakkuk (c. 605-600); 1 and 2 Kgs. (sources largely much earlier); Obadiah (before and after 586); Lamentations (possibly Jeremiah's, probably later, c. 550 B.C.).

(D) *Exile and after* (586-150 B.C.):

Ezekiel (593-573); Proverbs (early 6th century); II Isaiah xl.-lv. (c. 540);³ P (c. 520); Haggai and

¹ Burney, *Judges*, xxxviii. note, supplemented by a note in his revision of this MS., from which the above is taken. He adds, "Perhaps written by Gad or Nathan. It is the oldest prose-document in the O.T. and of unique historical value. This is generally acknowledged by Biblical critics." The quotation under (B) *sup.* is also Prof. Burney's.

² *Pentateuch* (=the 5 works) = Mosaic Books; *Hexateuch* (=the 6 works) = Mosaic Books + Joshua.

³ III Isaiah (lvi.-lxvi.) "certainly in the main post-exilic, and as certainly the work of different writers. The term "Trito-Isaiah" is used for convenience, not as a single author, but to indicate the post-exilic character of lvi.-lxvi. in distinction from Is. xl.-lv." (Burney, see note¹.) (See also Jastrow (*Heb. and Bab. Trad.*, pp. 285 sqq.), who writes an excellent note on this subject.)

Zech. i.-viii. (c. 520); Job (late 6th century); Malachi (c. 450); Sources of Ezra and Nehem. (450-430); Jonah and Joel (date unknown; possibly after Exile).

332 B.C. and somewhat later: Eccles.; 1 and 2 Chron.; Esther; Ezra and Neh.; Dan. (c. 160 B.C.).

(Psalms practically all written between 600-150 B.C.)

To Solomon's Song is ascribed any date from 970-400; see Ch. XVII. *inf.*)

* * * * *

(4) *Many Biblical books look like literary forgeries.*— This brings us to the fourth and last of the difficulties in our list. The question is often asked: Why did late writers, living centuries after Moses, ascribe their laws and books to Moses? Or why is the Psalter, mostly written after the Captivity, entitled "The Psalms of David," while equally late *Proverbs* and *Ecclesiastes* are fathered on Solomon? Is not this literary forgery?

From our "truth of fact" standpoint, the Mosaic Books are a literary forgery; from the Hebrew "truth of idea" outlook, they are Moses' very own. In Israel's eyes, Moses was the father of all laws, for it was directly through Moses that God gave to Israel that oral law which is the source and basis of all after-legislation; similarly David is the father of all psalms (2 Chron. xxix. 30; 1 Chron. xvi. 4, cf. 2 Sam. xxii.); and Solomon of all "wisdom" literature and proverbs (1 Kgs. iv. 30 sqq.). Therefore, any legislator after Moses, or psalmist after David, or wisdom-writer after Solomon, felt in honour and duty bound not to take to himself the credit of his own laws or hymns or proverbs, but to ascribe them to the source of his inspiration. He blotted himself out as the mere copyist, pupil and expounder of his great predecessor, and realised that he could lay no claim to originality for his own writings; in his eyes they were not new creations, only the old adapted to the ideas and needs of a later day. Each of these great names was therefore regarded as fully entitled to

receive all the credit for anything new discovered in his own particular line of thought; the new author counted for nothing, Strange as this procedure seems to us, it was a high ideal, and to call it a literary forgery would be a gross libel.

But, praiseworthy as is this ideal, it has the defects of its qualities, two in particular: (1) The ascription of all legislation to Moses absolutely prevents us to-day from knowing what laws or what commandments Moses actually made, especially if we bear in mind another point. It was considered not only right, but due to the memory of Moses, over and above giving him the credit of new laws, to revise, modify and alter his actual laws so as to bring them up to the requirements of a later day; to tone down what was too harsh, to add what was lacking so as better to fulfil and bring up to date the religious purpose Moses himself had in view. For instance, in what form did the Ten Commandments leave Moses' hand? "They are not Moses'" at all, say some scholars. Many more would say: "They were originally given in a much briefer form, to which from time to time reflexions and promises were added which strengthened their appeal to the mind and will" (Dr. W. P. Paterson).¹ (2) The original idea may have been simply to give Moses, David and Solomon their due, but it was always liable to the great danger of also giving the weight or authority of these great names to productions not their own. As the Bible itself proves, this is precisely what happened after the Captivity. From the time of *Chronicles*, certainly, it was fully believed by the Jews themselves that, even as Moses had completed the Law of Israel for all time, before the Chosen People entered Canaan,

¹ Cf. Montefiore, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 553: "That the Ten Words in the form in which they now appear in Exodus cannot be Mosaic in their origin, is obvious and almost undisputed." Many modern scholars see Moses' Ten Commandments in Exod. xxxiv. and not Exod. xx. nor Deut. v.; and Exod. xxxiv., distinctly suggests that the sacred writer thought so too.

so David completed the theory and contents of the Temple-psalmody before the Temple itself was built (*e.g.* 2 Chron. xxix. 30).¹

It would be untrue to say there are no real "literary forgeries" in the Bible, but they only occur in writings after the Captivity. Oppressed Israel, no longer a nation, groaned under present ills. The outlook was black: "We see not our signs; there is no more any prophet, neither is there any among us that knoweth how long." God's direct revelations to man were things of the past, now contained only in the written "Law and the Prophets." In this pessimistic mood they were not likely to appreciate the religious geniuses (*e.g.* a "Job") standing in their midst (*cf.* St. Jo. i. 26). These had perforce to approach their countrymen through writings which claimed to be the work of some great figure in the past, *e.g.* Job, Solomon (*Ecclesiastes*), Daniel.

BOOKS OF MOSES, THEIR DATE AND AUTHORSHIP

Even in an uncritical seventeenth century, the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch was questioned on the following grounds:—

An author does not minutely describe his own death (Deut. xxxiv. 5), record his own virtues (Numb. xii. 3), or favourably compare himself with men living centuries later (Deut. xxxiv. 10). Again, such passages as Gen. xii. 6, "The Canaanite was *then* in the land," and Gen. xxxvi. 31, "Before there reigned any king over the children of Israel," prove that the writer is writing after 1000 B.C. The frequent repetitions, duplicates and contradictions in the Pentateuch point to the same conclusion.

But although the Mosaic authorship of the historical portion of these five books was open to question, the legislation was fully believed to be the work of Moses.

Astruc's clue.—The first real clue to the Mosaic

¹ On the whole subject, see Jastrow, *Heb. and Bab. Trad.*, pp. 285, sqq.

problem was Jean Astruc's (1753). He found that entire sections of the Pentateuch called God Jehovah, while equally large portions seem to know Him only as Elohim.

De Wette's clue.—In 1805 de Wette added another link to the chain of evidence. Confining himself mainly to the historical side, he made these discoveries:—

A study of *Judg.*, *Sam.* and *Kgs.* shows the laws of Moses unknown or ignored for many centuries after him. Thus, if Deut. xvii. 14-20 is Moses' own, why does 1 Sam. viii. 7 make it a heinous sin to ask for a king? Again, Israel's history shows that the Deuteronomic Law abolishing local shrines and altars and forbidding images was not known till about 700 B.C. Clearly, then, Deut. is a late work. Moreover, the Genesis history is untrustworthy, the moral and religious tone of the Pentateuch is centuries ahead of Moses' day, and the Pentateuch bristles with contradictions.

Graf's clue.—But it was chiefly Graf, and his pupil Kuenen, who discovered the true clue. 2 Kgs. xviii. (*cf.*, for Josiah, 2 Kgs. xxii.) tells us that in Hezekiah's reign a reform was set on foot to abolish village high-places and centralise all worship in one place, Jerusalem; a reform legalised by Josiah in 621 B.C. Turning to the Hexateuch, even an uncritical reader can see that:—

(a) In *Gen.* and *Exod.* xx. 22-xxiii. 33, most of their contents were written at a time when local shrines were recognised, hallowed and dotted all over the land. (b) *Deut.* shows a complete change. Jehovah is to be worshipped only in one place. But this is only an order (xii.), not yet an accomplished fact, "ye shall not do after all the things that we do here this day" (xii. 8). (c) In the legislative portion of *Exod.* (except *Exod.* xx. 22-xxiii. 33 and xxxiv. 11-26), *Numb.*, and practically all *Lev.*, we find sacrificial worship confined to a single altar, that is, worship definitely centralised at a single sanctuary, and precise rules of worship clearly defined. The reform proposed by *Deut.* is an accomplished fact: one sanctuary, one altar, only priests can offer sacrifice.

Now these three stages exactly correspond with three actual stages in Israel's history: (a) Up to Josiah's reign local shrines and altars were all over the land, and any man could offer his own sacrifice, be his own priest. This was hallowed custom; Exod. xx. 24 gives it as God's own order. (b) Hezekiah (727-698)¹ tried to reform worship and do away with the superstitions and abuse of the high places and local altars, but his success was small. (c) Josiah (621) was more or less successful, and did practically put down these local shrines and centralise worship awhile in Jerusalem, but not till after the Exile was the reform an accomplished fact and priests the only ministers at the altar.

Ministration at the altar.—The same three stages can be equally illustrated if we confine ourselves to the altar and its ministers:—

(a) Before the Deuteronomy stage, priestly duties were not confined to Levites; any one could be his own priest. (b) In *Deut.* priestly duties are confined to Levites. *Deut.* xviii. 6-8 stipulates that, with the abolition of local shrines, provincial Levites officiating there, on coming up to the central sanctuary, are to have full priestly rights at the central altar equally with the ministers at the altar (= Jerusalem Levites) in "the place which the Lord shall choose." (c) As a matter of fact, Josiah's reform of 621 would not allow this: "*The priests of the high places (=provincial Levites) came not up to the altar of the Lord in Jerusalem (i.e. were not allowed by the Jerusalem hierarchy to sacrifice there), but they did eat unleavened bread among their brethren*" (2 Kgs. xxiii. 8. sq.). About thirty years later, Ezek. xliv. 10 also definitely means to exclude these Levites from the altar, because, as priests of the local shrines, they have as good as served idols. The legislation of the later portion of the Pentateuch (Priestly Code) definitely excludes them from offering sacrifice and relegates them to subordinate duties.

¹ A glance at *e.g.* Hastings, D. B., art. *O.T. Chronology*, i. p. 401, shows how uncertain is our chronology of the monarchy. There are three ways of reckoning it. The Assyrian canon is our generally accepted standard to-day.

We dwell on this point, the status of Priests and Levites, for it marks the transition from Deuteronomy to the Priestly Code.

Now even on these two lines alone,—the transition from local shrines to a central sanctuary, and the status of the Priests and Levites,—the Pentateuch naturally subdivides into three distinct groups and periods of composition. And a closer examination (literary and historical) of the Hexateuch confirms this evidence and carries it further to more definite results. For instance, the Hexateuch is full of duplicate and often contradictory accounts of the same events, *e.g.* two inconsistent accounts of the Creation, the Flood, Joshua's distribution of the land of Canaan among the tribes. Exactly the same variety meets us respecting the legislation at Sinai (= Horeb), the Festivals, the treatment of slaves and, as already seen, the mode of worship. Moreover, side by side we see distinct layers of religious and moral thought which could not possibly have been co-existent in Moses' day, neither can they be attributed to one author. We shall briefly glance at these different strands of evidence.

Moral and religious ideas—

(a) In *Gen.*, and the narrative portion of *Exod.*, *Numb.* and *Josh.* we have a very primitive conception of God. He appears in human form and acts as a man, even talks, walks, eats with man, and actually wrestles with Jacob. The state of morality reflected in these sections is also very primitive. (b) In *Deut.* we have a conception of God and a morality so lofty that only in the canonical prophets can we find its parallel. (c) In the legislative portions of *Exod.*, *Lev.*, *Numb.*, the religious attitude has hardened to an ecclesiastical creed. Religion and worship are clothed in a web of ceremonial formalities. God is "holy" and transcendent and only to be approached through His priests. The Tabernacle, altar, sacrifice, and ritual are all in all. Ritual and morality are all but on a level. In a word, we are in the period of Israel after the Exile.

Festivals.—

(a) In the older sections, there are only three Feasts, all agricultural, the Feasts of Unleavened Bread, Weeks, and In-gathering. They are mainly times of rejoicing, with a sacrifice,—“half-sacrifices, half-picnics, and largely secular” (Montefiore, *H. L.*, 345)—and not at a central sanctuary. (b) In *Deut.* we have the same three Feasts, still mainly agricultural, but the Feast of “Passover and Unleavened Bread” is now associated with the departure from Egypt, and the Feasts are to be held only at the one sanctuary and in a spirit of holy worship. (c) In the later priestly sections, there are six Festivals and only one is at all agricultural (the Feast of Harvest or Weeks); the rest are strictly Church Festivals and, now for the first time, their dates are fixed.

*Legislation.*¹—

Exod. xx. 22–xxiii. 33 and xxiv. 3–8 give us a definite body of laws, religious and civil, of singularly primitive character, originally a very old Palestinian civil code. Described as written in a book and making a covenant between God and man, it is known as the Book of the Covenant,² or, for brevity, C.

Exod. xx. 1–17 (cf. *Deut.* v.) gives us the moral Law³ (ten commandments) of Sinai as written by God on Two Tables of stone, which Moses dashed to the ground and shattered because of his anger at the Golden Calf worship.

¹ Carefully distinguish between the *age of the laws themselves* and the *dates of their codification*. So-called new laws, especially in older days, merely embody old “custom law” brought up to date, and often reveal traces of their original primitive character. *Exod.* xx.–xxiii., as it stands, reflects the age of *Judges* and early monarchy. But Burney (*Judges*, 329 sq.) rightly sees in it traces of human sacrifice (*Exod.* xxii. 29) and other primitive customs, and traces its laws back to pre-Joshua days and sees connecting links with Hammurabi’s Code (c. 2000 B.C.).

² *Book of the Covenant Code*, simple and on agricultural basis. Cattle and crops are the main wealth. Its criminal and civil justice is on the nomad Arab basis of retaliation and money compensation. It deals with murder on the principle of blood-revenge, but the innocent man-slayer may seek asylum at God’s altar (xxi. 13). With murder are ranked man-stealing, offences against parents, witchcraft. Other injuries are settled by decisions at the sanctuary, or on the principle of self-help by retaliation. Slaves have some rights; women are the man’s property.

³ As already said (p. 40 *sup.*) this version in *Exod.* xx. and *Deut.* v. has almost certainly been revised by a prophetic redactor of c. 700 B.C. who has greatly enlarged the original Ten Words, adding reflections and promises to the original very short “Words.”

Exod. xxxiv. professes to reproduce this same moral Law on Two new Tables, yet it is totally different. It is not moral Law at all, but consists of prescriptions for festivals and ritual rules. Moreover, *Deut.* ix. 8-x. 5 tells us that it was the Decalogue of *Deut.* v. 6-21 which was restored. This clashes with *Exod.* xxxiv. 1 sqq. The *Exod.* xxxiv. Code is very old, and many scholars to-day see in it the original Ten Words.¹

The *Leviticus* legislation is a great mass of ritual and ceremonial law. According to *Lev.*, all its ordinances of worship; its regulations for one sanctuary, one altar, one legitimate priesthood; and all its minutely prescribed ritual, were directly revealed by God Himself at Sinai.²

If the reader will carefully study (a) *Exod.* xx. 22-xxiii. 33 and also *Exod.* xxxiv.; (b) *Exod.* xx. 1-17, *Deut.* v, *Deut.* ix. 8-x. 5; (c) any portion of *Lev.*, he will see what contradictory duplicates the Books of Moses give us of the Law-giving by God at Sinai (or Horeb). He will also see in this legislation the same three stages [(a), (b), (c)], already so often noted.

Clearly, then, the existence of three distinct strata, three stages at least in the composition of the Hexateuch, is patent. But how distinguish them? For at present they seem so inextricably mixed up as to defy disentanglement. Scholars have laboured long and assiduously at this problem and, by applying Astruc's, de Wette's and Graf's clues, and also on the basis of sound historical and textual criticism, have achieved splendid results. They now unanimously recognise four main sources for the Hexateuch.

¹ Viz. (1) Worship no strange god. (2) Make no molten gods. (3) Keep the Feast of Unleavened Bread. (4) All the first-born are Mine. (5) Keep the Feast of Weeks and (6) the Feast of Ingathering. (7) Do not mingle unleavened bread with sacrificial blood. (8) The fat of my Feast not to remain overnight. (9) Offer the best of thy first-fruits in God's house. (10) Seethe not a kid in its mother's milk. (Better still, make (5) and (6) one, and insert *Exod.* xxxiv. 21, "Six days work, rest the seventh" (= 5).)

² Over and above Temple and sacrificial regulations, the Priestly Code dealt with ceremonial laws concerning (1) the observance of sabbaths and festivals; (2) Meats permitted and forbidden; (3) Laws respecting tithes, first-fruits, etc.; (4) Things "clean" and "unclean." Here, again, many of these laws as to "meats" and "objects or persons clean and unclean," go back to primitive *taboo* days; see note ¹, p. 45, *sup.*

Three of these run, in varying proportion, from *Gen.* to *Numb.*, reappearing in *Deut.* xxxi. 14-xxxiv. 12 and *Josh.*, while the fourth is found in *Deut.* and *Josh.* only.

Of these four sources, two are easily recognisable. Any reader must see that *Deut.*, in style and character, differs so strikingly from the rest of the Hexateuch that it stands in a class by itself. It is so highly spiritual in tone, its conception of religion so prophetic, its note so hortatory and inspiring that it stands to the other "Books of Moses" as S. John to the other Gospels. For brevity, *Deut.* is called D.¹

The second source is the one so often referred to as (c) in the above analysis of the Hexateuch, that portion of it dealing with the ecclesiastical or priestly laws, ritual, institutions which came into force in Israel after the Exile. Technically it is called the Priestly Code or P. It is interwoven in the narrative from *Gen.* to *Numb.*, reappears slightly in *Josh.* (see n. p. 55 *inf.*), and, including the Law of Holiness² which forms a previous stage in its development, forms the whole of *Lev.* Its peculiarities, literary, religious, and historical, are so pronounced that, like D, it may be distinguished with certainty almost in any combination by reason of its love of ceremonial law, its statistical details, its stereotyped phraseology.

D and P eliminated, we come to a harder problem. There now remain two other sources, so similar in many respects that it would be hard to separate them but for Astruc's clue (p. 41 *sup.*). Throughout *Gen.*

¹ It is now generally admitted that *Deut.* v.-xxvi. and xxviii. represent the original Deuteronomy. Chs. i-iv. (Wellhausen says i.-xi.) were afterwards written as an introduction; xxix.-xxxiv. are also later additions. (From Ryle and Driver.)

² *Law of Holiness* (=, roughly speaking, *Lev.* xvii.-xxvi.), a distinct body of law, forms the oldest part of the P Legislation, and is the centre and kernel of its new religious movement. It is marked off from the rest of P by its intense feeling of reverence for the "holiness" of God and everything connected with His service; "ye shall be holy, for I am holy" is its keynote. In parts, e.g. *Lev.* xxvi., it is almost akin to *Deut.* in its spirituality. The Law of Holiness (H) is probably of the age of Ezekiel, and in matter, style and wording recalls Ezekiel. It stands half-way between D and P.

and up to *Exod.* iii. 14,¹ large sections know God as Jehovah, while parallel sections as consistently call Him Elohim. The clue is not infallible, for later editors have effected some changes in names, but in most cases the distinction is marked and clear. For brevity, the Jehovah source is called J, the Elohim E. By way of illustration, from this oldest section of the Hexateuch we shall now give a few instances, taken at random, out of the many (a) double and divergent narratives of the same events, (b) double and divergent explanations of proper names,—so as to prove that this oldest section is itself a composite work.

*J and E duplicates*² :—

Gen. xvi. 4-14 and xxi. 8-21 give us two totally different accounts of, and reasons for, Hagar's flight. They are clearly distinct versions of the same tradition, and we are not therefore surprised to find their sources different, Gen. xvi. 4-14 using Jehovah, Gen. xxi. 8-21 Elohim, exclusively.—In Gen. xxxii. 1-2 (E) the dual form Mahanaim, "two hosts or companies," is explained by the statement that the "angels of God" met Jacob, so he called the place Manahaim, "two hosts," *i.e.* his own and that of the angels. In Gen. xxxii. 4-14 (J) we are told (7) that Jacob divided his people into "two companies," so that if Esau attacked one the other might escape; in verse 10 he confesses his sense of Jehovah's mercies in that, whereas

¹ Because *Exod.* iii. 14 represents God as first revealing Himself then as Jehovah.

² P also supplies many duplicates in Gen. Two good examples are: (1) The Creation: *Gen.* i.-ii. 4a is P, ii. 4b sqq. is J; (2) in the Flood Story (*Gen.* vi. 5-ix. 17): *Gen.* vi. 9-22; vii. 6-9, 11, 13-16a, 18-21, 24; viii. 1-2a, 3b-5, 13b-19; ix. 1-17 is P; the rest is J. If P be read consecutively, it gives a consistent and almost complete account of the Deluge. If the J sections be read consecutively, they will be seen to give a different version of the same events, though not so completely preserved as the other.—As P and E both consistently use Elohim throughout *Gen.* one might expect to find it hard to distinguish them. Not at all. E and J are simple, naïve, primitive in style and character, while P's character is the reverse. So peculiar to P are its style, characteristics and vocabulary that it can be recognised almost at a glance. *Gen.* i. is out and away the finest chapter of P, and exceptional.—Where there is some difficulty is within the older E itself. There is an older and a younger layer of E, one very like J, while the later stratum is close akin to the teaching of the prophets and almost Deuteronomic in character. It is often called E². Hosea's ideas and phrases colour it throughout and its date is not earlier than 700 B.C.

he crossed Jordan on his outgoing journey with his staff only, now he is become "two companies" (the plural *Mahanôth* is used with the numeral *two* prefixed). This is clearly a divergent explanation of the dual Mahanaim.—Gen. xxi. 22-32 (E) and xxvi. 19-33 (J) give us duplicate and inconsistent reasons and explanations of the proper name Beer-sheba, again reproducing distinct versions of tradition.—Again, Gen. xvii. is P, xviii. is J, and xx. 1-17 is E. In Gen. xvii. and xviii. Abraham and Sarah are so old that the birth of a son to them is an unheard of miracle, yet two chapters later (xx.) Abimelech is enamoured of Sarah and takes her to wife, as Abraham had palmed her off as his sister for fear of his life.—Note also how Gen. xx. (E) makes God warn Abimelech in a dream and saves Sarah, while Gen. xii. 10-20 (J) gives a totally different account.—Compare the different explanations of Isaac's name in Gen. xvii. (P), xviii. (J) and xxi. 6 (E). Similarly E explains the name Joseph as "God hath *taken away* my reproach" (from Heb. *'āsaph* "to take away"); J explains it as "may Jehovah *add to me* another son." (Heb. *yāsaph* "to add.")

At the end of this chapter we give a list of the Genesis sections belonging to J, E, and P respectively. It will be noted that E is not found in Gen. i.-xi. It apparently began its history with Abraham. J and E carry their history certainly down to Joshua's death, "and when we find in *Judg.* and *1 Sam.* a similar combination of two old narratives possessing much the same characteristics as J and E, the question is at once raised whether these are not to be regarded as the continuation of J and E in *Joshua*, J and E thus representing, in their original forms, continuous prophetic histories of the nation of Israel down to the foundations of the monarchy, if not further." Closer examination seems to prove that this is the case. (Burney, *Judges*, xxxviii.)

Striking and persistent characteristics differentiate J and E the one from the other. Even in our English version, the reader will readily detect a difference in the story-teller's art and manner in each case by comparing *e.g.* :—

J's Gen. ii. 4 sqq. (Creation), iii. (Temptation and Fall), iv. (Cain and Abel), xviii.-xix. (God a guest in Abraham's tent, story of Lot and Sodom), xxiv. (Abraham's servant's quest for a wife for Isaac), xxvi. (Isaac in Egypt risks his wife's honour), xxvii. (Jacob deceives his father), xxxiv. (Story of Dinah), xxxviii. (Judah and Tamar), xxxix. (Joseph and Potiphar's wife), etc., etc. ; And E's: Gen. xx. (Abraham risks his wife's honour), xxi. 8-32 (Stories of Hagar, and Beersheba), xxii. 1-14 (Sacrifice of Isaac), xxxi. 4-47 (Jacob's flight from Laban), xl.-xli. (Joseph interprets dreams), xlv.-xlvi. 5 (Joseph reveals himself and sends for his father).

J and E are often closely akin in their ideas and language. Ever simple and natural, their admirable prose narratives are fresh and vivacious, full of rich colour, life and movement, full of exact observation of nature and men, always drawing directly from life, and working on the reader, not by elaborate description, but by dramatic presentation of character and action. Their characters are men and women of flesh and blood, and certainly not drawn with a puritanical pen, and often with an undercurrent of dry humour. They tell their tale with sympathy, too intent upon the story itself to point a moral, and all the more effectively appeal to all that is best and truest in the human heart. It is from J and E, with their narratives so full of human interest, so rich in colour and imagination (*e.g.* the loves of Jacob and Rachel, the story of Joseph) that we must judge of Hebrew literature in its first and best bloom.

Of the two, J is the more simple, fresh, dramatic. He has more lightness and delicacy of touch and warmth of colouring, producing the finest effects with the fewest strokes, *e.g.* the scene of Rachel and Jacob at the well (Gen. xxix. 2-12). There is a charming simplicity, quaint naivety, in the human way in which he speaks of God and makes Him act. Gen. ii., iii.-iv., xviii. are striking instances of God's familiarity with His friends, and His homely way

of doing things, in J's exquisite old picture. We see God walking in the Garden in the cool of the day, calling to Adam and Eve to ask where they are, making coats of skins to clothe them, putting a mark on Cain for his protection, shutting the door of the Ark behind Noah, smelling the sweet savour of Noah's sacrifice, coming down to see the tower of Babel, and also to see whether Sodom was as bad as represented (Gen. xi. 5, xviii. 21). In Gen. xviii. God comes to Abraham's tent, eats of his butter and milk and veal, predicts the birth of a son to aged Sarah, and asks why Sarah laughs at the statement. He wrestles with Jacob in Gen. xxxii. 24 sqq., and seeks to kill Moses, till Zipporah appeases God and saves her husband (Exod. iv. 24 sqq.). In the same spirit J reports the most wonderful events as if they were the most natural things in the world, *e.g.* God brings the animals to Adam to see what he will call them, Jacob secures speckled herds and brown flocks by placing straked rods in the troughs, and a wind parts a sea in two. In J heaven and earth blend into one, and his whole atmosphere is full of a sweet poetic fragrance and charm.

As a story-teller E is little inferior to J, but he is less vivid and picturesque. His God is, if we may say so, more dignified, stands more aloof from man, and usually reveals Himself through heavenly voices, dream-visions, or by means of angels.¹ Similarly E explains the wonders of J's fairyland as due to the direct intervention of God, and magnifies the miracle. Thus in Gen. xxxi. 4-13, it is God in His Providence who secures an abundance of speckled cattle for Jacob, just as it is God, through the marvel-working rod of Moses, that parts the Red Sea. Again, where J openly reveals his heroes' human foibles, *e.g.* Abraham's risking his wife's honour, Jacob's deceits,

¹ In Gen. xxviii. 12 they seem to need ladders to go to and from heaven. Contrast to E's "angels" (in verse 12), verse 13 (J), where Jehovah Himself stands at the top of the ladder and speaks.

Hagar's expulsion, E tones down these objectionable features. Thus in Gen. xvi. 4-6, Hagar's expulsion is due purely to Sarah's jealousy, while in Gen. xxi. 12 Abraham is counselled of God to send her away; even as J in Gen. xii. simply states that Abraham palmed off his wife as his sister in Egypt for fear of his life, whereas E (xx.) is at pains to show how God saw to it from the first that no harm came to Sarah.¹

Many local touches—*e.g.* the stress laid on the sanctuaries of Bethel, Shechem, Beersheba, and the prominence given to Joseph, father of Ephraim and Manasseh,—point to the Northern Kingdom as E's home, while similar local touches suggest Judah as J's. From their general religious tone, their toleration of much against which canonical prophets ever protested, and their never subordinating their evident interest in their stories to a specifically religious purpose,² J and E must be earlier than the canonical prophets. Their style and tone stamp their narrative as the work of the early prophetic school. We speak of J and E, but they are not the work of a single hand in either case. The narrative of J in Gen. i.-xi. is clearly composed of two strands, and throughout J and E, from *Gen.* to *Sam.*, considerable variations are to be found within J and E alike. Each is the outcome of a long literary process, the work of a "school" of like-minded prophetic historians. In their histories, they embodied pre-existing material,

¹ Besides the peculiarities noted, J and E have many other distinguishing characteristics. For instance, E is more of an antiquarian and more learned; he makes Laban, an Aramaic Syrian, call the boundary cairn Jegarsahadutha, Jacob gives it the good Hebrew name Gal'Ed (Gilead) (Gen. xxxi. 47); he knows Egyptian names (xli. 45); and refuses to use the name Jehovah till it is revealed to Moses, for fear of anachronism.—E uses "Amorites" for J's "Canaanites"; Horeb (E) for Sinai (J); Jacob (E usually) for Israel (J); in J Moses acts by and for himself, in E Aaron, Jethro, Joshua help him much. In E more is made of prophets than in J, *e.g.* Abraham, Moses, Miriam are so called.

² On the other hand, we must not fancy that J and E endorse all they report. They often just repeat tradition without comment of their own. Ancient ceremonies, however, the original meaning of which was forgotten, they interpret in the light of their own day, *e.g.* Jacob disguising himself with skins. So of the names of sacred places, Beersheba, Bethel.

folklore, legends, poems, tradition of various date, transmitted orally (or by writing ¹) from very much earlier times, as well as several collections of old laws.

Such were J and E. The date of J is assumed to be *c.* 850 B.C., that of E *c.* 750 B.C. Genesis gives us the best samples of both, but the narratives of Exod. and Numb. also supply many of their masterly pictures. Though they often closely resemble each other, they were written independently, for E did not copy J. Their resemblance is due to the fact that J and E were parallel narratives drawing on a common stock of tradition which had already crystallised into a comparatively fixed form.²

As parallel documents with much in common and supplementing each other, the attempt to combine them in a continuous narrative was natural and soon adopted. About 700 B.C. J and E were welded into one narrative JE, and so skilfully that at times it is all but impossible to separate and reconstruct these two sources. JE extends as far as Joshua, but may go further. In JE the prophetic moral and religious element is strong.

About 650 B.C., as already stated, “prophetic” Deuteronomy was composed. At first it was all but exclusively a Law-Book, beginning at Deut. v.; v.-xi. expounding the fundamental principles of religion, xii.-xxvi. containing special laws,—laws, however, not systematically and technically stated, but ethically expounded,—and xxviii. as a fitting and effective conclusion of the whole, a peroration. So it is a Law-Book in a class by itself, hortatory and homiletical thought on the lines of the canonical prophets. It deals mainly with religious reforms and regulations. Both its religious code and its history are based on

¹ A scribe chronicler was attached to the royal court from David's day onwards. The earliest books were apparently Lyrics, *e.g.* “The Books of the Wars of Jehovah” (Numb. xxi.-14), “The Book of Jashar” (Josh. x., 2 Sam. i.).

² Both J and E were revised and enlarged by later hands. There were very many editorial revisions of the Hexateuch down to, may be, the third century, and consequent additions and alterations.

JE adapted to the needs and ideas of 650 B.C. The special laws in D, especially xxii. sqq., are similar to those of Exod. xxi.-xxiii., and Lev. xvii.-xxv., and embody ancient custom. Chs. v.-xi. form the core of D and lay down its theocratic principles, embodying the Decalogue of Exod. xx.

D, as it stands, is not the work of one hand or of one date. The original nucleus (v.-xxvi., xxviii.) has been revised, expanded and modified. "Some little time after the kernel (chs. v.-xxvi., xxviii.) of Dt. was composed, it was enlarged by a second Deuteronomic writer or writers" (Driver). This done, the next stage, during the Captivity, was the inclusion of D in a new edition of JE. This is known as JED.

During the Exile also, a new body of ritual law, the Code of Holiness, (H) (see p. 47, n. ² *sup.*), was drawn up, about Ezekiel's day, and probably by a disciple of his. Later still, *c.* 500 B.C., was written P, (p. 47, *sup.*) with its great mass of ritual and ceremonial laws. Next, P (including H now) was united with JED., about 420-400 B.C., and a new historical setting was written as a framework to P's legislation. "The Editors took P as their basis, and introduced in each period the parts of JE which seemed to them to belong there" (Prof. G. Moore).¹ Not content with its large contribution to the Pentateuch, and the new sacerdotal version of its history, the priestly editors of P "revised the whole Hexateuch, pieced together its writings in such a way as almost everywhere to make their own line of thought the foundation of the whole, and, wherever possible, to adapt the other writings to their own pattern."

* * * * *

The following Table gives Ryle's analysis of J and E in Genesis :—

¹ "Speaking very roughly, P embraces 11 chs. in *Gen.*, some 19 in *Exod.*, all *Lev.*, and 28 chs. in *Numb.* The Pentateuch, as we now have it, is a fusion of these 85 chs. with the two far older narratives, and with the Law of D" (Montefiore, *II.L.*, 315). Of course, this does not imply that JE, etc., wrote in *chapters*.

J: 2^{4b-4²⁶}; 5²⁰; 6¹⁻⁸; 7^{1-5, 12, 16b, 17, 22, 23}; 8^{2b, 3a, 6-12, 13b, 20-22}; 9¹⁸⁻²⁷; 10^{8-19, 21, 24-30}; 11^{1-9, 23-30}; 12^{1-4a, 6-20}; 13^{1-5, 7-11a, 12b-18}; 16^{1b, 2, 4-14}; 18; 19^{1-28, 30-38}; 21^{1a, 2a, 33}; 22²⁰⁻²⁴; 24; 25^{1-6, 11b, 18, 21-26a, 27-34}; 26^{1-33, (exc. 16, 18)}; 27^{1-45 (mainly)}; 28^{10, 13-16, 19}; 29^{2-14, 19-35 (exc. 28b, 29)}; 30^{1-23 (mainly), 24-42}; 31^{1, 3 (25-27, 33-40), 46, 48-50}; 32^{4-14, 23-32}; 33¹⁻¹⁷; 34 (largely); 35^{21-22a}; (36³¹⁻³⁸); 37^{12-35 (partly)}; 38-39; 42^{35-44⁸⁴}; 46^{25-47^{5, 13-26, 27a, 29-31}}; 49^{1b-28a}; 50^{1-11, 14}.

E: 15 (portions,¹ according to some scholars), e.g. parts of vv. 1, 2, 3, 5; 20¹⁻¹⁷; 21⁸⁻³²; 22^{1-14, 19}; 28^{11, 12, 17, 18, 20-22}; 29^{1, 15-18}; 30 (portions); 31^{2, 4-47 (exc. 18b)}; 32^{8, 13b-22}; 33^{5b, 18b-20}; 35^{1-8, 16-20}; 37^{2b-11, 14a, 18, 19, 22-24, 28a, 28c-30, 36}; 40 (showing some influence of J); 41^{1-45, 50-57}; 42¹⁻³⁷; 45^{1-46⁵}; 48^{1-2, 8-22}; 50¹⁵⁻²⁶.

The following is Driver's list of P sections in the Pentateuch²:—

Gen. 1 to 2^{4a}; 5^{1-28, 30-32}; 6⁹⁻²²; 7^{6, 7-9, 13-16a, 18-21, 24}; 8^{1-2a, 3b-5, 14-19}; 9^{1-17, 23-29}; 10^{1-7, 20, 22-23, 31-32}; 11^{10-27, 31-32}; 12^{4b-5}; 13^{6, 11b-12a}; 16^{1a, 3, 15-16}; 17; 19²⁰; 21^{1b, 2b-5}; 23; 25^{7-11a, 12-17, 19-20, 26b}; 26³⁴⁻³⁵; 27⁴⁶ to 28⁹; 29^{24, 29}; 31^{18b}; 33^{18a}; 34^{1-2a, 4, 6, 8-10, 13-18, 20, 24, 25, 27-29}; 35^{9-13, 15, 22b-29}; 36 (in the main); 37^{1-2a}; 41^{1b}; 46²⁷; 47^{5-6a (1xx.), 7-11, 27b-28}; 48^{3-6, 7⁹}; 49^{1a, 23b-33}; 50¹²⁻¹³.

Exod. 1^{1-7, 13-14}; 2^{23b-25}; 6² to 7^{13, 10-20a, 21b-22}; 8^{5-7, 15b-19}; 9⁸⁻¹²; 12^{1-20, 28, 37a, 40-51}; 13^{1-2, 20}; 14^{1-1, 8-9, 15-18, 21a, 21c-23, 26-27a, 28a, 29}; 16^{1-3, 6-24, 31-36}; 17^{1a}; 19^{1-2a}; 24^{15-18a}; 25¹ to 31^{18a}; 34²⁹⁻⁷⁵; 35 to 40.

Lev. 1 to 16; (17 to 26); 27.

Numb. 1¹ to 10²⁸; 13^{1-17a, 21, 25-26a, 32a}; 14^{1-2, 5-7, 10, 26-38}; 15; 16^{1a, 2b-11, (16-17), 18-24, 27a, 32b, 35, (36-40), 41-50}; 17 to 19; 20^{1a, -3b, 6, 12-13, 23-29}; 21^{4a, 10-11}; 22¹; 25⁶⁻¹⁸; 26 to 31; 32^{18-19, 28-32}; 33 to 36.

Deut. 32⁴⁸⁻⁵²; 34^{1a, 8-9}.

¹ "It is to be observed that the E passages are first to be identified in the story of Abraham" (Ryle).

² A document close akin to P is incorporated in Josh. xiii. 15-xxi. 42. "This document, though of the same character and age as P in the Pentateuch, cannot be shown to be originally of the same source, and may have originally formed an independent document. The part borne by the Priestly writer in *Josh.* seems to be somewhat different to that fulfilled by P in the Pentateuch. In *Gen.*-*Num.* the narrative of P is to a large extent complete in itself, and forms as it were the framework of the narrative. In Josh. i.-xii. the traces of the Priestly hand are comparatively insignificant, amounting in all to some 10½ verses" (Burney, *Schweich Lect.*, p. 26 n.).

CHAPTER V

EARLY MAN AND HIS CREED

IF our plea in Chs. I-IV. is sound, two points now stand out: (1) The Bible's one aim is edification, not information; character-building, not head-knowledge. It is our spiritual guide, not a historical or scientific handbook. "My Bible tells me how to go to heaven, not how the heavens go," said Galileo to his inquisitors. (2) The Bible sets truth of idea above truth of fact, and we must read it in the same spirit. We are bound by its judgments of value, but free to challenge its statements of fact. On God, Life, Duty it says all but the last word; to it we must go for our knowledge of God's will for us. But for our knowledge of God's methods, how He works in history and Nature, our modern science and our history-books are our true guides.

This chapter takes us far behind Israel's history to the infancy of man. Yet omit it we cannot. It alone explains that large quaint primitive element which is at the root of every religion in the world. We meet it constantly in Israel's religion in quaint myths, customs, superstitions, which are "survivals" from a lower level of culture, waifs and strays of man's beliefs in the babyhood of the world. For instance, how else can we explain these strange Hebrew beliefs:—Man is formed out of clods, and God breathes the breath of life into his nostrils, while woman is created out of man's rib, because God saw he was lonely (Gen. ii. 7, 18); Lot's wife turns into a pillar of salt; Satan is a talking snake;

Balaam's ass speaks; God is worshipped as a bull; angels wed the daughters of men, and giants are born; God sets a mark upon Cain to stop others from killing him; there are trees of life and knowledge, and forbidden fruits; the ashes of a red heifer remove sin, so does the placing of people's sins on the head of a goat and sending it to Azazel, an evil spirit in the desert¹; the belief in spirits lurking everywhere, and in magic and witches; the ordeal of the "waters of bitterness or jealousy" which will cause a faithless wife's body to swell and her thigh to fall away; the laws of "uncleanness"; circumcision so imperative that God "met and sought to kill" Moses for omitting it; the various *taboos*, to break which means disaster, disease or death, *e.g.* to eat *taboo* fruit or touch "holy" (= *taboo*) objects (*e.g.* the Ark) or persons (*e.g.* kings (2 Sam. i. 14, sqq.)); ladders to heaven for the use of angels, and God eating butter, milk and veal as Abraham's guest in his tent (Gen. xviii., xxviii.); the magic power of names; Rachel conceiving through eating mandrakes; cutting oneself, shaving the hair, wearing sackcloth after a death, necromancy, etc., etc. ?

Such passages—and they can be indefinitely multiplied—read like so many pages out of Tylor's *Primitive Culture*² or Frazer's *Golden Bough*.³ So

¹ See Estlin Carpenter, *Comparative Religion*, in "Home University Library" series, pp. 204-207, where this vicarious transference of sin to the bodies of men, animals, and objects, is well illustrated by instances all over the world.

² This MS. was ready for press before Frazer's classic, *Folklore in the O.T.*, appeared. I meant to re-write this chapter and incorporate much of Frazer's valuable matter, but critics advise me to let it stand as it is. Frazer's book is, in discreet hands, invaluable to the Bible student. He flashes a powerful sidelight from *Primitive Culture* on, *e.g.* : why it is forbidden to seeet a kid in its mother's milk, (by sympathetic magic it hurts the cow and her milk); or to leap on the threshold (Zeph. i. 9), (because it angers the spirits of the dead buried under it); or to number the people; why some slaves have their ears bored; why Jacob disguised himself with skins; why an ox that gored was stoned and his master put to death; why priests had tinkling golden bells on their robes, (to frighten away bad spirits). Specially interesting are Frazer's chapters on Jacob: why he inherits before his elder brother (ultimogeniture, cf. the borough-English custom), or marries the elder sister first and the next as a matter of course, and serves Laban for his two wives. Bearing on what we say in the text of spirits leaving the body in dreams, etc., is Frazer's

they are. They are survivals of days when the remote ancestors of Israel were, as in all other races, rude savages; and only a knowledge of primitive man's beliefs can give us the key to them. Here we need not go back to man's earliest or pre-animistic stage, when man knew himself only as body and not soul. How he came to know he had a spirit or soul is still a moot point. The trance or dream theory at present still holds the field.¹ Men, animals, objects are seen in dreams and trances. Therefore, says primitive man: When I sleep I go to distant places, see distant people, even see and speak with the dead. So, beside my body-self, I have another self, "pale and soft so that if any one tries to grasp it he feels nothing"; when I sleep, that "me" leaves my body, travels in a moment any distance, and goes on its own business. In death the spirit quits its body-home. But its old body is still its very own, so long as a particle of it is left; so is its tomb. It hovers around them, haunts them, and expects to find its food and drink ready for it there. Woe betide any one, especially a relative, who fails in his duty to the spirit or its other self, its corpse! Both by reason of the mystery (baffling to savages) and horror of death to early man, and also out of sheer terror of the dead man's ghost, a human corpse—and any corpse—is to him the superlative type of awful power for evil. So is blood; it *literally* "shrieks from the ground" for vengeance (Gen. iv. 10, sqq.), and though

explanation of 1 Sam. xxv. 29: ". . . the soul of my lord shall be bound in the *bundle of life*," the early belief that souls can be extracted from their bodies by owners, friends, or witches, to be tied up in a bundle for safety in friendly hands, or, in hostile hands, the bundle could be undone and the souls scattered to the winds.

¹ Does the dream or trance explanation satisfy? If man's personality, soul, spirit, "the immortal centre in us all," the god within us, be really spirit of God's Spirit, "thirsting after God," restless till it finds its rest in Him, groping darkly after Him, a soul hungry and homesick, then, surely, here is our key. Even neolithic man was not without an inner prompter ("Hlis the gentle voice we hear, soft as the breath of e'en . . . that speaks of heaven"). The soul whispered, conscious man overheard, and dream or trance simply gave a body to the subconscious inspiration. Hence the universal idea of something after death, however vague.

the earth "opens her mouth to receive it," it poisons and sickens her, and she cannot be healed except by the blood of him that shed it (Numb. xxxv. 33, cf. Job xvi. 18, Ezek. xxiv. 6-8). Thus corpses (Numb. xix.) and exposed blood, even animals' blood (Lev. xvii. 13), are very much *taboo*, "unclean," much to be shunned: "Do not touch or meddle with it, or woe betide you!" This is the true meaning of *taboo* or "unclean." Unclean is *not* a sanitary term (see Frazer, "Taboo," *Enc. Brit.*). It means "charged with curse-power." Moreover, any person or object infected with the virulence of the curse passes it on to others, infects them with his "uncleanness," so is put out of bounds as a positive source of danger to all and any.

Spirits loom large to primitive man. The air teems with spirits potent to help or, oftener, to hurt. They hover all round and can enter, singly or in troops, into man, animal, or object.¹ Fertility or barrenness, health or disease, accident or death, are their work. A tree or boulder falls on a man, a bad spirit lurked in it waiting for him to pass. Spirits are not always homeless; after a while they either re-enter another body or go to a large pit in the bowels of the earth. Their power to help or hurt still remains. Hence ancestor-worship, chief-worship, animal-worship.²

Besides dead men's "spirits," there are other and greater "spirits." Sun, moon, stars, wind, sea are persons even as we. The Sun is a big man or giant, the rays are his arrows; when angry, his fierce and burning arrows spread disease, famine, and death; when friendly, his arrows drive away the rain-gods

¹ Hence the law (Numb. xix. 14 sqq.) ordering all open vessels to be covered on a death, though the Jews had forgotten the original meaning of the custom. Funeral customs teem with survivals of early man's fear of ghosts. Mourning ceremonies, dress, etc., were naive attempts at disguise, etc., to mislead the ghost.

² Many tribes trace their descent from animals or plants (= dumb animals), and these "totems" are "holy," *taboo*, in their eyes. Persons of the same totem may not intermarry (Frazer, "Totemism," *Enc. Brit.*).

and storm-gods, and man's crops and herds thrive. The Moon is the Sun's wife,¹ the Sea a huge snake-monster, Fire an animal that bites. When a thunder-storm is seen approaching in S. Africa, a whole Kaffir village, led by its medicine-man, will rush to the nearest hill, beat tom-toms, and yell at the Storm-Spirit to divert him from his course. In the same spirit early man would cut at the hot Wind of the desert with his sword, hurl his spear into the swollen River, stab the Earth, flog the Sea, shoot his arrows at the Clouds or the scorching Sun,² and build up towers to carry Heaven by assault, or adorn a handsome or holy Tree with bracelets like a girl. A natural force or power without body and personality is an idea utterly beyond early man's comprehension. Trees grow and bear children; rivers run and steal men and cows and huts; the sun gets up and goes to bed, and hurts or is kind,—because they are living persons just as ourselves. Disease is a demon who has entered the body, fights with man's spirit, and is either beaten and driven out by man's spirit or the demon goes off with it. By an effort of imagination to-day, we speak of the Sun as a giant rejoicing to run his course; early man was in dead earnest in his belief that the Sun was a giant.

Hence, naturally, looking upon wells and trees and stones and everything as alive, invisible may be, yet persons like himself and usually as arbitrary, he lived in fairy-land or demon-land every moment of his life. Everything that fills the savage with awe, admiration, wonder, all that strikes him as unusual and strange—and this includes most phenomena—he

¹ But the Semitic Moon-god (Sin) is masculine, and many scholars identify Yahweh (Jehovah) of Sinai with the Moon-god Sin (see Burney, *Judg.* 249 sqq.).

² Just as our rudimentary organs (*e.g.* canine teeth, appendix, tail-bone), are physical "survivals," so we retain mental survivals of the childhood of our race. Who has not felt an impulse of hatred, or even expressed it in a curse, against a sudden rainstorm or gust of wind, or an object that has hurt one? or a pang of pity for a flower torn and trampled in the dust? Such emotions, momentary in adults, more real in children, are survivals of a day when we, too, were early men.

at once sets down to the presence of some invisible superhuman being acting in a mysterious way. His wife has a child, because a "spirit" seeking a home entered into her as she passed his hiding-place. His herds multiply, his crops thrive,—or the reverse,—and all the credit or blame is due to friendly or harmful spirits. Strange music—especially the buzzing of the "bull-roarer"—is the voice of an angry god. A stone peculiar in shape, size, or colour—a monolith, volcanic boulder, bit of quartz—has "eaten ghost," and becomes a "fetish" or "god." He carries it about with him, and his sling, arrow, or spear kills much game; but if his "fetish" fails him, he discards or beats it. Or he places stones round his hut or crop, tells them to hurt strangers and bless all that is his, and fully believes that they hear and do accordingly (Gen. xxxi. 44 sqq.).¹

Primitive man's whole idea of the world is that of a realm wholly given over to the caprices of arbitrary friendly or hostile powers. His one aim is to make good spirits his allies, and propitiate or counteract the evil demons. Most spirits are evil and savage like himself, but the Nature-gods, Sun, Wind, Rain, are sometimes good and kind. With a blend of affection and dread he comes to them with prayers and gifts, to plead or bribe.

Spirits, like men, set apart certain objects and persons for their own special property and use, *e.g.* a particular animal, food, tree, individual, tribe. These instantly become "holy," *taboo*; whoso lays hand on them is "accursed," under the wrath and ban of the deity. Thus almost everywhere kings, chiefs, priests, medicine-men are sacrosanct, "anointed,"

¹ Frazer well brings out the original meaning of stones and cairns as "witnesses" of a covenant or agreement (*e.g.* between Laban and Jacob; cf. Joshua). In very early days, the covenanting parties really attribute life and consciousness to the stones, and call upon them to witness the agreement, as in the Laban-Jacob and Joshua stories in Gen. xxxi. and Josh. xxiv. 26 sqq. By sympathetic magic the bond was also strengthened and tightened by absorbing the strength and solidity of the stones. To this day in Guernsey certain projecting boundary-stones in walls are called "témoins" (witnesses).

taboo; a whole tribe may be thus set apart. Anyone who touches them touches the god, for the two are now one. To show they are the god's property and under his protection, they bear his mark in their body, *e.g.* tattoo, filed teeth, a finger cut off. A world-wide god-mark is circumcision. Thus his God meets Moses and seeks to kill him for not bearing that mark (Ex. iv. 24); and in proof of its stone-age antiquity, note how both Zipporah and Joshua (v. 2-9) use flints for the operation.

Among *taboos*, a god's name is specially so. In olden times, names were not looked upon as mere labels detachable from their owner; they were viewed as part and parcel of the person to whom they belonged, as much so as his flesh and blood, and a profound meaning and magical power was attached to them. This gave rise to strange fancies. It was thought that any one who knew and correctly uttered the true name of a god had magical power over him. Hence gods and men took the greatest care to safeguard their names from wrong use. The best plan was not to let anybody know it. Thus in Gen. xxxii. 29, and 27, after the wrestle between God and Jacob, God asks Jacob his name and is told it, but when Jacob asks: "Tell me, I pray Thee, Thy name," God's answer is: "Why askest thou after My name?" and He blesses Jacob but will not tell him His name. Or if his votaries knew their god's name, it was kept very secret, and to be uttered even by intimates only in the most inner circles and very seldom. Thus, even in historical times, Jehovah's name could only be uttered on the great Day of Atonement in the inmost temple and by the High Priest.¹ Possibly the Third Commandment originally had this secrecy in view. Another plan, with early men, to hide their names, was to have several others, wrong names or names not so intimately connected with them, so as

¹ So secret was the name of Jehovah, as we call Him, kept, that its pronunciation was utterly forgotten.

to throw people off the right scent. Hence the more names of a god or man one knew and could address him by, the better, for thus was one likely not to omit the "name of power" which gave a strong hold on him. Thus a god's "name" was very "holy" or *taboo*.

Gifts, magic, and spells are most potent to please, appease, and have power with spirits.

Gifts are the natural and commonest way everywhere. Food comes first with savages living from hand to mouth by the chase, and their natural idea is that spirits are as hungry as themselves. If the omens show that the spirit spurns the offering, (*e.g.* as in Cain's offering,) he is angry; if (as in Noah's sacrifice) the spirit "smells the sweet savour and says in his heart: I will not curse the sacrificer again," all is well. Also, as with men, so with spirits, to eat with them binds them to you and you to them.

Magic and spells, however, are still more potent, both with gods and men. We shall take magic in its power on man first, for this gave the idea of its universal potency. A savage medicine-man makes a rough image of a man, puts it on a slow fire and utters the spell: "I am burning the heart, liver and spleen of So-and-so"; or he wants to help or hurt some one, cause or expel disease, trace guilt, etc., and he gives them a strange potion or an amulet made potent by the proper spell; or he wishes to make an agreement binding, and he hacks a victim to pieces, uttering the spell: "So be it done, and more also, to him who breaks the covenant,"—and his magic often works. We know how very credulous and susceptible to suggestion are children, ignorant people, and savages, and we can realise how these awe-ful magic rites and spells so hypnotise and impress their victims that they have the desired effect. The savage is not only a good actor but a good spectator. When the medicine-man affirms that such and such horrors or blessings are to be his lot, he

meets that lot more than half way and actualises it by the terror or confidence it inspires. Through self-suggestion, the denounced so-and-so sees *himself*—not the mere symbol of him—tortured, and he pines away and dies; the magic potion or amulet has “eaten ghost,” and must help or hurt; the covenant-breaker is sure he is under the spirits’ ban, and comes to a sad end. Such repeated proofs of their efficacy convince medicine-man and people alike that magic rites and spells do work with power. If they seem to fail, it is only because the other party has more potent counteracting magic. Thus Aaron (Ex. vii. 9 sqq.) not only turns his rod into a snake, like the Egyptian magicians, but his swallows theirs. Primitive man argues: If magic and spell are thus potent with men, so also with spirits. Thus in New Caledonia sunshine is made by kindling a fire and the spell: “Sun, I do this that you may be burning hot”; and plague is averted thus: “Ha! Spirit of death-dealing fever, we fling you into the water, like these torches.”¹

Magic working through good spirits or for good ends is white magic, and the medicine-man’s rites and spells are then akin to the religious priest’s ritual and prayers; if through evil spirits or for evil ends, it is black magic, and the medicine-man is first-cousin to the wizard. Indeed, the primitive medicine-man is usually medicine-man, priest, magician and seer. He combines all the rôles of Deut. xviii. 10, 11, and “maketh to pass through fire, useth divination, is an observer of times, an enchanter, a wizard, a charmer, a consulter with familiar spirits, a necromancer.” He is fully believed by himself and others to be “god-possessed.” Under the “spirit’s” influence, stimulated by fasting or drugs or loud music and dancing,

¹ Babylonian religious literature, which was already full-grown in Hammurabi’s day (c. 2000 B.C., the Bible names him as Abraham’s contemporary—Amraphel), then remained stationary, is the half-way house between early man and the O.T. In the Babylonian sacred books we get magic, incantations, spells, omens, ritual, etc., close akin to early man’s, indeed, often exactly the same. In the O.T. we meet them all again, but the prophetic writers have toned them down in many cases.

he works himself into ecstatic frenzy, collapses in a trance, sees and reveals things hidden to others. Gifted with second sight these men undoubtedly often are (see A. Lang, *Making of Religion*, ch. iv.), though savages are apt tricksters. As with Samuel the seer, men consult them fee in hand, "for all they say is sure to come to pass" (1 Sam. ix. 6 sq.).

As to how the world and man and death came into being, early man's views are equally quaint. Almost everywhere, the spirits form man out of clay,¹ making a figure of clay and breathing life into it. Death and disease are due to the breaking of a *taboo*. Thus in Australia a woman was forbidden to approach a tree where dwelt a bat. She went near it, the bat flew away, and men thereafter died. The Ningphoos were banished from their paradise and became mortal, because one bathed in forbidden water. Universally, early man creates the world out of something already existing, *e.g.* out of a fragment of soil fished out of the Big Waters, or out of the Big Water itself, even as Gen. i. presupposes (1) darkness, (2) a chaotic watery abyss, (3) air. Gen. i. bears even now the clearest traces of its older form, representing the Big Waters (Tehôm) as a monster serpent which a god cut in half, and out of one half made the dome of heaven (see Ch. VI. *sub fin.*).

Naturally, men who see in Sun, Wind, Sea, not only persons, but savage persons as arbitrary as themselves; who believe that spirits can change themselves and men into animals, plants, stones; and that the capricious will of these arbitrary spirits decides anything and everything from moment to moment, be it a thunderstorm or a stomach-ache,—such men will credit anything. Primitive man sees nothing incredible in the spirits or their agent, the

¹ When J in Gen. ii. 7 says that "the Lord God created man (*adam*) of dust from the ground" (*adamah*), he evidently connects *adam* with *adamah*, implying that Adam means "earth-born." The two terms, however, are hardly to be philologically connected.

medicine-man, causing solid iron to float, or streams to split asunder to let men pass, or dead men to rise. It is all on a level with much else in his strange daily experience, uncanny every moment.

If early man's mind was crude, still more his moral sense or conscience, and for this reason. To get bare food by the chase, and ward off death by man or beast, was his one concern; for this, cunning and strength of body his essential need. The struggle for bare existence took up all his time and all his wits. He had none to spare for the higher life of being good, which did not pay then. So strength and cunning came easily first and conscience nowhere. Savages to-day are in culture far ahead of primitive man, yet when a modern Bechwana was asked what it is "to be good," puzzled awhile he answered: "To be good is to have a wife and cows and to steal your neighbour's wife and cows." To Australian aborigines the words "good" and "bad" only refer to bodily taste and comfort. "Conscience," says Burton, "does not exist in E. Africa. Repentance expresses regret for missed opportunities of mortal crime. Robbery constitutes an honourable man. Murder—the more atrocious the midnight crime the better—makes the hero." Only so much moral sense is asked for as constitutes honour among thieves. The only law is "tribal custom"; any breach of it means expulsion, every man's hand against you, and the tribal god's dire curse. Even in the Judges' period, "no such thing is *wont to be done* in Israel" was final. Everywhere "custom" exacted "eye for eye, life for life"; vendetta was its code of honour; some trace of honesty or humanity inside the clan, but robbery, lying, violence and even murder to all outside it, was its policy. We shall see manifold instances of this "particularism" in the Old Testament, a primitive trait which dies hard in us all.¹

¹ Cf. Bishop of Carlisle, *Hibbert Journal*, Jan., 1919, p. 204: "Hitherto nationhood has been exclusiveness, patriotism national selfishness, ensuring our

Like all others, the Hebrew race passed through this primitive stage, shared these beliefs, and never quite forgot them. They are hardy plants and thrive with us to-day.¹ Hence Hebrew belief in spirits, magic, witchcraft, demon-possession, exorcism, necromancy (Deut. xviii. 10, 11); their tendency to worship sun, moon, stars (Deut. iv. 19); their idea of certain stones, trees, wells, groves, heights as "houses of god"; their devils and gods in animal shape (Gen. iii. 1; Deut. iv. 16 sqq.; Exod. xxxii., etc.); their idea of *taboo* trees, ark, corpses, foods, even captive foes and their belongings, as God's property (Gen. iii. 3; 2 Sam. vi. 6, 7; Josh. vi. 17 sq.); their strange ordeals and recipes for removing "uncleanness," so reminiscent of the medicine-man (Numb. xix.; v. 15 sqq.); their making their children pass through fire (Deut. xviii.; 2 Kgs. xvi. 3; xxi. 6); and their law: "every first issue of the womb among men and cattle" is "devoted" to Jehovah (originally sacrificed) (Exod. xiii. 2, 12-16; cf. Mic. vi. 7); and their tradition of a day when the first-born was sacrificed by the builder of a house or city and laid under the threshold or foundation-stone (Zeph. i. 9; Josh. vi. 26), etc., etc. (see also Note, p. 69).

Some will say: "This may all be true, but does it not belittle our idea of Bible and Religion?" Just the reverse! Which is the more inspiring, the Eden picture of man's degeneration from angel to brute, or Evolution's picture of man's ascent from brute angelward?² Has evolution lowered our idea of God,

strength by others' weakness, our honour and glory by the shame and abasement of others." And can it truly be said either of Christian nations or Churches to-day: "See how these Christians love one another"?

¹ *E.g.* are mascots, belief in witchcraft and exorcism, ghosts, superstitions about upsetting salt, sitting 13 at table, unlucky Fridays, evil eye, etc., etc., unknown to-day?

² All the same, as one of my critics points out, Romanes' difficulty ever crops up: "Why 100,000 years of animalism and savagery? True, at the end we come to an Isaiah, Socrates, Shakespeare; but what of the misery and suffering of the savages themselves at whose cost we have reached our present stage? The 'Fall' was a gloomy doctrine, but it had its redeeming points." He is right. Like the whole problem of evil, this puzzle is insoluble with our present knowledge. Job's (xxxviii.-xlii. 7) frame of mind is the present writer's own attitude towards it.

Nature or man by showing us one continuous upward trend, with God at the source and helm of it all, a trend upward from next-to-nothing beginnings to the world of values we know? As we see the infinite trouble and patient pains God has taken with man's education, the more do we believe in man's and our own great possibilities in the loving hands of such a Father. It braces us to actualise those immense possibilities and become what we are, children of God, to "come to ourselves," as sons of God made in His image.

Really, we know not anything as we ought, or to any purpose, till we know how it has come to be what it is. Childish as early man's ideas seem to us, by them we have climbed to our present outlook. The beginnings of writing, mathematics, science, were all rudimentary, yet they interest us profoundly and excite scorn only in foolish minds. Just as the man who invented the ABC was a creative genius of the first rank, so was he who discovered the alphabet of the moral law, or the first man whose heart-thrill of awe made him see a superhuman something in thunder or storm. We curl the lip at Sun-personification, spirits, magic, taboo. God rejoiced to see it; He prompted it. Thus early was He inspiring man, giving "a divine impulse to man's own thoughts," suggesting simple ideas which, ugly as they seem, will of themselves grow into ever deeper truths and ideals. One and all of these early creeds were but "the baby figures of the giant mass of things to come." Look to the end, it crowns all and explains all.

Nature-worship led through Nature to Nature's God; the wide world over, it was at Mother Nature's knees man learnt his first lessons of God. Out of early man's idea of a phantom "double" of himself, his wraith, sprang his belief in an undying soul. His awe of superhuman beings, even demon-spirits, was the seed of his belief in a Personal God. *Taboo* was his first lesson in reverence and respect for others' rights of property. Magic was his first step to a

relationship with a deity; spell and incantation his first prayer and praise. The bloody ritual of early sacrifices repels us, the common meal with a god makes us smile; yet in these lies the root-idea of all religion,—fellowship with God and man. Our beautiful faith in the Fatherhood of God and Brotherhood of Man is but the ripe fruit of this ugly seed sown in man's infancy and long watered with the blood of degrading sacrifices.

Baptise these primitive ideas into God, press them into His service, and you start them on a career of moral and spiritual development which makes them at last the fit expression of the highest religious ideals, as Gen. i.-iii. proves, for it turns their clay into gold. But between primitive man and Genesis the interval is big. In this interval, first Babylonia, then Sinai, stamped indelibly on Israel its distinctive characteristics, as the two following chapters show.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE TO P. 67.

While correcting this proof-sheet, my attention has been called to Ezek. viii. with its weird picture of primitive cults in a secret chamber of the Temple as late as 590 B.C. It gives us three scenes. (1) *The "chamber of imagery"*: In a side-court, with the "image of jealousy" at its entry, the prophet comes to a hole in the wall, digs into it, and finds a door to a dark cave. There he sees "every form of creeping things and abominable beasts," and "idols," portrayed on the walls round about, and 70 elders with a priest in their midst, "every man with a censer in his hand," performing their black rites in secret.—The cave, pictures, rites, strongly reproduce the wall-paintings, magic, and totemism of palæolithic cave-men and of Arunta natives to-day. (2) *Tammuz worship*: At the N. door of the Temple, "behold there sat the women weeping for Tammuz," *i.e.* the god of vegetation killed by the Sun's fiery arrows. (3) *Sun-worship*: He sees 25 men "with their backs to the Temple of the Lord, and they worshipped the Sun towards the east," with a strange ritual: "and lo, they put the branch to their nose."

CHAPTER VI

BABYLONIA, ITS INFLUENCE ON ISRAEL

"THE rediscovery of Babylonia and Assyria through recent excavations has thrown much light on the origin of the traditions and early beliefs of the Hebrews; it has demonstrated that Hebrew history is unintelligible without constant recourse to the data obtained from cuneiform literature." . . . "Babylonia by virtue of early associations and by almost continuous contact, though closer at some periods than at others, is a most important element in Hebrew life and thought." "We are safe in placing the Hebrews among the immigrants who drank deep of Babylonian culture" (Jastrow, *Heb. and Bab. Trad.*, viii., ix., and p. 23).

Babylonia's influence on Hebrew thought is fully admitted to-day. Hence this chapter in a history of Israel. But what we want to know is at what period or periods Babylonia's contact most influenced Hebrew thought. (1) Was it in Abraham's day in Ur of the Chaldees and in Harran (Gen. xi. 31)? or (2) on Israel's arrival in Canaan? or (3) from 734-586 B.C. and during the Exile? Of course, there is a possible fourth alternative: Babylonia, Israel, and Canaan have all three very much in common as to religion, customs and ideas, because they are all Semites from the same cradle. The relationship between Babylonia and Israel is much closer than this, but let us take this clue first, for it will lead us some way to our real goal.

Babylonians (and Assyrians, their children), Canaanites, and Aramæans (and their offshoot, Hebrews) are all Semites¹ whose original cradle is now admitted to be central Arabia. As nomad Arabs they migrated from Arabia in three movements, which are to be viewed not as one big wave of invaders, but as a series of waves lasting a very long period. The Babylonian wave came first. Already in 3000 B.C. we see these Semitic Arab invaders firmly settled in, and owning, Akkad (N. Babylonia) under the famous Sargon, who founded his Semitic dynasty and extended his empire to the Mediterranean, including Canaan. Now, as these Semites had by 3000 B.C. ousted the original inhabitants from N. Babylonia, driven them to Sumer (S. Babylonia), assimilated the advanced civilisation of the Sumerians,² and already established an imperial dynasty, they must clearly have established themselves in Babylonia long before 3000 B.C. Their occupation of N. Babylonia indicates that they entered it either by coming through Canaan and Northern Syria or by following the West bank of the Euphrates.

The Canaanite migration came next. Semites are in possession of Canaan as far back as we know. A Semitic wave from Arabia moving northward, then westward, both founded the First Dynasty at Babylon (2275-1926) of which the famous Hammurabi (2123-2081) is a king, and also peopled the region to the west of the Euphrates, including the Mediterranean seaboard. This whole district was known as "the land of the Amurru" (= Amorites). It is impossible to distinguish between these Amorites and Canaanites,

¹ Semites may be divided thus: E. Semites = Babylonians (and Assyrians); —W. Semites = "men of Amurru," *i.e.* Canaanites and Amorites, hard to differentiate; Aramæans (and Hebrews); —Central Semites = Arabians; —S. Semites = Sabæans and Ethiopian Semites.

² Some scholars, *e.g.* Jastrow, Meyer, Price, say the Semites preceded the Sumerians, but the weight of authority is against them, and, as Pinches points out, so is the evidence of the oldest monuments where figures, with head and face clean shaven, *i.e.* non-Semitic, precede those of the Semitic period in chronological order.—Yet, strangely, the Sumerian deities are *bearded*.

if there is any racial distinction. "The Amorite or West Semitic tongue was the ancestor of the Hebrew language of later times, cf. Is. xix. 18" (Burney, *Judges*, lxi.). Now Babylonia's sway often extended to the Mediterranean (*e.g.* under Sargon *c.* 3000 B.C.), and Hammurabi's title "King of the Amurru" indicates that it did also in 2100 B.C. Sargon already had realised the value of the "Cedar Forest" (= Lebanon) and the "Silver Mountains" (= Taurus), and commercial enterprise as well as conquest made this "land of the Amurru" very valuable to Babylonia. One plain fact which speaks volumes for Babylonia's influence in Canaan is that—as the Tell-el-Amarna Letters tell us—the Babylonian language and cuneiform script were the official medium of intercourse in Canaan, Syria, and Western Asia about 1400 B.C. Evidently Babylonian culture and influence in Canaan were pronounced, and the ties binding the Euphrates Valley with Canaan very close, from at least 2000–1400 B.C. (King, *Schweich Lect.*, 9 sq.).

We can draw the link between Babylonia and Israel closer still and far more directly. Israel's own tradition (Gen. x., xi.) looked persistently to Babylonia as the cradle of their own race. They regarded themselves, rightly, as of Aramæan stock (Deut. xxvi. 5, R.V.), and Ur of the Chaldees and Harran in the Euphrates Valley as their ancestral home (Gen. xi. 31). This is true in so far as nomad Arab tribes, personified in Abraham, settled awhile in Babylonia, and formed part of what is known as the third or Aramæan Semitic wave. This movement consisted in a gradual working up of Arabian tribes along the desert or western side of the Euphrates towards Syria their eventual goal. Hebrew tradition insists that some of these nomad Aramæan tribes—the Terahites—settled awhile in Ur, W. of the Euphrates, then, crossing the river, settled more definitely in Harran. Jastrow makes a strong case for this

tradition of Ur and Harran¹ as Terahite stopping-places in the movement which eventually brought them to Palestine. As he points out (*Heb. and Bab. Trad.*, 19-23), the Genesis tradition of an old Hebrew settlement in Babylonia indicates a deep-rooted and permanent impress made upon the Hebrews during their stay in Babylonia. He concludes that the sojourn there "was not a short one, not a mere passage of nomadic hordes on their way from Arabia to Syria, . . . but a relatively permanent settlement involving partial assimilation to the ways of the country, and we are safe in placing the Hebrews among the immigrants who drank deep of Babylonian culture, even though they relapsed into the life of pastoral nomads when with other Semites they passed into Syria and Palestine." In 1400 B.C., so the Tell-el-Amarna tablets tell us, Habiru,² nomads forming part of the great Aramæan movement, are flocking into Syria-Palestine, and taking forcible possession of many of its cities, Shechem included.

Thus far three facts stand out: (1) Babylonians, Canaanites, Hebrews, are all of one stock, Semitic Arabs, and, even on this ground, will have much in common; (2) Jastrow seems right in his conviction that Hebrews settled in Babylonia and there "drank deep of Babylonian culture"; or how are we to account for the deep-rooted Hebrew tradition? (3) Canaan, from 2000-1400 B.C. at least, was in direct

¹ Very great and important religious and political centres in the days of Hammurabi ("Amraphel, King of Shinar," Gen. xiv. 1), "Abraham's" contemporary in 2123-2081 B.C.

² See Burney, *Judges*, lxxiv. sqq., for cogent reasons for identification of Habiru with Hebrews.—On leaving Babylonia, and *en route* Canaanwards, the Hebrews comprised Israel, Edom, Moab, Ammon of later days. Hence the Bible calls Edom Israel's brother, and Moab and Ammon Israel's cousins. Tradition also makes Israel akin, not only to Aramæans, but to the Arab tribes of the Sinai peninsula, *i.e.* the Kenites, Amalek, and Midian. But Israel would *not* recognise kinship with Canaan, and regarded it as a stranger and subject. Yet they were close kinsmen, both speaking Hebrew. Even in Jewish blood there was a non-Semitic strain (= Hittite) as, speaking of Jerusalem, Ezek. xvi. 3 brings out: "Thy father was the Amorite, and thy mother a Hittite"—not a moral comment, but an ethnographical fact.

touch with Babylonia and steeped in its culture. So, if not in touch before, Israel's settlement in Canaan brought it into full contact with Babylonian ideas.

Babylonian contact with Israel continues, of course, long after this period. In historic days Israel was never out of touch with Babylonia. Syria-Canaan forms a bridge between Asia and Africa, and, through the great caravan or trunk-roads, was the natural channel of commercial intercourse between the two earliest centres of civilisation, Babylonia and Egypt, and the cultural effect of this intercourse must have been very great. Moreover, from about 850 B.C., when Ahab fought as the ally of Benhadad of Damascus at Karkar (854), Assyria became a menace to Israel. It did not, however, directly intervene in Israel's affairs till 734 when Tiglath-Pileser IV., at Ahaz's request, came to Judah's rescue against the Syria-Israel coalition. From that day Ahaz was his vassal, and Assyria's direct influence on Judah marked; witness Ahaz at Damascus and his Assyrian altar in Jerusalem. Under Manasseh (698-643) this influence is intensified, and 2 Kgs. xxi. 3-8 shows us Manasseh adopting Babylonian cults bodily. We need not trace the sequel in Jerusalem's fall and the Babylonian Captivity.

But the whole period covered by the last paragraph comes too late for our purpose, which is to identify the era when Hebrews acquired such a knowledge of Babylonian traditions and ideas as we find in the Deluge story and elsewhere in the Mosaic books; for J knew them already in 850 B.C., and from his tone and style we can see that these traditions had been part and parcel of Hebrew life and thought for centuries before that date. For the moment of their original adoption we must go far behind 850 B.C., either to the Canaan settlement or to the Hebrew sojourn in Babylonia.

The present writer's own persuasion is as follows: As nomad Arabs the Terahite Aramæans came to

Babylonia, were long settled there, and left it impregnated with Babylonian ideas. Arriving there about 2100 B.C., how long they stayed we know not. The next we hear of them is invading Palestine, c. 1400 B.C. The movement from Babylonia to Canaan probably involved a long sojourn in the desert and considerable reversion to nomad Arab type. Reaching Palestine with a curious blend of Arab and Babylonian ideas, there they came into direct touch with Canaanite kinsmen steeped in Babylonian views. This contact soon revived and deepened their Babylonian habits of thought. Other factors contributed to the same result. The caravan route, commercially, and Assyrian influence from 734 onward, politically, will have helped not a little to keep Babylonian ideas alive. These may be reckoned as important factors *safeguarding* the early traditions, but we must go to the Babylonia of 2000 B.C. for the planting of the traditions and ideas, and to the Canaan of 1400-1000 B.C. for their revival into vigorous life at a time when they were beginning to droop.

If we are to appreciate Israel's Babylonian loans we must know something of Babylonia's history, culture, and religion. The latter we must deal with at some length, for it chiefly concerns us here, so we must dismiss the history in a few lines.

*Babylonian*¹ *History*.—From earliest days² of which

¹ "Babylonia," strictly speaking, is a misnomer. We hear nothing of Babylon till shortly before 2000 B.C., and there was no single name for the whole country till about 1700 B.C., when it was called Karduniash (the O.T. calls it Shinar, or, after the Captivity, "the land of the Chaldeans"). For long ages it was not one compact empire, but a number of independent states, each centred round a (sacred) city, e.g. Eridu, Nippur, Erech, Kish, Ur, Larsa, Agade, Babylon, the last a late upstart by the side of Eridu and Nippur which go back to very early days. From time to time, now one city, now another, all but established an empire (e.g. Sargon and his equally great son Naram-Sin ruled up to the Mediterranean), but, until Babylon's day, these empires were short-lived.

² It is impossible to fix early Babylonian chronology. Scholars once spoke of "a high state of civilisation in Babylonia at least 9000 years ago" (H. S. Williams, *Enc. Brit.*, xxvii., p. xi., cf. Sayce, *ibid.*, xxvi., 40). This may be; but our earliest historical data begin with Sargon (c. 3000), though the civilisation then is so high that we must allow at least 1000 years, if not thousands, for its growth. But the fact remains that 3000 B.C. is our earliest historical date. Even after 3000 our chronology is tentative, for dynasties once regarded as consecutive are now known to have been contemporaneous.

we have any data the Euphrates valley was a rich, populous, and highly civilised region. Its earliest inhabitants were non-Semitic Sumerians, the practical founders of Western civilisation. Their art and literature¹ were very advanced, and so old that Prof. Hommel sees in Sumer not only "the cradle of Western civilisation, but probably also of that of ancient Egypt" (Hastgs. *D. of B. i.* 214).² The Semitic invaders of Sumer adopted their civilisation, writing, records, and legends; long used their language for their own records (Hommel), and up to the last carefully preserved and studied the Sumerian texts.³ In 3000 B.C. we find these Semites firmly settled in Akkad (N. Babylonia) under Sargon,⁴ head of a great empire, the Sumerians retaining Sumer in the south. Gradually the Semites absorbed the original inhabitants. As in classical Greece, so in Babylonia, one state occasionally made itself overlord of others, but it consisted mainly of several independent states till about 2000 B.C. Then the First Dynasty (2225-1926), of which Hammurabi is one famous king (2123-2081), shook off an Elamite dynasty, and formed Babylonia into a single monarchy with Babylon at its head. Hammurabi extended his empire to the Mediterranean,

¹ A Sumerian tablet just found at Nippur, of 2000 B.C., gives us an account of the Creation, Deluge, and lists of kings of immense longevity, exactly parallel to the *Gen.* accounts (see King's "*Schweich Lecture*," 1916).

² King, *Schweich Lect.*, 7, quotes evidence of Mesopotamian (Sumerian?) models of the flint age, loans from Mesopotamia, in Egypt (but see *ibid.*, p. 22).

³ As we daily see more and more how absolutely Babylonian folklore, legend, and tradition—and also Hebrew through Babylonia—flows from Sumerian originals, scholars are questioning more than ever the other theory of the *separate and independent* origin of much of this folklore, in dozens of different places, through the similar workings of the human mind under similar circumstances. Man is an imitative animal, and creative genius is far from common, and the wide dispersion of many similar beliefs and traditions is now often put down to "loans" through contact with others. The close contact between, *e.g.*, Mesopotamia and Egypt from early prehistoric days is admitted; moreover tribes were ever on the move, *e.g.* migrating from India to Europe, and from Arabia north-westward. There is ample evidence of migratory movements and of cultural drift.

⁴ Of Sargon, legend tells how "he was born in concealment and set adrift in an ark of bulrushes on the waters of the Euphrates,"—the probable source of the Moses legend. But it is a very common legend, repeated all over the world.

and his reign was an Augustan age of literature. Even with changes of dynasty (*e.g.* Kassite), Babylon remained the capital of the kingdom and "the 'holy city' of Western Asia" (Sayce). About 1400 Assyria (offshoot of Babylonia) broke away from its allegiance to Babylon, warred with it, captured it *c.* 1275, reigning over Babylon for seven years. Babylon regained its independence, but Assyria steadily increased in power while Babylon fell more and more into decay. In 729 Assyria again wrested the power from it, razing Babylon to the ground in 689. But it was soon rebuilt, and in 625 a new Babylonian Empire arose. It only lasted to 538, but under Nabopolassar and Nebuchadrezzar its grandeur eclipsed all previous records, and Babylon's magnificence was one of the wonders of the world. In 538 Cyrus captured Babylon and made it Persia's vassal.

Babylonian Religion.—Babylonia's holy scriptures, a whole library of very old (largely Sumerian),¹ religious epics, hymns, prayers, penitential psalms, laws, ritual, from 3000 B.C. onward, prove the vast scope, influence, and antiquity of this religion. The age of Hammurabi (*c.* 2100) represents the high-water mark of this religious literature. At its best, only the Old Testament can really match it in ancient times, and no other religion has so influenced, directly or indirectly, man's religious thought. Israel's religion is cast in its mould; Phœnicia's far more so; and from Phœnicia Greece and Rome largely got theirs, turning Phœnician clay into Greek gold.

Babylonia's religion, with its "gods many and lords many," and its strong colouring of nature-worship, as well as its quaint legends, is the connecting link between early man's creed and the Old Testament, especially if we bear in mind that, even

¹ Even as the Babylonian Semites borrowed Sumer's gods (see *inf.*), and Hammurabi's Code embodies much earlier and Sumerian "custom law" (Burney, *Judges*, lxiii.), so his library of religious epics, etc. (copied by Assurbanipal in 7th century B.C., and now ours), goes back far into Sumerian days, and is, of course, from Sumerian texts.

in 650 B.C., the prophets were hard put to it to stop Israel from worshipping "the sun, moon, and the stars, even all the host of heaven." Indeed, in Manasseh's reign, as 2 Kgs. xxi. 3-8 tells us, we have fire-worship (passing children through fire), astral worship (altars to the "hosts of heaven" in the Temple), and divination, magic, and necromancy, *i.e.* the whole paraphernalia of Babylonian religion publicly and officially practised in Jerusalem. Ashtart and Tammuz-worship are also Babylonian loans.

The striking feature in Babylonian religion is its early stagnation or arrested progress, its coming to a dead stop. Already well-developed, systematic, and fairly spiritual in 2100 B.C., with magnificent temples, a good moral code of laws (Hammurabi's), an organised priesthood, and a clearly-defined theological system, it is not one whit more advanced in 600 B.C. Unfortunately for Babylonia, it was priest-ridden and had no prophets like Amos or Isaiah. Occasionally, Babylonian (and still more, Assyrian) religion came very near to henotheism (if not monotheism), but popular and priestly conservatism was fatal to it. It had no progressive prophets, as in Israel, to break across popular superstition and priestly conservatism with its love of tradition. Otherwise Marduk in Babylonia, Ashur in Assyria, would have become their one god, even as did Jehovah in Israel, originally a tribal Storm-god dwelling in Sinai and appearing in thunder, lightning and earthquake.

Of Babylon's gods, three from the outset stand in a class by themselves as *the* Holy Trinity: the Sky-god Anu (Sumerian "An" = heaven, with Semitic ending), patron of the city Erech; the stern Earth and Storm-god, Bel, or rather Enlil (Sum. "En" = lord, "lil" = wind) of the city of Nippur; and the gracious Water-Abyss¹ god, Ea (Sum. "E" = "house," and

¹ Big Waters, "the ocean of heaven," waters behind the heavens and running behind the horizon and under the earth, thus forming a complete circle (cf. Gen. i. 7). This is "the waters above and under the firmament" of

A = "water") of Eridu. Next in order come a second Trinity: the Moon-god, Sin, of Ur; the Sun-god, Shamash, of Larsa; the goddess of reproduction in Nature and man, Ishtar¹ (Heb. "Ashtoreth"). Noted also were Ramman (or Adad, possibly W. Semitic), the Storm-god; Nebo, the River-god, of Borsippa; Nergal, the Scorching Sun-god, god of disease, death and battle; the Fire-god, Nusku, lord of magic.

The supremacy of Babylon (c. 2200) made its patron-god Marduk, or Merodach, (= the Spring-Sun god), Babylonia's chief god, even as Assyria's independence and power later made its patron god Ashur supreme. In those days the conquest of the peoples of other gods meant that the conqueror's god had beaten those other gods. Conqueror Marduk could not oust that powerful Trinity—Anu, Enlil, Ea,—conservative tradition and their established position² are too strong for that, and as a younger god he is called their "son"; but at once he becomes *de jure* and *de facto* "without a rival among the gods," Lord of lords. He not only absorbs the other gods' powers but even their titles, as an old tablet proves: "Ea is the Marduk of canals, Ninib is the M. of strength, Nergal is the M. of war, Enlil is the M. of sovereignty and control, Nebo is the M. of possession, Sin is the M. of light of the night, Shamash is the M. of justice, Adad is the M. of rain," etc. This is henotheism on the way to monotheism, but arrested. Beneath these superior gods, and largely independent of them, were a whole

Gen. i. Both in Babylonia and Israel the heavens were regarded as a solid vault or dome.

¹ Ishtar was (a) Queen of heaven and all virtues; (b) goddess of war; (c) of love. The last title led to abuses in her cult, but many hymns show her finer side as a kind of "Queen of heaven," like the Virgin Mary (see *inf.* p. 85).

² Such gods as Anu, Enlil, Ea were as old as the hills, had been patron-gods of their important cities for millennia, and these cities were jealous of the honour of their god. In the Nippur Creation epic, our very oldest "find," four gods unite to create the world, thus reconciling the rival claims of four cities and their patron-gods. Christianity only succeeded in ousting pagan deities, feasts and holy places by baptising them into Christ; a monotheist religion might do that, not a polytheistic creed. The priests and masses alike would have rebelled had any liberties been taken with their time-honoured hallowed gods.

host of spirits¹ or "demons," invisible, mysterious, ubiquitous beings responsible for most mishaps incident to daily life. Naturally, these spirits loomed large in popular religion, and official religion recognised, though it had partly outgrown, their cult.

We have hinted at the well-organised and stately system of Babylonian worship. Each holy city had a splendid temple, a fully-organised and scholarly priesthood, ornate ritual and liturgical services, rich prayers, hymns and psalms. Prayers and sacrifices and divination rites, as well as incantation formulæ, were the recognised means of making the gods favourably disposed towards man and his affairs, or learning their will. Sacrifices² were offered always once, oftener twice, daily. Festival pilgrimages were made from all parts to the great temples on solemn days. Holy-days or Festivals were many; New Year's Day was a particularly prominent Festival, celebrated for eleven days in the month Nisan. In certain months, perhaps in all (Jastrow), the 7th, 14th, 19th, 21st, and 28th days were sabbaths,³ rest and fast days on which nothing whatever was to be done; the priest was not to furnish oracles on that day, nor the physician to heal, nor the ruler to put on festive robes, mount his chariot, eat fire-cooked food, nor give official decisions.

Priests, highly-educated scholars and theologians, were the most powerful class in the land. They regulated every department of life. As the gods'

¹ Gods are only "superior spirits." The differentiation between the "higher powers" (= gods) and the "lower" (= good or bad demons) was a gradual evolution and mainly the work of priests.

² The sacrificial victim must be pure and without blemish, so must the priest be ceremonially "clean." Also he has to don the proper vestments, assume the right position and use the proper rites and correct formulas, or woe betide him!

³ See Jastrow (*Heb. and Bab. Trad.*, ch. iii.) on Heb. and Babylonian Sabbath. He connects it with Moon periods of transition, times of great uncertainty and anxiety in olden days. Early man associates the waning and disappearance of the moon with its capture by hostile powers. To this day nomad Arabs welcome the new moon with rejoicings. Hence the moon's transition-periods were "days of pacification," *i.e.* days on which restrictions must be observed so as not to anger the gods. Cf. the association of new moon and Sabbath in O.T., *e.g.* 2 Kgs. iv. 23; Is. i. 13, lxvi. 23; Am. viii. 5.

representatives, mediators between god and man, their services were essential in all worship, and for much else, for the gods had to do with all happenings in life. The king undertook nothing without consulting the gods through the priests, and the people copied his example. On every emergency, great or small, they were men's guides and counsellors. Men came to them in the temple before setting on a journey or building a house, and for relief and guidance in suffering or anxiety. Priests were judges in all suits, and all agreements and contracts also came "before the god," *i.e.* before them. They were the nation's scholars and, as scribes, composed and preserved the national records which amaze us to-day. Temples and priests were under royal patronage and largely endowed with lands and property, while the priests were also entitled to portions of the sacrifices, tithes, rates, fixed fees and offerings. Thus the organisation of the priesthood, and their many functions, were met and secured by a systematic and regular temple-income.

Religious Literature.—We give a few samples of Babylonian religious epics, prayers and psalms. They are greatly abridged and, like the writers of Genesis, we omit the grotesque, coarser, extravagant elements which often mar these sacred books in our eyes. This emasculates the original, but makes comparison with the Bible easier by merely bringing into prominence the points of family-likeness.

Deluge-Story.—For man's sin¹ the gods resolve to send a Flood, but kind Ea warns Utnapishtim to "build a ship, abandon all you have and preserve life, bring into the ship the seed of all living things." He is told its exact dimensions. "According to the plan, the walls were to be ten gar high, ten gar the measure of its width. I divided it into seven parts. Six sar of pitch I poured on the outer wall, three sar on the inner wall. I brought

¹ As Jastrow points out, this judgment on sin is clear from the closing lines quoted above: "On the sinner be his sin, but let no flood come again to punish men."

to the ship all my family, cattle of the field, beasts of the field, all my household I brought on board" . . . "Shamash had fixed the time: when the rulers of darkness cause a terrible rain-storm, step into the ship and close the door. . . Six days and nights the storm and hurricane ceaselessly swept over the land. When the seventh day came, the storm ceased, the sea grew quiet, the evil storm abated. I opened a window and light fell on my face. At Mount Nizir the ship stood still. . . I sent forth a dove. The dove went hither and thither; not finding a resting-place, it came back; a swallow, it came back. I sent forth a raven; it ate, croaked, but did not turn back. I brought a sacrifice on the mountain-top; the gods smelled the savour, the gods smelled the sweet savour," and were gracious; "the great goddess (= Ishtar) lighted up the rainbow." Even stern Enlil relents when Ea pleads with him: "On the sinner impose his sin, send wild beasts and famine to minish men, but no rain-storm." Enlil graciously assents and blesses Utnapishtim and his wife.

Creation-Story.—(Note.—In Gen. i. the chaotic abyss is called *Tehom* (= Tiamat), and of this abyss the Bible makes Rahab, a big sea-serpent, ruler. We are told in Job ix. 13 (R.V.), where "the helpers of Rahab" are named, and in Job xxvi. 12 (R.V.), Is. xxvii. 1, li. 9, Ps. lxxxix. 10, that Rahab the dragon fights with Jehovah, is vanquished by Him and cut in two. Note also in Gen. i. 6-7 as to the making of the firmament and the *dividing* of the waters. These points will elucidate the story.)—In the beginning, "when the heavens above were not named, nor the earth below, Apsu (= the watery deep), the primeval parent, and Tiamat (= chaotic abyss), mother of all, mingled their waters together; no soil, no seed, no shoot was to be seen." Tiamat, ruler of dark chaos, hates the gods of light, and with her eleven helpers (Job ix. 13 R.V.) fights them. The great god of Light, Sun-god Marduk, cleaves Tiamat in two with his sword. With one half of Tiamat (= watery abyss) he makes the firmament of heaven, with the other half the earth (cf. Gen. i. 7). He sets bounds to the waters above (by means of the firmament) and draws a bolt¹ across the expanse. On the (?) day Marduk creates sun, moon and stars to rule over the night and the

¹ Jastrow (*Heb. and Bab. Trad.*, 108 sqq.) aptly quotes Ps. lxxiv. 13 sqq. as a capital illustration of the Tiamat-Jehovah fight and the Creation generally; and Job xxvi. 13, "the bolts of heaven are in terror before Him (lxx.), His hand has crushed the fleeing serpent," for "the bolts" drawn by Marduk across the firmament made out of half Tiamat's body.

day, and to be for years and months and seasons. [Tablets here defective, but, says Hommel (*Hastings' D. of B.*, i. 221), "extant connected fragments make it plain that thereafter followed the creation of plants, animals,¹ and finally man. Another Babylonian epic tells us Ea made man out of clay."]² Marduk creates man blood of his blood and bone of his bone, *i.e.* in his image.

A far older Sumerian Creation-Story, just discovered at Nippur (Sumerian text with Accadian translation, *written c. 2000 B.C.*, but the story itself is ages older), gives an account of the Creation of the world (after the conquest of the Dragon by Enlil), carries on the narrative to the Deluge, gives us Antediluvian history, then a list of kings who each reigned hundreds of years, *e.g.* "Galumum ruled for 900 years, Barsalnunna ruled 1200 years, etc., etc."; for a parallel to these patriarchs we have to go to the lives of similar antediluvian patriarchs in *Gen.* Briefly, this is the old Sumerian story: In the beginning heaven and earth were not, only the primeval dark waters. Four great gods—Anu, Enlil, Enki, and Ninkharsagga—were the world-creators. Man was created for the gods to receive worship, then animals were made, then came kingdoms. Before the Flood there were five cities: Eridu, Bad . . ., Larak, Sippar, Shuruppak. The gods decree man's destruction by flood. The hero of the Deluge is Ziusudu, king and priest, a godly man. Enki warns him in a dream of the coming "flood to destroy the seed of mankind," and bids him build a great ship. "All the mighty winds together blew, the flood . . . raged. When for seven days, for seven nights, the flood had overwhelmed the land, the Sun-god³ came forth lighting heaven and earth. Ziusudu opens the opening of the great boat, bows himself down, sacrifices an

¹ The passage reads: "he made living beings come forth, the cattle of the field, the beast of the field, and the creeping thing."

² General points of resemblance in *Gen.*: All that originally existed were (1) darkness, (2) Tehom = chaotic watery abyss, (3) air. In both versions, (a) God cleaves Tiamat (= the waters), (b) by means of the firmament divides the waters above from the waters below the earth, (c) Sun, moon, stars created "for signs and for seasons." From other tablets—(d) plants next, then animals, and lastly man. In the Creation Story Marduk makes man out of his own blood and bone ("in the likeness of God" in *Gen.*).

³ Marduk and Shamash, as Sun-gods, explain much in Babylonian legends, *e.g.* in the Creation and Flood Story (Sumerian especially) is the underlying truth that through the Sun of Spring (Marduk or Shamash) the storms and rains of winter are driven back to the heavens and kept prisoners behind bolts and bars; also this symbolism explains why Shamash (cf. Apollo), dissipating darkness, darting rays of light into the gloomiest corners, is the foe of "deeds of darkness," and brings sunshine to sad hearts, a god pure and just and a comforter. (See beautiful Shamash hymn, *inf.* p. 84).

ox, a sheep he slaughters." Anu and Enlil are appeased by the pleas of Ziusudu and grant him eternal life.

The chief interest of this story lies in its connected account of the Creation, Antediluvian history, and the Deluge exactly as in *Gen.*; and also in its long list of enormously long-lived patriarchal kings. The whole catalogue of kings sounds like a long extract from "the book of the generations of Adam" in *Gen.* "Galumum's nine hundred years seem to run almost like a refrain; and Methuselah's great age is even exceeded by two Sumerian patriarchs. The names in the two lists differ, but in both we are moving in the same atmosphere and line of thought" (King, *Schweich Lect.*).

Prayers and Hymns.—These reveal the spiritual phase and higher aspirations of Babylonian religion. Their number is vast; we quote a few extracts:

A king thus prays to Marduk: "O eternal Ruler, Lord of all, . . . lead in the right path the king whom Thou hast set up. I, a prince, Thy servant, am the creature of Thy hand. According to Thy mercy, O Lord, which Thou vouchsafest to all, may Thy almighty power be merciful. The fear of Thy Name implant in my heart. Grant me what seemeth good to Thee, for Thou art He who has given me life." Or again: "O Marduk, great Lord . . . open my eyes that I may know Thee; place justice in my mouth, plant mercy in my heart."

Very beautiful are many hymns to Shamash:

"O Lord, who enlightenest our darkness, Thou merciful God, who liftest up the lowly and watchest over the weak . . . all mankind Thou guidest as one man; with uplifted eyes they wait upon Thee; when Thou dost show Thy face they rejoice and are exceeding glad. . . . Thou holdest man's lot in Thy hand, eternally just in heaven art Thou, and on earth Thou rulest in righteousness. Thou knowest what is right, Thou knowest what is wrong. . . . Whoso thinketh evil in his heart, his horn dost Thou break; whoso in setting landmarks annulleth rights, whoso taketh a bribe and judgeth not aright, him with a mighty hand dost Thou restrain and layest the sin at his door. But him who is righteous dost Thou prosper and make his days long in the land. . . . The seed of the wicked shall not prosper, their judgments and devices wilt Thou bring to nought; Thou markest

their transgressions. No one, be he where he may, is hid from Thee; all are in Thy hand; Thou orderest their judgments, Thou settest the captives at liberty. Thou hearest the prayer and the cry of the humble. With loud voice the poor cry unto Thee, the weak, the weary, the oppressed, mother, wife, and maiden, and Thou hearest them."

Penitential Psalms, with their deep contrition and earnest appeal for forgiveness, reach a high spiritual tone and constantly recall Hebrew Psalms. Here is a penitent's appeal to Ishtar :

"Hear me, Queen of Heaven, when I, Thy servant, full of sighs, call upon Thee, for the fervent prayer of a contrite heart Thou dost not despise. . . . Besides Thee, there is no other god to guide me; look in mercy upon me, hear my supplication. Speak peace, and let Thine anger be assuaged. How long, O my Lady, wilt Thou turn away Thy face from me? Like a dove I wail, I am weary of my groaning. . . . When Thou lookest down in loving-kindness, the dead revive, the sick are whole, the mourner is comforted in the light of Thy countenance. I, Thy servant, bowed down and sore afflicted, racked with pain, call upon Thee; look graciously upon me; hear my supplication. . . . Put my sin far from me, purge my iniquity, my transgression, and my sin; forgive my transgression, accept my supplication. . . . Set my feet again in Thy path, then shall I again hold up my head among men and, the divine indignation overpast, the dark smoking embers shall again burst into flame, and my candle that was put out shalt Thou relight."

Moral Psalms.—We shall presently see that law and morality in Babylonia in 2100 B.C. were certainly at as high a level as in Israel in 850 B.C. and even later. "As a man thinks of God, so is he," is an axiom largely true, and Babylonians who looked up to Shamash as a god who loves justice and hates iniquity, who takes up the cause of the weak against his oppressor, of the righteous against the evil-doer; and who knew Marduk as "large-hearted, broad in compassion, full of loving-kindness"—such men are not likely to be lacking in moral principles. There

are many tablets with moral precepts very like *Proverbs*, e.g. :—

“Thou shalt not slander, speak what is pure. Thou shalt not speak evil, speak kindly. He who slanders and speaks evil, Shamash will visit his sin on his head. Let not thy mouth boast, guard thy lip. When thou art angered, do not speak at once ; for if thou speakest in anger, thou wilt regret it afterwards and in silence sadden thy penitent heart. To thy God come with a pure heart, for God loves the pure in heart. Prayer and penitence, bowing thyself before Him, render unto God early in the morning, and with God’s help thou wilt prosper. The fear of God begets His favour. Love and prayer cover many sins. Give to the needy food to eat, wine to drink. Seek what is right and eschew what is wrong, for this is well-pleasing in God’s sight. It is pleasing to Shamash and He will requite.”

Law Codes.—These come under holy scriptures, for universally of old law-givers spoke as the direct mouthpieces of God, and their words and decrees were His own. The law was an oracle (Heb. *tôrâ*, Bab. *têrtu*), and laws once given could not be recalled, but could be re-worded to adapt them to the ideas and needs of a later day—hence in Israel, “the Book of the Covenant,” the “Book of the Law” (Deut.), the “Book of the Law” (Priestly Code) are all one and the same law given on Sinai, the law of Moses. Thus Hammurabi introduces his famous Code of 2100 B.C. by stating he is the mouthpiece of Shamash, Anu and Enlil “to spread justice in the land, to destroy the wicked and the bad, so that the strong may not oppose the weak.”

Discovered in 1902, his code is a kind of Code Napoléon, dealing with almost every case that can arise in connection with agriculture, trade, contracts, family life, marriage, slaves, temple property, etc. Its general spirit is humane and equitable, marked by a keen sense of fairness and justice, quite on a level with the

¹ “The law of the Medes and Persians which altereth not,” was a principle equally sacred in Babylon and Israel.

Israel Codes till *Deut.* and the (prophetic)¹ Ten Commandments. In many respects Hammurabi's Code is strangely like Israel's 1300-1600 years later. Yet it is not strange, for Hammurabi was not only king of Babylonia, but "King of Amurru," that is, the land of the Amorites, and his Code of course ruled in Syria-Canaan as well as Babylonia (Burney, *Judges*, 329 sq. n.). The law embodied in written Codes is always ages older than the date of codification, and scholars all agree to-day that the Hebrew Codes (*e.g.* "Book of the Covenant," Priestly Code,) embody very largely the "custom law" of Canaan-Israel from a period long anterior to the monarchy or even the Joshua-settlement. The contrasts between Hammurabi's and the Hebrew Codes are evident, but the parallels are too pronounced to be explained away. They are "the same in literary form, they contain numerous practically identical laws, not a few cases of actual verbal agreement, and the parallels are too close to be explained upon a theory of common tradition."² The laws on leases, contracts, debt, embezzlement, distraint, usury, would be thought equitable to-day and humane. "The Code also throws a favourable light on the moral spirit in which relations between husband and wife, father and children were regulated" (Jastrow). Slaves were most humanely treated, were members of the family, allowed great freedom, had rights of property. The old law of retaliation is nominally retained, but in principle largely replaced by money-compensation. The laws of marriage and divorce, and the relationship of father to children are practically identical with Israel's.³

¹ "*Prophetic*," *i.e.* The Ten Words as enlarged by prophetic schools (see p. 40, *sup.* and 104 *inf.*). With the exception of Commandments I, and II., Hammurabi's Code is as strong as the Decalogue in its ethical legislation on *e.g.* duty to parents, murder and deeds of violence, honesty, adultery, slander, infringing others' rights. Not for one moment would we place Bab. and Heb. ethical values on a par. They are *not*. They have much in common, because Babylonia taught Israel as a child; but they have very much *not* in common, because Israel's prophets were Israel's next teachers, and, as themselves steeped in a conception of a God loving, just, and righteous, they spiritualised and transfigured Israel's outlook, religious and moral, so that morally and spiritually the world's "salvation is of the Jews." Our point in the text is that Israel *started* at Babylon's level.

² Hastings' *D. of B.*, art. "Code of Hammurabi," gives its full text and an exhaustive analysis and commentary, to which this paragraph is much indebted.

³ If anything, Hammurabi is more averse to polygamy than Israel, but allows it when marriage is without issue; he limits the man's power over wife and children more than Israel does. Laws on incest, etc., are identical with Israel's; so on divorce, even to the ordeal, "waters of jealousy" (Numb. v.), only Hammurabi allows the wife to declare her innocence on oath. So of slaves and legitimatised children, very humanely treated in their property-rights.

But spiritual as much of Babylonia's religion may be, there is often a coarse, crude, childish materialism in it. Its gods were nature-powers to the last, and a religion that cannot rid itself of a materialistic conception of God has definite barriers set to its growth. Not till the days of Hebrew spiritual prophetic religion do we find even Israel rising above a semi-material outlook on life to a higher form of religious aspiration. The main concern of Babylonia's religion was securing material blessings, property, health, success in war and in private undertakings, and a certain amount of tranquillity of soul. With no conception of one holy, righteous, loving God, but still steeped in nature-worship, primitive beliefs died hard in Babylonia and, even in the official priestly religion, there is a pronounced popular and lower layer of religion exactly as in early man's creed. This comes out strongly in their incantation and omen literature, instructing man how to have power with the gods and find out their will.

Incantations or Spells were used in seeking relief from baneful spirits or their agents, witches in league with these demons. Appeals were made to the gods through the priests, who were believed to be able to exorcise the evil spirits and counteract witches' wiles, if they prayed to the gods with the right words; but the greatest possible importance was attached to the exact and precise wording of the formula used. Even the slightest deviation from it spelled disaster. Hence these incantation formulas were carefully handed down from generation to generation in fixed form. Over and above the fixed formula, it was allowed to add more prayer as well, provided the original formula came in. Hence, occasionally, impressive hymns and strikingly beautiful prayers are inserted amid a jumble of old spell-formulas. No other civilised race so filled their world with demons and witches as Babylonia. Here, primitive man's whole spirit-creed was endorsed; disease,

accidents, evils of all kinds were spirits' work. Spells and magic rites alone could expel or avert evil spirits, and only priests knew the right ritual and words for it. Babylonian sacred literature on incantations is the richest in existence. Here is a sample ; the priest makes an image of, say, the witch, and acts as stated in the words of the formula :

“Witch, I seize thy mouth, I seize thy tongue, I seize thy piercing eyes, thy restless feet, thy active knees, thy outstretched hands, I tie thy hands behind thee, may Sin (= Moon-god) blast thee, cast thee into an abyss of water and fire ! O witch, like the setting of this seal-ring, may thy face glow and become pale.”

Omens and Oracles.—It was vital to know the will of the gods so as to court their favour and not offend them, or to ascertain their good or evil intentions for country, king or individual. Omens indicated the favour or displeasure of the god, oracles foretold the future. Thus observation of the signs in the heavens or in Nature, the inspection of sacrificial victims, or unusual phenomena in animals or babes, gave omens or indications of the divine will. Eclipses, earthquakes, abnormal births, uncanny animals or occurrences intervening, smoke not ascending straight from the sacrifice, defects in the liver and entrails of the victim, were bad omens and showed divine displeasure. As to the foretelling of the future, this was done by reading the stars, casting lots, divination, consulting sacred images or oracles.

Life after Death.—As in early man's creed, the souls of the dead go to a pit in the bowels of the earth.

There the wraiths of good and bad are all huddled together, though great men, e.g. kings, are in some honour there. In the pit, life is dark and dreary ; no joy, no activity. They lie there, shorn of all strength, activity and powers, barely conscious, leading a featureless existence without hope of release. One of the finest Babylonian epics tells us of Ishtar's “Descent into Hell” “to the dark house whence those who enter do not return, to the

road from which there is no path leading back, to the house in which those who enter are deprived of light, where dust is their nourishment, clay their food. They do not see light, they dwell in darkness, clothed like a bird, with wings as a covering; on door and lock dust has settled." Life in the lower world is well brought out in the Gilgamesh epic. Gilgamesh (two-thirds god, one-third man), the hero, wants to know what comes after death. The spirit of his friend Engidu, like Samuel's, rises up from a hole in the ground, and tells him not to ask: "I cannot tell thee, or thou wouldst sit down and weep the whole day"; another friend bids him eat, drink, and enjoy life as long as it lasts, live with the wife of his bosom, anoint his head, keep his body clean and his garments white, and enjoy his home, wife, and children. It is *Eccl.* ix. 7-9 to the letter, and Israel's idea of life in Sheol, "the Pit," "the Land of Forgetfulness," "the Place of Silence," up to about 300 B.C., Job's "land of darkness, of dense darkness, where even light is dark" (x. 22). In Babylonia and Israel the place and idea of it are identical, but Aralû is the Babylonian name for it, Sheol the Hebrew. Hommel says, "Sheol is Bab. Shêlu, from shu'-âlu, 'place of judgment,'" but this is not generally accepted to-day.

* * * * *

The Hebrews left Babylonia some time after 2000 B.C. steeped in this religion. It died hard, though the prophetic writers (850-500 B.C.) of our Bible, consciously or unconsciously, veil the fact. It was Israel's creed till Moses' day, and the *popular* belief very long after. Traces of it in the Bible are many, *e.g.* the Creation, Flood, and Babel stories and the genealogies of long-lived men; many Genesis legends; the developed belief in spirits, magic, witchcraft; in omens (*e.g.* Cain's sacrifice) and in oracles (cups of divination, Ephod, Urim and Thummim, lots); Sabbath and Sheol; Ashtoreth, Molech, moon and star-worship and their rites. Why then did they not also borrow Babylonia's *organised* system of worship, its elaborate temple-services, priesthood, liturgical services and ritual? or much of its higher culture? In 2100 B.C. Babylonia's temple-worship and institutions were far ahead of Israel's in 700 B.C., when it slowly set about

elaborating them for itself.¹ A possible, and probable, solution of Israel's retrograde movement is that, on leaving Babylonia, the Hebrews spent ages in the desert, reverted to nomad Arab type,² each man again becoming his own priest, and "custom" their only law. That is, the Hebrews left Babylonia fairly civilised, and reached Sinai a horde of lax and superstitious Arabs. Our next chapter shows how Moses set to work on this rough material.

NOTE ON DELUGE.

Prof. King (*Schweich Lect.*) gives this most interesting comparative table of the 5 principal Deluge versions:—

<i>Sumerian.</i>	<i>Gilgamesh Epic.</i>	<i>Berosus.</i>	<i>Gen. (J).</i>	<i>Gen. (P).</i>
Gods decree mankind's destruction by flood, Nintu protesting Ziusudu, hero of Deluge, king and priest Ziusudu's piety	Gods decree flood, the goddess Ish-tar protesting Ut-napishtim, hero of Deluge	Xisuthros (=Khasisatra), hero of Deluge, king	Destruction of man decreed, for his wickedness Noah, hero of Deluge Noah's favour	Destruction of all flesh decreed, on account of its corruption Noah, hero of Deluge Noah's righteousness
Warning of Z. by Enki in a dream	Warning of U. by Ea in a dream	Warning of X. by Kronos in a dream		Warning of Noah, and instructions for ark
Z.'s vessel a huge ship	Ship: 120 x 120 x 120 cubits; 7 stories; 9 divisions All kinds of animals	Size of ship: 5 x 2 stadia All kinds of animals	Instructions to enter ark 7 (x2) clean, 2 unclean	Size of ark: 300 x 50 x 30 cubits; 3 stories 2 of all animals
Flood and storm for 7 days	Flood from heavy rain and storm for 6 days Ship on Mt. Nisir Abatement of waters tested by birds	Flood Ship on mountain Abatement of waters tested by birds	Flood from rain for 40 days Abatement of waters tested by birds	Flood; "fountains of deep" and rain, 150 days Ark on Ararat Abatement of waters through drying wind
Sacrifice to Sun-god in ship	Sacrifice with sweet savour on mountain	Sacrifice to gods, after landing and paying adoration on earth	Sacrifice with sweet savour after landing Divine promise to N. not again to curse the ground	Landing from ark [after year (+10 days)] Divine covenant not again to destroy earth by flood; bow as sign
Anu and Enlil appeared	Ea's protest to Enlil			
Immortality of Z.	Immortality of U. and his wife	Apotheosis of X., wife, daughter, and pilot		

¹ Cheyne believes that, during the Captivity, when the Jews once again lived in Babylonia for 70 years, an Ezekiel and the spiritual leaders of Israel at last adopted Babylonia's well-organised priesthood, stately worship, ornate liturgical services, and ritual as found in the Second Temple, and much else. But those *conscious* loans from Babylonia are unduly exaggerated to-day. Israel's debt is rather in the way of "suggestion" than actual loans.

² See Jastrow, *Heb. and Bab. Trad.*, p. 16 sqq. and pp. 73, 75 *sup.*

PART II
DAWN OF ISRAEL'S HISTORY



CHAPTER VII

MOSES

OF the history of the Hebrews from the day of their migration from Babylonia to the days of Moses we know next to nothing. The emigrants formed a group out of which eventually sprang Israel, Moab, Edom, and Ammon, races which only became differentiated as portions of the group settled here, and others there.¹ Some of the Israel tribes, seeking subsistence for their flocks or forced by the pressure of other tribes behind them, crossed the Egyptian border, while others their kinsmen settled in the Sinaitic peninsula and worked up into Canaan independently.² The Egyptian settlers retained their Arab customs and usages and were regarded by the civilised Egyptians as barbarians without part or lot in their own public life. Impressed to work for public purposes by Rameses II. (c. 1292-1225 B.C.),³ these pastoral tribes revolted against such compulsory *corvée*, and went out of Egypt in King Mineptah's (c. 1225-1215 B.C.) day under Moses' leadership. With the passage of the "Red Sea," actual Hebrew history dawns.

Of Moses' historicity there is no shadow of a doubt. He is a historic personality of the very first

¹ Moab, apparently, was the first to settle, on the E. of the Dead Sea; Ammon next, N.E. of Moab; then Edom, E. and W. of Mt. Seir.

² See p. 34 n. *sup.* for Burney's plea that only the Joseph-tribes, and parts of the Judah, Simeon, and Levi clans were in Egypt, whilst, *e.g.* Asher, Naphtali, Gad, Dan, Issachar, Zebulun ("hand-maid" and kindred tribes, because not so pure in blood) had long since been dwelling in Canaan before Joshua's settlement in it.

³ For data for these dates, see Burney, *Judges*, civ. sqq.

rank. He made history and civilisation as only some half a dozen men have made it. The Jews themselves have ever rightly maintained that to Moses they owe the whole treasure of their religious faith. In their eyes he is the Founder of their nation and their religion, and he undoubtedly was an exceptional leader and a teacher with a unique revelation. About parts of his life-work all scholars are agreed; much is also either shrouded in mist or idealised.

Of the broad general facts of the exodus from Egypt there is no doubt. Right through the Bible, from the Song of Triumph at the Red Sea down to the latest psalms, the allusions to this epoch-making crisis are endless and ever the same. The tradition is persistent and never varies. This much seems clear: Moses inspired and rallied the oppressed Hebrews in Egypt by assuring them that their Jehovah had seen their misery and, of His compassion, was resolved to free them. Prompted by Moses, they broke away from bondage to seek a home in the wilderness whence they came, the home of their kinsmen (*e.g.* Kenites and Edomites), and the seat of their God. The Egyptians, unwilling to let these serfs go, set in hot pursuit. That very old poem, the "Song of Triumph," as well as uniform Hebrew tradition, clearly prove that at the "Red Sea" Israel had a wondrous escape¹ from a perilous situation, whatever its nature. So miraculous did it seem that they gave their Jehovah the credit for it all. He, and no other, had manifested Himself as Israel's champion and deliverer, enabling a rabble of shepherds to set Egypt's hosts at nought and safely to reach their destination and their kinsmen at Sinai, under Moses, Jehovah's agent.

At Sinai, Moses now entered on his real life-work.

¹ Exod. xiv. 21 attributes it to a strong east wind's action (upon shallow water) that the Hebrews were able to cross it. See Rendel Harris and Chapman in Hastings' *D. of B.*, i. p. 802, where the head of Suez Gulf is indicated as the place of passage, and actual instances of similar phenomena are quoted

He had in view two main ends: (1) He was bent on welding his rude and clannish Arab horde into a nation; (2) he meant to plant the fear of God in their hearts. As a man of God, his heart was set on it; as a statesman, he saw in this fear of God an essential factor to his national policy. "Hear, O Israel, I am the Lord *thy* God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt; thou shalt have none other gods before Me," is his one key-note. Absolute dependence on their Jehovah is what he means to drill, first and last, into his wild Arab clans: "It is not you, O Israel, who have chosen Jehovah; He, of His compassion, has chosen you. Cleave to Him, obey Him, as your one God and champion. If you do, you will be blessed and prosper; if you do not, His curse is upon you, for He is a jealous God."

At Sinai in forty years Moses achieved both these ends.¹ By his force of character and consummate statesmanship he laid well and deep the foundations of Israel's greatness. Rightly, in all their after-history, Israel traced its real birth to Moses at Sinai. What took place there? Three momentous events: (1) Moses made Jehovah Israel's one God; (2) Moses bound Israel to its Jehovah by an awful and solemn Covenant; (3) Moses gave Israel laws.

These bare facts are certain; all further details misty. Our earliest Bible record of it dates, in written form, 400 years after the events, and the other accounts of these Sinaitic facts are much later still. In each case, the writers throw back into Moses' day the ideas and conditions prevalent in their own, and assign the views and laws of 800-500 B.C. to Moses himself. Now, if the Books of Moses are unreliable for the Mosaic age (see pp. 41 sqq. *sup.*), can we reconstruct at all this Mosaic age and its culture as it was *c.* 1200 B.C.? Yes, and for this reason. J and E (p. 48 *sup.*)

¹ Modern Japan, and militarist Germany before the war, prove how truly an "emotional ideal,"—to use Kidd's phrase,—drilled into a people, can revolutionise national character even in one generation.

carried their history of Israel beyond the *Gen.* to *Josh.* narrative, and in *Judg.* and 1 *Sam.* i.-xii. we have the same two old documents as our authorities,¹ as well as other very old fragments such as the Song of Deborah [probably from "the Book of the Wars of Jehovah" (Numb. xxi. 14)], all but contemporaneous with their events. From this old material in *Judg.* and *Sam.*, "essentially of a piece with J and E in the Hexateuch," also from indirect references in the Hexateuch itself, and from Israel's religious and moral standard even under the earliest kings, we can reconstruct approximately Israel's cultural and religious stage in Moses' day. What picture do these data give us of (1) the culture and morals, (2) the conception of God, in Israel then?

Culture and Morals.—Very rude and primitive is Israel's condition in the Judges' period.² Dean Stanley well says: "It would almost seem as if *Judges* were in the Bible to impress upon us the human, nay barbarian, element which plays its part in sacred history. In any other history we should regard Samson and Jephthah, even Gideon and Barak, not as devout servants of God, but as freebooters, stern sheikhs, passionate, revengeful, lax, superstitious."—We see the tribes, no compact nation as we usually fancy, but, largely, disintegrated units acting independently of their fellows, settling down as best they can in the midst of an alien population mostly unsubdued, adopting their superstitious ideas and rites. Law and justice in our sense there was none in that age. "Custom," not law or morality,

¹ Burney, *Judges*, § 3, cogently proves that "the document E of the Hexateuch continues beyond *Josh.* and provides material for the history of *Judg.* This seems to be placed beyond the range of controversy (cf. *Judg.* ii. 6-9 = all but verbatim *Josh.* xxiv. 28-31 (E)). A similar conclusion must be drawn with regard to J, e.g. *Judg.* i.-ii. 5 is now generally admitted as from J." The redactor of *Judg.* had evidently J and E gathered together into two continuous prophetic histories, and it was these two documents which were brought into one by him, i.e. not two collections of disconnected narratives.

² Of course, due allowance must be made for laxity in times of war and unsettlement, which always impairs the vitality of virtue.

ruled everything. “Custom” demanded blood-revenge and retaliation, “eye for eye, life for life,” and laid this as a bounden duty on the next of kin. Custom allowed as a matter of course adultery with concubines and slaves, but not with married women or free maidens. This was prohibited *not* as morally wrong, but because they were others’ property and chattels. Custom gave parents power to sell or even slay children. Custom expected some honesty towards Israelites, but strangers could be cheated or robbed. For centuries after Moses each man “did that which was right in his own eyes” (*Judg.* xvii. 6, xxi. 25), and had mostly to take the law into his own hands to redress his wrongs. Fear, not moral motives, kept man from wrong. Only dread of bodily hurt and outlawry at men’s hands, or of the wrath and curse of national Jehovah, for breach of “tribal custom,” kept men from robbery, murder, or perjury. This is the picture of *Judges* and, largely, for 200 years later.

Conception of Jehovah.—In the “Books of Moses” the ethical monotheism of 700–800 B.C. is thrown back to Moses’ and even Adam’s day. Facts contradict this flatly. Man’s idea of God ever reflects his own character and outlook. Hebrews of 1250–1000 B.C., themselves rude, arbitrary, vindictive, imagined God such an one as themselves in body and passions, only much greater and stronger. He was jealous of His rights and exacting; *e.g.* certainly up to Saul’s day (1 Sam. xv. 3)¹ they believed that Jehovah exacted the wholesale murder of “banned” foes—man, woman, child, cattle, belongings,—and was terribly angry if it was not done thoroughly. Nature-worship was these old Hebrews’ second nature, and largely accounts for their idea of God.² For ages they asso-

¹ Cf. the same idea even in humane Deut. xx. 13 sqq., about 650 B.C. (but long after it was possible to carry it out).

² A god’s character naturally reflects what he stands for. Thus in Babylonia Nergal is the Sun of midsummer’s torrid heat bringing suffering, disease, famine, and death. Shamash is the Spring Sun driving away winter’s cold, darkness, and storms, and bringing light, warmth, joy, life. Shamash is

ciated Jehovah with the awful and stern Storm-God of Sinai (Judg. v. 4 sq.; Josh. x. 11; 1 Sam. vii. 10; Ps. xviii. 9 sqq.) appearing in or amid fire and lightning, fire the symbol of His Presence and instrument of His wrath (Ex. iii. 4; 2 Kgs. i. 10; Judg. xiii. 20; Numb. xvi. 35), or as a pillar of fire and cloud going before them. He is terrible in His wrath at any infringement of His rights. All that is in any way His peculiar property, set apart for His use and service, is "holy," awfully inviolable, *taboo*. Woe betide any who dare approach or touch His "holiness!" Thus He instantly slays men wholesale for daring to look into His Ark¹ (1 Sam. vi. 19); kills Uzzah for touching it to save it from falling² (2 Sam. vi. 6-8); warns His people not to draw near His dwelling-place, Sinai, "lest the Lord break forth upon them and they perish"³ (Ex. xix. 21-24). In keeping with His character He is specially, as Deborah's Song shows, Israel's War-God and Battle-Leader (Judg. v.). "Jehovah is a man of war, Jehovah is His Name" (Ex. xv. 3). He is present wherever His Ark is. It represents Jehovah (see esp. Numb. x. 35 sq.), and with it He travels wherever His Israel goes. Hence Israel's horror and dismay at the

worshipped as kind, loving, just; Nergal is pictured as "a destructive warrior," a death-dealer, a giant, sword in hand, causing havoc. As in Babylonia, so in Israel, as long as Jehovah was mainly the Sinai God of storm, fire, earthquake, a limit was set to His moral and humane conception.

¹ LXX (*i.e.* Septuagint, cf. n. ² *inf.*) has "saw," "looked at," not "into." God smote 70, because they were not glad to see the Ark, not for "looking into" it. 70 often = a large round number. 50,000 seems to have come into the text as a doublet, or a scribal error. The text is very corrupt.

² But there are other versions of these two passages, *e.g.* 1 Sam. vi. 19 reads in the LXX: "And the sons of Jeconiah did not rejoice when they saw the Ark, and He slew o them," etc. As to 2 Sam. vi. 6-8, Arnold in his recent "Ephod and Ark" (*Harvard Theol. Studies*), with one slight emendation, gives a new interpretation: "And they came to Nachon's threshing floor, and Uzzah slipped against the ark and clutched it, for the oxen had been dunging, and God, angry, smote him for the slip." A very slight Hebrew emendation turns "stretched forth" into "slipped"; the verb translated "had been dunging" means literally "had let fall," always a puzzle. Hence Arnold interprets: Uzzah slips on the dung, tries to clutch the ark to save himself, and cracks his skull on the rock. But both these interpretations leave us where we were as to the conception of God.

³ Cf. Ex. iv. 24, where Jehovah meets Moses and seeks to kill him for being uncircumcised.

Ark's capture by the Philistines. Even then Jehovah asserts Himself. Before Him in His Ark their god Dagon falls as dead, and plagues curse Philistia, so that the Philistines exclaim: "Send away the ark of the God of Israel that it slay us not and our people" (1 Sam. v. 11); even as the people of Beth-shemesh, when a large number of them died for looking into the Ark, exclaimed: "Who is able to stand before the Lord, this 'holy' God?" (1 Sam. vi. 20). Jephthah's vow proves that human sacrifices were popularly thought acceptable to Him, especially the sacrifice of the first-born, and this was clearly a very popular belief up to 700 B.C. (*e.g.* 2 Kgs. xvi. 3; xxi. 6; Deut. xviii. 10; Mic. vi. 7). Images of Jehovah (teraphim, certainly, and probably ephod, = images) were common (*e.g.* Judg. viii. 27; xvii. 5), and no objection was raised to them till the days of the canonical prophets.

Clearly, then, Israel's early God was not the Moral Governor of the whole world as with us. He is the one God of Israel, and belongs to Israel only. His province begins and ends with Israel's borders. Other nations are outside His sphere. They have their gods as real as He is. Hence He is not addressed as God simply, as if there were no other. He has a proper name, Jehovah, to distinguish Him from His peers, *e.g.* Chemosh, god of Moab, or Milcom, god of Ammon. Thus David is sure that his flight to Philistia puts him outside Jehovah's protection and subjects him to Philistia's gods (1 Sam. xxvi. 19; cf. Judg. xi. 24).

From this rapid sketch of early Israel's moral and spiritual plane, we are in a better position to understand Moses' three epoch-making deeds, his (1) revelation of Jehovah,¹ (2) Covenant, (3) Law,—at Sinai.

¹ Directly given in the O.T., or preserved in proper names, is a long list of titles of God. Some express the general notion of "god," others are descriptive, *e.g.* *El* = god, *Shaddai* = Almighty (from LXX)—*El* is a very ancient name of god, common to Babylonians, Canaanites, and Hebrews, and may have been borrowed from Sumer; it is found in Heb. proper names, *e.g.* Isra-el, Beth-el. Dr. Burney thinks its original Sumerian meaning may have

(1) *Jehovah*. "I am the Lord *thy* God; *Thou* shalt have none other gods besides Me." This, Moses and Israel could easily grasp. It meant: Jehovah is Israel's God and Israel's only; Jehovah has chosen Israel for His own, reserves Himself for it alone, links His fortunes with Israel's. But Israel must do the same. Jehovah is a jealous God, brooks no divided worship with Chemosh or Baal. Israel must serve Him and Him only. Thus it is henotheism, the worship of one God only out of many; not monotheism, the worship of the one and only God, beside whom there is no other. We shall see that the moral element enters into Israel's idea of Jehovah, but they are far more alive to His strength and awful "holiness."

(2) *The Covenant*, ratified with awe-inspiring rites such as would impress a rude and superstitious people, pledged Israel to loyalty to its Jehovah. In Ch. V. we saw that in savage days, so as to make a compact inviolable, the priest cut a victim in pieces, made two heaps of them, and uttered the spell: "So be it done, and more also, to him who breaks the agreement"; then the parties passed between the two heaps, thus putting themselves

been "the bright one," "the pure one." *Elohim* is a plural of eminence, equivalent to a superlative; *Elyon* (poetical) = the most high; *El-Shaddai* = God Almighty. *Adonai*, another plural of eminence = mighty Lord. As proper names show, e.g. Jerub-baal (= Gideon) and Abi-melech, *Baal* (= lord or owner) and *Melech* (= mighty king) were also titles of Jehovah, and, in this connection, have no reference to the pagan gods of that same name.

Jehovah, or rather *Yahweh*, is now known to have been recognised as "god" in Babylonia from c. 2000 B.C. onward, but not earlier, and Sayce, Hommel, and Burney believe it was introduced there by the Amorite kings, and make *Yahweh* an Amorite deity. He was early identified with the Moon-god, Sin. J (not E), regards the use of the name *Yahweh* as primeval, e.g. Gen. iv. 26 states that already in the days of Adam's grandson, Enos, "then began men to call by the name of *Yahweh*." What the revelation of the name in Exod. iii. 13, 14, means is that the name *Yahweh* was now given a uniquely new significance, full of the moral and spiritual meaning which Israel's prophets afterwards drew from it.—We have seen how names in olden days were kept secret for fear of the magic use to which they might be put (p. 62 *sup.*). So *Jahwe's* or *Yahweh's* name was unutterable, and concealed under the form *JHWH* so carefully that its pronunciation is quite lost. (Cf. III. Commandment and especially Lev. xxiv. 16 (H), a very old law.)

under the god's blessing or curse (cf. Gen. xv. 9 sqq.). Moses did much the same thing¹: (1) A solemn and bloody sacrifice is offered, at once bringing God in; (2) The terms of the agreement are clearly set forth by Moses; (3) A solemn pledge: God pledges Himself (as shown by the sprinkling of the blood on His altar, *i.e.* on Himself) to abide by His part of the agreement; Israel pledge themselves (as shown by the sprinkling of the blood on the people, and by their express words) to be loyal to Jehovah and abide by the contract; (4) The slain oxen symbolise Israel's fate, if faithless to its covenant; (5) The passing between the pieces is protective (against evil spirits), and also sacramental, uniting the covenanters by the bond of common blood.

Never before, in any land, had the relationship between a god and his people been based on such a mutual agreement or Solemn Covenant between the two parties. It was precisely this moral bond, this mutual Covenant-relationship, that gave Israel's religion its unique religious character. It was a Covenant based on duties as well as rights, *i.e.* it was a *moral* covenant. On moral grounds, out of compassion for their misery in bondage, Jehovah had chosen Israel as His own; as if between man and man, He was now entering into a moral covenant with them; but He claimed in return their loyalty to their bond and their undivided allegiance to Himself. Too much stress cannot possibly be laid on this moral factor. It is the seed, and the ethical monotheism and sublime spiritual teaching of an Isaiah is but its flower. It is precisely this moral element in Mosaic religion which makes all the difference between Israel's and other religions. This and this alone explains why these nomad Arabs absorbed civilised Canaan instead of being absorbed by it. It also explains why Judaism

¹ As elsewhere (*e.g.* Gen. xxii.), the prophetic writers adapt this scene to their own day, *e.g.* introduce into it a "*Book of the Covenant*" written 400 years later, and give it a moral and religious setting.

is the seed of which Christianity is the ripe fruit. The inspiration which prompted Moses to give the Covenant this moral bed-rock foundation in itself stamps him as the greatest of prophets, a spiritual genius, a great outstanding Leader and Teacher of men, whose moral teaching was so instinct with life that it lived on and thrived when all its environment was dead against it. True, a Joshua, Gideon, Nathan, Elijah, Amos watered the plant, yet they but entered into the fruit of Moses' immense labours and uniquely inspired foresight during those forty years. We have to jump 1250 years before we meet another prophet equal to and greater than Moses.

Never did Israel forget this awe-inspiring Covenant ceremony of Moses' day. It stamped itself deep in Hebrew minds and awed them for all time. But this "everlasting covenant" also filled them with a national pride and faith in themselves under a Jehovah now and henceforth their God and champion, and theirs only.

(3) *Moses' Law*.—As we have seen (pp. 41 sqq.), it is now admitted that the Book of the Covenant (C.) written about 800 B.C., Deuteronomy's Book of the Law (c. 650) and the Priestly Code (c. 500) cannot possibly be Moses' work. Even if any portions go back to Moses, we have no means of identifying them. As said in Ch. IV. *sup.*, not only were all new laws ascribed to Moses, but the written codes of 800 and 650 B.C. were, in Moses' name, constantly revised, modified, altered to bring them abreast of later ideas and needs. Hence, as Cheyne, Paterson, and Montefiore assure us, there is good reason to believe that even the Ten Commandments did not originally bear anything like their present form and character. As Cheyne remarks, the purely ethical tone of our Decalogue, "the refinement which forbids *even thoughts* of covetousness," would have been far above the heads of rude Arabs of 1250 B.C. Moses' original Ten *Words* must

have been much shorter and less high-pitched, dealing largely with rights of property and on less Deuteronomic ethical principles. The moral element was in Moses' Words from the first; the prophets were not the first to enunciate it, they inherited from Moses the conviction that true religion utters itself in morality. The persistent Tradition assigning these Ten Words to Moses proves that they were fundamentally moral from the start, and all we imply is that the various reflections and promises now found in them are later prophetic additions. The original Ten Words were, rather, terse sentences forbidding man to tamper with what belongs to God or man as his by right. The long explanations in Words II. and IV. are clearly late additions. In the Second, *all* images are prohibited; yet down to the eighth century no one appears¹ to be acquainted with such a categorical prohibition of images of Jehovah. Gideon, the Judge, had one; so had Micah, and *Moses' own grandson*, Jonathan, was its priest; David consults the ephod,² "most likely an image of Jehovah" (Pater-son); Gideon's "ephod," made of 1700 shekels of gold, was probably an image, and the association of ephod with *teraphim* elsewhere (*e.g.* Hos. iii. 4) seems to confirm this view. The parallel to Word II. in Ex. xxxiv. 17, "Thou shalt make thee no molten gods," *i.e.*

¹ In the *Journal of Theol. Stud.*, Ap., 1908, Dr. Burney argues that there were two forms of Yahwism in Israel from Moses' day. As already said (p. 34, n.) his school holds that only a few tribes (*e.g.* Judah, Simeon and Joseph-tribes) were in Egypt; the rest, "handmaid" tribes, were already in Canaan. The Mosaic tribes were steeped in Mosaic Yahwism and eschewed images. This purer Yahwism was fostered by, *e.g.* the prophets, Nazirites, Rechabites. The non-Mosaic tribes were Canaanite Yahwists, that is, Yahweh worshippers but with more of the heathen element, *e.g.* images and other rites, in their cult. After the settlement in Canaan, the Mosaic tribes would come under the influence of the non-Mosaic and be prone to lapse into their lower religious ideas.

² Of course, we must carefully distinguish "ephod" before (say) 700 B.C. from "ephod" in the Priestly Code, which is ever a high-priestly vestment. We must add that many modern scholars deny that ephod ever was an image, "but the ordinary priestly vestment employed (*e.g.* Exod. xxviii. 4) in obtaining an oracle"; (see Burney, *Judges*, pp. 236 sqq. for "ephod" = vestment, not idol; and Hastings' *D. of B.*, i. 726, where Driver gives the reasons for both views).

images of *strange gods*, sounds much more like the original Word and is fully in keeping with Moses' resolve to stamp out polytheism. In the IVth Word no doubt Moses commanded Sabbath-rest (cf. the terse "Six days thou shalt work, but on the seventh thou shalt rest" in Ex. xxxiv. 21), but not till the monarchy was it kept "holy" in our sense. Again, Deut. v. 14: "that thy servants may rest as well as thou, etc.," gives a totally different reason for Sabbath-rest to that of Ex. xx. 11, "for God rested the seventh day," an obvious reference to the late Gen. i. Creation-Story of 500 B.C. These variations, anachronisms, palpable prophetic spiritual colourings, and also the disproportion in the Two Tables, one with 146 words and only 26 in the other, all point to our Decalogue as the outcome of many revisions. (Jastrow, *Heb. and Bab. Trad.*, p. 165, has excellent suggestions as to the way in which the short Decalogue grew.)

To sum up. The general conviction to-day is that the original Ten Words were pithy one-line commandments, *e.g.* Thou shalt have no other God but Jehovah; Thou shalt make thee no molten or strange gods; Thou shalt not utter the "holy" Name; Thou shalt keep the Sabbath-rest; Thou shalt obey thy father and mother; Thou shalt do no murder, adultery, robbery, perjury, nor falsely claim thy neighbour's chattels.

Of course, the elaborate laws on priests, sacrifices, ceremonial, are not Moses' own. Up to Hezekiah's day (727-698) worship was neither thus centralised nor organised. Any Israelite could sacrifice without priestly aid at any place with an altar, and these local shrines were legion. The Book of the Covenant expressly tells him to do so (Ex. xx. 24 sq.). Early priests were rather caretakers of a shrine and its belongings than ministers at the altar. Thus in Moses' day they were caretakers of the Ark and its Tent. Not the altar, but the oracle first gave them dignity. Wherever there was a shrine with an image

of Jehovah (ephod or teraphim)¹ *there* was an oracle, where men could consult God's will by the sacred lot and ephod (cf. Urim and Thummim, and 1 Sam. xiv. 41, 42). Israel's religion bade disputants thus to "come before God" for His decision, and these decisions were carefully kept as precedents. Through long experience the priests alone had skill to interpret oracles, apply old decisions to new cases, indicate the proper usages, formulas, and ritual in approaching God or performing sacred rites. Thus, as interpreters of God's will, they became soothsayers, judges, teachers, and counsellors. Like Moses, as God's spokesmen they interpreted God's will, decided suits, gave guidance in social matters. This oral teaching or priestly *Torah*,² a deeply moral influence, is the source and basis of all the Pentateuch laws, and dates from Moses' day onward.

Hence, priests grew in esteem and dignity, gradually appropriated one function after another till they eventually became a sacrosanct guild or caste, and at last monopolised the ministry at the altar (after 621 B.C. nominally, really after the Exile), and became sole mediators between God and man. But this was not so till long after Moses; neither is the popular idea correct that from Moses' day all priests had to be of the tribe of Levi.³ Thus Judg. xvii. 7 speaks of

¹ *Teraphim* not Jehovah-images, but probably household-gods, originally connected with ancestor-worship. Images they were (Gen. xxxi. 30, 32), and Michal places one in David's bed (1 Sam. xix. 13 sqq.). They were used as oracle-givers (in Micah's shrine, Judg. xvii. 5, cf. Hos. iii. 4). In 2 Kgs. xxiii. 24 they are associated with witchcraft. In early days, their cultus was not thought disloyal to Jehovah.

² *Torah*, or "oracle of God," oral or written, is a wide term covering eventually both Scripture and Tradition. In early times it denotes *oral decisions*, answers to hard questions, civil or ritual, by the priests acting as God's interpreters and mouthpieces, *i.e.* as judges (see Hag. ii. 11-13). Ex. xviii. 13 sq., shows us Moses making known the *Torah*; he is sitting all day long "judging the people," *i.e.* giving decisions in hard cases as people come to him "to enquire of God." He "makes known to them the statutes of God and His Laws" (16), *i.e.* he is God's mouthpiece, so are the priests after him. In this sense Moses gave Israel's Law, *i.e.* he was the first to actualise the sense of law and justice and to begin the series of oral decisions, "oracles of God," which priests and prophets continued after him. On these decisions all Israel's Codes are based.

³ Were Levites a tribe at all? *Levi*, priest = "one attached" (to priestly

"a Levite of the family of Judah"; Moses uses "young men of the children of Israel" to offer the covenant sacrifices (Ex. xxiv. 5), and appoints the Ephraimite Joshua as custodian or "priest" of the all-holy Tent. So afterwards. The Ephraimite Micah first appoints his son priest; Samuel is no Levite; the sons of Abinadab, no Levite, are "sanctified" as priests to serve the sacred Ark (1 Sam. vii. 1; 2 Sam. vi. 3). But although priests need not be Levites, Levites were preferred if available.

Enough has been said to show that Moses did not contribute to Israel's legislation and religious institutions all that the "Books of Moses" imply. None the less, he is Israel's greatest creative genius, the Founder of Israel as a nation and of its religion, the inspiration of after-prophets, and man's "schoolmaster unto Christ."

functions). Thus Gen. xxix. 34 (J) connects Levi with *lavāh* (R.V. m.) "to be joined"; (cf. Numb. xviii. 2, 4, (P): "They (Levi) shall be 'joined unto' thee (Aaron).") Many able scholars endorse this view, regarding the term *Levites* not as a tribal name at all, but as, originally, a descriptive adjective = "those who attached themselves to" the Ark and priestly functions. Hommel points out that already in Minæan inscriptions the word *lawi'u* = priest. Driver writes: "At one period the term Levite was merely a priest's official title regardless of his tribe," *i.e.* the name of a priestly caste. He instances Ex. iv. 14 (JE) where God, addressing Moses, speaks of "Aaron thy brother the *Levite*." Driver adds: "As Moses, equally with Aaron, belonged to the tribe of Levi (Ex. ii. 1), the term, as applied *distinctively* to Aaron, must denote, not ancestry, but profession," *i.e.* clerics as opposed to laymen.

Other eminent scholars deny this, and hold that Levi was, as O.T. tradition assumes, an independent Israelite tribe; originally secular, it eventually (possibly after its decimation and dispersal) came to be invested with priestly functions, a privilege due to its close connection with Moses, himself a Levite and represented in Ex. xxxiii. 7-11 (E) as sole intermediary between God and Israel. Gen. xlix., "The Blessing of Jacob," a very early poem, endorses this view strongly and all but conclusively. In it Levi is a purely secular tribe, censured, with Simeon, for some act of violence leading to their being accursed and dispersed among the other tribes; probably referring to the treachery of the Levi and Simeon tribes towards the Shechemites (Gen. xxxiv.) and its dire requital by Shechem (cf. Burney, *Judg.* 436 sqq.). An etymology of Levi widely accepted to-day: "Levi is simply a gentile form of his mother's name Leah = 'wild cow,'" (totemism,) favours the view of Levi as a tribe.

CHAPTER VIII

PERIOD OF THE JUDGES

WITH Moses we crossed the border-line separating prehistoric from historic Israel, but lack of data compelled us to confine ourselves to broad facts and general outlines. Henceforth we are on surer ground. *Judges* and *Samuel*, though seventh-century compositions, incorporate far older sources (J and E) of real historical value. But the seventh-century editors of *Judg.* (though probably pre-Deuteronomistic, possibly as early as 700 B.C.) are all but Deuteronomists in tendency. Like Deuteronomy, they treat facts of history with an eye to their judgments of value, for their practical religious lessons. The main introduction (ii. 6-iii. 6) gives us the editors' key-note to their scheme of "pragmatic" history. We are there told that as soon as Joshua and his generation had died, Israel fell away from Jehovah and worshipped the gods of Canaan; immediate punishment at once falls upon Israel in the form of a foreign oppressor. Thereupon Israel cries to Jehovah, and He promptly raises a deliverer or Judge. Israel is faithful till the Judge dies, then the wholesale apostasy begins all over again, with the same results, six times over. The editors see in all the *Judges* period one long scene of idolatry and perpetually recurring apostasy. Where an Amos or Isaiah ascribes Israel's downfall to false worship *and* bad lives, these redactors dwell exclusively on false worship. They artificially force history to illustrate a Hosea's prophetic teaching, and are imbued with his spirit.

Yet the historical value of the stories in *Judges* is very great. It is only the framework that is thus artificial. The religious pragmatism of Judg. ii. 11 sqq. does not colour the stories themselves, the main narratives representing the older material. It is only applied, practically word for word, at the beginning and close of the stories. As already said (p. 98 *sup.*), the real historical sources of *Judges* are J and E, two very old collections of stories of the struggles of the tribes, E. and W. of Jordan, with the older inhabitants or with invaders during Israel's settlement in Canaan. In this older material we discover the true facts of the settlement, *e.g.* its purely local and tribal character, as Judg. i.-ii. 5, a very old J document, tells us from the start. Moreover, in J and E, the religious motive is much more true to fact and primitive, exactly as in the J and E sections of the Hexateuch. We find little (except in vi. 7-10 and x. 6-16) of the pragmatic conception of sin, punishment, and repentance; yet the utmost emphasis is laid on the fact that the Judges are only enabled to make headway against tremendous odds as Jehovah's commissioned deliverers, and in the Divine strength which supports and inspires them.

The period of Judges covers the whole interval between Joshua and Samuel, *c.* 1200-1000 B.C.,¹ when Israel was struggling for a firm foothold in Canaan and settling there. In this long 250-year process of conquest, settlement, and fusion with the old inhabitants, Canaan's influence on Israel was strong and twofold, uplifting in civilisation, but reactionary in religion. The Canaanites as Semites (= Amorites)

¹ *Chronology*.—The systematic chronology of *Judg.* with its numerous exact numbers, 20, 40 (5), 80, is very artificial. Forty years is the O.T. equivalent to a generation. It is a favourite O.T. number, *e.g.* Moses' life falls into three parts of 40 years; Eli, David, Solomon, each rule 40 years. 1 Kgs. vi. 1, reckons 480 years (= 12 generations) from the Exodus to the building of the Temple, Solomon's fourth year. According to *Judg.* numbers, it would add up to nearly 600. As already said, the Exodus was about 1250 B.C. probably, and the Judges period about 200 years or so (see Burney, *Judges*, 1.).

were Israel's kinsmen and spoke much as they did. As we have seen, Canaan, certainly from 2100-1400 B.C., was steeped in Babylonian culture, religion, nature-worship. Israel had only just begun to cast off this nature-worship,¹ and was still impregnated with many of its views. The seductive influence of Canaan's nature-worship had its effect on Hebrew religion. While on the whole remaining loyal to its one Jehovah, Israel borrowed many of Canaan's forms of worship, her feasts and sacrificial rites, her altars upon high-places and under green trees, her Asheras or sacred poles, and not a few reverted to Canaan's nature-gods and her Baals and Ashtarts.² Yet the impression conveyed by the pragmatic³ history of the *Judges*-editors that the whole Judges period was one long scene of Hebrew apostasy, is a gross exaggeration. We know as a fact that all the national leaders, from Deborah to David, were loyal servants of Jehovah, and invariably found nine out of every twelve Israelites eager to rally "to the help of Jehovah." As the footnote (2) shows, it was Jehovah Himself that half the Israelites were worshipping under the form of Baal and even Ashtoreth.

If we reconstruct the actual historical background, the religious situation will stand out in bolder relief. As often in the Bible, *Judges* gives us two versions of the same events, sometimes three, by reason of the two original sources J and E, themselves different, and also the editors' own comments. *Joshua*⁴ and

¹ If the modern idea of only Joseph-tribes being in Egypt with Moses is accepted, while many of the rest were at the time already in Canaan, then only the Mosaic tribes, imbued with Moses' ethical conception of Jehovah, would be conscious of lapsing from a higher to a lower form of Jehovah-worship in serving Him under the form of *baals*, and thereby infringing the Covenant.

² *Baal* is not a proper name like Jehovah, but means "master," "owner," and is applicable to any god. "Strange as it sounds, the title was in early times used to describe the God of Israel" (Burney, *Outlines of O. T. Theol.*, 27 sq.). Proper names of Jehovah-worshippers have it, e.g. Jerub-baal = "Baal (= Jehovah) strives." For Baal = Jehovah, cf. Hos. ii. 16, 17.

³ *I.e.* treating facts of history with reference to their practical lessons.

⁴ Of course, at the back of the *Joshua* narrative lies a genuinely ancient tradition like Judg. i.-ii. 5, but the Deuteronomist redactor of JE has obscured it (Burney).

much of *Judges* represent the conquest of Western Palestine as the work of a compact Israel welded in unison. After extirpating the Canaanites, Israel is pictured as laying the ownerless country at Joshua's feet for him to divide it by lot among the tribes. This is an idealised picture. *Judg.* i., an older and more historical document, knows nothing of this systematic organisation of the tribes with its well-mobilised army and unity of direction. True, at acute crises, the common danger at times welded several tribes together—never all (*e.g.* *Judg.* v.). But except on two or three such memorable occasions, the tribes led each its own life and fought each for its own hand. The conquest of Canaan took the form of guerilla warfare, each tribe independently trying to effect a more or less permanent settlement where it could, and as best it could, in the midst of an alien population largely unsubdued. Naturally, the conquest was far from complete. Whenever the Canaanites, as split up as Israel, combined to strike a united blow for freedom, the clannish and disorganised Israelites found themselves in sore straits, even had to flee to caves or hills for refuge. Then some inspiring Hebrew champion, a Deborah or Gideon,¹ would rise up, rouse Israel in Jehovah's name, muster several tribes together and break the power of the foe. But, the crisis over, the tribes flew asunder again and lived each its own life as before. Indeed, throughout this period, Israel had a clannish foe to thank for such success as their invasion achieved. Had the Canaanites possessed any cohesion among themselves, Israel must inevitably have been chased out of the land; but Canaan, with its heptarchy, was hopelessly divided. Even so, far from being exterminated, as Deuteronomy implies,

¹ Just as the Deuteronomist editors turn local into national conflicts and settlements, so they make of the Deliverers or Judges a succession of national rulers, whereas they were mostly tribal captains with a purely local authority, and only one (Gideon) handed down his office to his son. Only when face to face with the foe did the other tribes obey them.

vast numbers of Canaanites remained in the land, and the old population amalgamated with the new. This proved both a blessing and a curse to Israel.

Through the Canaanites, nomad Hebrews were introduced to agriculture and civilisation. A period of free open-country life intervened before they had to settle down to the restricted life of cities, thus making the transition-stage from nomad life to civilisation easier. True, some cities were early in Israelite hands (*e.g.* Judg. i. 10, 22), but, generally, the Canaanites still held the cities while the Israelites occupied the villages.¹ Their villages, even, they turned into fixed camps: "To your tents,² O Israel," was their signal cry for dispersing in those early days, just as "every man to his own city" (1 Kgs. xxii. 36) replaced it later. Thus in their first stage of civilisation Israel had only to assimilate the culture and agricultural pursuits of Canaanite peasants, with whom they soon found much in common. As time went on, Israel also made cities their own and adopted Canaan's higher arts and civilisation. From the first, fusion and intermarriage proceeded apace between the two races. This largely explains Israel's rapid growth in population as well as culture, and paved the way for the populous and cultured empire of David's and Solomon's days.

Israel's introduction to Canaan's higher civilisation was politically an immense gain. Had they remained nomad shepherds, their subsequent historical development would, of course, have been impossible. Their career would have been that of their first-cousins Edom, Moab and Ammon. But as certainly did Canaanite civilisation involve a great peril; it did not improve their morals. Accustomed to a hardy open-air life in the desert, where they had to wrestle

¹ *E.g.* "The villages ceased in Israel" (Judg. v. 7), is looked upon as a very heavy blow to Israel in Deborah's day.

² True, as Driver and Burney point out, "tent" is merely a "survival," and really means "to your homes."¹

with hard Nature for bare sustenance for selves and flocks, they now found themselves comfortably settled in "a land flowing with milk and honey." This had an enervating influence on the Hebrew sensuous temperament. Moreover, the old inhabitants soon introduced Israel to their native shrines, nature-worship, superstitions and questionable feasts. This new religion—practically their old one of Babylonia—with its sensuous associations, appealed to Israelites, and their religious practices and views underwent considerable modification. It was a religion of feast, laughter and easy morality, not making such heavy demands on life and character as their own Jehovah-creed with its many "Thou shalt nots."

This period of transition from the old to the new left its scars on Israel. The lawless times of war, the seductions of civilisation, the attractions of Canaan's sensuous religion, the long spells of enervating peace and plenty, one and all had a corrupting effect on Hebrew character, religion and morals. "Every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Judg. xvii. 6) and many "served Baal and Ashtart" (ii. 13, x. 6). We need only instance Samson's¹ vagaries; the story of Gibeah (xix.), when a Levite (= priest) takes the corpse of his abused concubine, cuts it up in pieces and sends them to the various tribes; or Jephthah's² vow, to show that it is a period of anarchy, laxity, and superstition.

But under this unprepossessing exterior the

¹ A semi-historical, semi- (solar) mythical folklore hero. The story is full of the rough vigour and broad humour of the rustic story-teller. He is "the ideal of the country-hero; the village-lion must be first with the female sex, first in bodily strength, courage, brawling, mother-wit" (Budde). Religiously, he seems little of a divinely commissioned Deliverer, and his own wayward passions are his one guide. The story has unique value as illustrating village-life, and the Israelite-Philistine relations on the borderland. It is an old story; the editors have touched it up, and apparently would fain have eliminated it, but his figure was too deep-rooted in popular imagination.

² Mainly historical, but a blend of two varying traditions. Jephthah and his vow are probable facts, but reflect the yearly festival commemorating the sad death of the virgin-goddess (= Spring) then commonly celebrated in Canaan (cf. Ezek. viii. 14, "women weeping for Tammuz").

Hebrew heart was still sound. Moses' Jehovah-covenant had struck deep root in those hearts. Even in their blackest hour, when the fire of their zeal for Jehovah and His cause seemed clean gone out, a Deborah or Gideon had but to appeal to their higher feelings, and the spark of loyalty to God and country at once leaped into flame. Israel was sound at heart, but the Israelites were ever a sensuous race loving the flesh-pots, and seductive temptations were many. The iron had to enter deep into their soul before hard experience taught them that self-indulgence is not life, nor Baal-licence their best good. The Philistines were the means of at last really rousing Israel from its sloth and slumber.

At Aphek the Philistines smote Israel "hip and thigh with a great slaughter"; worst of all, they carried off Jehovah's Ark (*i.e.* Jehovah Himself, in men's eyes then). Israel saw in this a direct visitation of God. Conscience-smitten and ashamed, they now braced themselves in dead earnest as one man to action and loyalty to their Jehovah. A wondrous spirit of inspiration came over Israel. Suddenly, and apparently for the first time, "prophets," or troops of ecstatic enthusiasts on whom the "Spirit of the Lord" has come with overpowering force, appear in bands all over the land, men full of a new religious and patriotic fervour, awakens of the national conscience. Like Moslem dervishes,¹ these prophets roused their hearers to a pitch of intense excitement by their preachings to the accompaniment of music, song and dance. So contagious was their enthusiasm that soon the nation was roused to wipe out the shame and hurt done to Jehovah and His Israel by Philistia. All that was now needed was a leader and deliverer. Samuel was Israel's judge(?)² then

¹ Kuenen and Montefiore believe that these dervish-like "prophets" were on the model of the fanatic Baal prophets (cf. the quaint actions of the Baal prophets at Carmel). Cf. 1 Sam. xix. 24 and Cheyne in *Enc. Bib.* 3857.

² A twofold inconsistent account of Samuel's rôle and of Saul's election is given in (1) 1 Sam. ix.-x. 16, x. 27b-xi. 1-15 (J); (2) 1 Sam. viii., x. 17-24, xii.

but he was aged, and more than an old judge was wanted now. The crisis called for a strong war-leader for the coming life-and-death struggle with the foe. Samuel saw his country's need. The neighbouring nations had taught him the value of a king for keeping a nation compact, well in hand, and giving it unity of direction; and combined action with unity of direction was essential now, if Israel was to be saved. Samuel well knew the dangers of kingship, always grave in the East, but despotism was better than absorption by the Canaanites or annihilation by Philistia. In Saul, the son of Kish, he discovered the very man wanted. He also saw to it that both king and people should realise that only as Jehovah's servant and representative did His anointed king rule on earth. With king Saul begins a new era in Israel's history. One of Moses' goals is reached. At the outset of our Judges' period, Israel was still a rude nomad race without any real land of its own. At the end of it they emerge, no longer a wild, disintegrated, mixed rabble, but well on the way to a civilised compact nation with a land of their own.

Conception of God.—Still much as in Moses' day (p. 99, *sup.*). Specially is Jehovah now Israel's War-God. The joyful confidence in Jehovah as Israel's

(E, E²). In (1), the older version, Samuel is an almost unknown "seer." Israel is without a leader against Philistine oppression, and God (through Samuel) readily chooses and appoints Saul as king and deliverer. In (2) Samuel (cf. Eli before him) is a well-known Judge. Israel is at peace, and Philistia already beaten. Samuel grudgingly yields the rule to Saul at the people's urgent request, while God and Samuel view Israel's petition for a king as an act of religious apostasy, and prophesy endless calamities in consequence. The later religious colouring of (2) is palpable. Cf. 1 Sam. vii. where Samuel beats Philistia crushingly through the efficacy of his sacrifice and prayers. Gideon and Jephthah and Deborah go about it more secularly. The Deuteronomist historian's moralising introduction in Judg. ii. 11-iii. 6 seems to require (cf. in *Josh.* and *Deut.*) a correspondingly solemn hortatory conclusion, such as Moses and Joshua deliver as their testament to Israel, and exactly such a discourse is found in 1 Sam. xii., Samuel's address, marking the close of the Judges period. (In including x. 27b in the older account, read x. 27b as given in R.V. m.: "And it came to pass after about a month that Naboth," etc. (LXX). As Dr. Burney points out: "The LXX here is original. In the narrative (x. 7 Samuel had told Saul, 'Let it be that thou do as occasion serve thee'; x. 27b (as the LXX gives it,) resumes the narrative of x. 8.")

real Leader in battle comes out vividly in the Song of Deborah, loud in its praise of Jehovah who has left His home on Sinai to hasten by Mt. Seir to the battle-field of Megiddo. Hence the inhabitants of Meroz are cursed "because they came not *to the help of Jehovah*, to the help of Jehovah among the heroes." Hence, too, Deborah's panegyric on the valiant tribes in the field with Jehovah against His and their foe, and her bitter scorn on those tribes that stayed at home and fought not with Him. This conception of God as Israel's War-God explains His new name, Jehovah Sabaoth, Jehovah the God of the hosts¹ (of Israel). We also begin to hear of Him under new titles, *e.g.* "The Angel of the Lord,"² "The Name³ of God." It is dawning on men's minds that He is too great and "holy" (= unapproachable) for men to see His actual face and live. He still appears to men, but not in His actual body or person; it is still Himself and not another, but a paler manifestation of Himself in angelic form. As to the title "The Name of God," we have already spoken of the magical power of Names in olden days (p. 62, *sup.*). The name was regarded as part and parcel of its bearer, a power in itself, and "Name of God" is equivalent to Jehovah Himself present with power. Again, as represented by His Ark, His shrine, Jehovah accompanies His Israel wherever they go. Even in David's day the Ark stood for Jehovah's Presence: "And David arose, and went with all the people that were with him, from Baale Judah, to bring up from thence the Ark of God,

¹ *Jehovah-Sabaoth* = J. of armies or hosts. But what hosts? Are they the armies of (1) angels, or (2) "all the hosts of heaven," *e.g.* sun, moon, stars, storms, etc., or (3) the armies of Israel? All these views find able supporters, but (1) is improbable, for belief in angels is largely post-exilic (see Ch. XV.).

² At a relatively early date, in passages originally representing Jehovah as appearing, speaking, etc., to men, an attempt was made to replace Jehovah by His Angel, which was not very successful, *e.g.*, in several passages, He alternates with His Angel.

³ This is a very ancient title of God. The name Samu-el is best explained "The Name is God." The same expression appears in two (Amorite) names of the First Babylonian Dynasty kings: Sumu-abi, "The name is my father"; "Sumu-la-ilu," "The name indeed is God" (Dr. Burney).

which is called by the Name, even the Name of the Lord of hosts" (2 Sam. vi. 2). This also comes out strongly in that old fragment Numb. x. 35: "When the Ark set forward, Moses said: Rise up, O Lord, and let Thine enemies be scattered; and when it rested, he said: Return, O Lord, to the ten thousands of the thousands of Israel." Hence the appalling punishments on men, like Uzzah, who ventured to touch it. Images of Jehovah seem quite common in this period, even with fervent worshippers of His, *e.g.* Gideon, Micah. At this time the Ephod was all but certainly an image, though not so after *c.* 700 B.C.¹

But if Jehovah is Israel's God, so is Baal Canaan's god; even Israel recognised that. They also firmly believed that a god and his people were so identified that their fortunes rose or fell together, in proportion as a god's nation beat other nations or was beaten by them. Through a nation's defeat, its god was eclipsed by the more powerful god of the victorious nation, but his existence was not ended, though he became lower than the victorious god. Thus Babylon's supremacy in 2225 B.C. made its god Marduk (= Merodach) chief god, Lord over the other gods, but their worship still went on. Hence, in Hebrew eyes, Israel's invasion was a trial of strength between Jehovah and Baal.² If Jehovah's Israel beat Baal's

¹ Dr. Burney insists that "ephod and teraphim were regarded as means of enquiring the oracle of God, but were *not* themselves regarded as images of Jehovah." See Burney, *Judges*, pp. 236 sqq. on the whole question.

² Was Baal *one* particular god, or were there a legion of local Baals? "the worship of *Baalim*," *i.e.* is Baalim an intensive plural, "the great Baal" (cf. Elohim), or a collective plural? Again, when we read that Israel served Baal, does it—at *this* period—mean the actual god of Canaan, or that they worshipped Jehovah under His Canaanite form, *i.e.* spoke of Jehovah as Baal and also adopted Baal rites in His worship? If Baal was not a proper name, but descriptive and = Lord, master, owner, then quite easily, as actually happened in Hosea's day, Israel could speak of Jehovah as Baal of His people, *i.e.* their owner and husband (Hos. ii. 16). If we accept this view, then Baal-worship at this period was largely, not sheer apostasy and idolatry, but a debased form of Jehovah-worship, and Dr. Burney's contention that there was at this time a sharp conflict between (1) the purer worship of Jehovah on the part of the Mosaic tribes, and (2) the lower Jehovah-worship of the "handmaid" tribes longer settled in Canaan and tainted with Canaan's superstitions, is largely confirmed. In the text above, I personally stand for the older view that Baal

Canaan, then Jehovah would dethrone Baal, rule in his stead, make Baal His vassal. It took centuries to rid Israel of the conviction that Baal still was god in his land. The long and hard struggle from 1200 B.C. onward showed Baal very much alive in his fight with Jehovah. Even when the Canaan conquest was complete, Baal was not yet ousted so long as he still had his Canaanites in the land. Moreover, as a nature-god, the giver of fertility, the *soil* of his native Canaan was his, and its corn and wine and oil (see Hos. ii. 8). Till Jehovah had wrested it all from Baal, He could not leave His Sinai and make Palestine His one dwelling-place. Thus Israel, while cleaving to their own God Jehovah as their one God, still believed in Baal as the God of Canaan.

Of a regular hierarchy of priests, or of worship only in official temples, we hear nothing in this period. Men continue to offer sacrifice in person, and altars and sacred places are to be found everywhere. But temples are beginning to arise, though on a modest scale. The most important was at Shiloh, where the Ark was kept, and to which people resorted at the three great agricultural Festivals, the Feasts of Unleavened Bread, Weeks, and Tabernacles, the last a harvest-festival originally. Eli and his house officiated at Shiloh. Although any one could, and did, offer sacrifice in person, a certain portion of the sacrificial meat fell to the temple-caretaker or priest. At Shiloh it was his "customary" and therefore legal due, which he exacted at times by force (*e.g.* 1 Sam. ii. 12 sqq.). Priests, as in Moses' day, need not be Levites, though they were preferred (see p. 108, *sup.*). The Sabbath was observed mainly as a feast-day.

Thus the period of the Judges is one of partial

originally was one supreme god, afterwards broken up into many local baals as his local cults became prominent. Even to Jehovah this happened, and He had special names according as He was worshipped at Beersheba (Gen. xxi. 33), Bethel (xxx. 13), Shechem (xxxiii. 20), or Ophrah (Judg. vi. 24), like Baal-peor, Baal-Hermon, cf. Baal-berith, Baal-zebul.

religious decay and partial advance. Its one great redeeming feature comes towards its close. In the religious revival after Aphek, and especially in the rise of the new "schools of prophets," we have the dawn of a great new religious era. It will produce a Nathan and an Elijah as its first-fruits, and culminate in an Amos and Isaiah with their highly spiritual conception of God, out of which will spring humaner thoughts of what man owes to God and to his brother-man.

NOTE ON THE HISTORICITY OF "JUDGES."

Judges gives a true picture of morals and society then; but what of its facts of history? Its stories, for centuries, were handed down orally, not in writing. But comparison of that historical gem, the contemporary Song of Deborah (v.), with the parallel prose-version (iv.) clearly points to a large amount of genuine history in such other old stories (*e.g.* Gideon (J), Abimelech, Micah,) as contain intrinsic evidence of their truth to the circumstances of their day. Broadly speaking, Deborah, Barak, Gideon, Abimelech, Micah are certainly historical figures, and their stories largely true; so, probably, of Ehud and Jephthah. Probability inclines against Samson's historicity, but the picture of Israelite-Philistine relations is true to fact. "Shamgar, son of Anath" (v. 6) is a real person, but the late author of iii. 31 probably had only the hint of v. 6 to go upon, and may have turned a foreign oppressor into a deliverer. "Othniel and the five minor Judges, Tola, Jair, Ibzan, Elon, Abdon, are undoubtedly not individuals, but personified clans." The one story of no historical value, apparently, is the Gibeah outrage and the ensuing vengeance of Israel on Benjamin xix.-xxi., evidently written out of animosity to Saul's memory; yet some facts may be embedded in it. (See Burney, *Judg.* cii.)

PART III
HISTORICAL ISRAEL

CHAPTER IX

SAUL TO AMOS (c. 1050-760 B.C.)

OUR authorities for this period (1050-760 B.C.) are *Samuel*, *Kings*, and *Chronicles*. Their historical value varies greatly, as the following paragraphs may show.

Samuel's subject is the creation of a united Israel by Samuel, Saul, and David. It is mainly based on three old documents or sources, J, E, and a still older source for 2 Sam., nearly contemporary with the events which it relates, and probably written in Solomon's reign. The historical value of *Samuel* is very high, and when we reach the history of David in 2 Sam. we have Hebrew style and history at their best. From a literary point of view the admirable prose narratives of 2 Sam. are as vivid, dramatic and poetic as Genesis,¹ and the history bears all the marks of a contemporary who "not only knew the large political events of the reign, but was intimately informed about the life of the court, and the scandals, crimes, and intrigues in the king's household which clouded the end of his glorious career. These things he narrates with an impressive objectivity and impartiality."² *Samuel*, throughout, is a graphic, simple,

¹ Greece, Rome, England show that great history-making epochs often produce an equally great literature. The life-and-death struggle with Philistia, the consequent birth of a pronounced national and religious consciousness in Israel; the welding of the tribes into a compact nation; the glorious, if short-lived, Hebrew empire under David and Solomon, would stir a people's soul and be celebrated in song and story,—and with such heroes as Saul, Jonathan, David, Joab, Abner, etc., such as popular imagination loves, need we wonder at the freshness, beauty, dramatic power of Hebrew literature in its first bloom under David and Solomon?

² He is a great admirer of David, but not blind to his faults and sins

straightforward narrative, with very simple religious conceptions. As already stated, in 1 Sam. there is a tendency to pragmatic history, side by side with an older and more historical version. We have seen how there are two contradictory accounts of Saul's election, one which views the kingship as of divine appointment, while the other regards it as a token of national apostasy. Roughly speaking, up to 1 Sam. xii. we are in the atmosphere of *Judges*, and here and there, overlaying the older and more historical version, there is a theocratic representation of a different texture, reflecting the standpoint of Hosea. As soon as we enter upon the history of Saul and especially David, this moralising tendency practically ceases,¹ and in 2 Sam. (except ch. vii.) it has vanished. Hence the ancient biographies of Saul and David in *Samuel* are most reliable, even though our *Samuel* only assumed its present form in the early seventh century.

Kings takes up the history with David in his old age and carries it on to the end of the monarchy. Here and there the old documents incorporated in *Kings* are left almost in their original form, e.g. 1 Kgs. i.-ii. is as vivid and authentic as anything in *Samuel*, while the splendid episodes of Elijah and Elisha match in grandeur and interest anything in the Old Testament. Evidently the sixth-century editor of *Kings* had at his disposal rich material of various kinds and worth. 1 Kgs. i.-ii. shows that he had

which he does not gloss over. We see vividly the weak father and the consequent domestic tragedy; even how David all but fought on Philistia's side at Gilboa, only the Philistines suspected him and refused his aid. So of the harem-intrigues to secure Solomon's succession from doting old King David, and David's enjoining in his last will the murder of Joab, to whom above all others the House of Jesse owed the throne.

¹ There is little room for pragmatic history in 2 Sam., for in Saul and David's reigns there was no apostasy, or Baalising tendency, as in *Judg.* The national revival of religion after Aphek was still a living force, and loyalty to Jehovah very much alive. Till Solomon's Temple was built, even prophets never dreamed of objecting to village altars (= high places), e.g. Elijah at Horeb, even in Ahab's reign, so far from condemning them, says: "The children of Israel have forsaken Thy covenant, thrown down Thine altars" (1 Kgs. xix. 14).

access to the court-history of David which we get in 2 Sam., for this section is of a piece with 2 Sam. 1 Kgs. xvii.-2 Kgs. x. (mostly) also proves that he had a special source for the stories of Elijah and Elisha, and, as these prophets were, politically as well as religiously, outstanding figures both in home and foreign policy, this fine old source has also preserved for us much that bears on the Syrian wars. This popular¹ old ninth-century source is of high historical value; even its vesture of legend forms the natural setting for such heroic figures as a titanic Elijah and his "son" Elisha. It gives us a better total impression of these supermen than any amount of exact truth of fact ever could do. The editor of *Kings* had other sources too. Scribes or recorders were attached to the royal court from David's day onward, and, doubtless, the temple-priests kept their own records. In either case, these would be brief chronicles of bare events, not historical or biographical narratives proper. Hence, as 1 Kgs. xiv. 19, 29 directly tells us, part of the material in *Kings* comes from "the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah," or "of Israel." Thus there was excellent material available for a most reliable history from David onwards, yet the actual record is not nearly so reliable in *Kings* as in *Samuel*, and for this reason. The editor of *Kings*, a pronounced Deuteronomist, writes with a deliberate religious end in view. History is for him the vehicle of certain religious lessons, drawn from the past, which he desires to inculcate upon his own and future generations. . . . His aim is to show that loyalty to Jehovah means prosperity; disobedience failure and catastrophe, and that *Jerusalem is the one and only place of worship* (see Burney, Hastings' *D. of B.*, i. 857). He is bent on the abolition of local altars, and the centralisation of all worship in Jerusalem as

¹ "Popular" in the sense that, before the sources come out on the stage of history, popular imagination had woven a texture of legend around some of the facts; e.g. the Elijah and queen of Sheba stories.

Deuteronomy prescribes. Hence, barely referring to David, he really begins his history with Solomon *and his Temple*. In his eyes, the foundation, building, and dedication of the Temple is epoch-making in Israel's history, the beginning of Israel's true life; for this centralisation of worship in Jerusalem must eventually wean Israel from its false worship at the many local shrines which his soul abhors. This pronounced Deuteronomist spirit colours *Kings* throughout and biases its history.¹

Chronicles (300-250 B.C.) begins with Adam and ends abruptly in the midst of Cyrus' restoration decree (538). Its writer is steeped in the ecclesiastical spirit of his day, when Israel, no longer a nation, is rather a Church,² under a Priestly Code and a high-priest as its head. The Jerusalem Temple and its sacrosanct priests are all in all, and everything is viewed from a Church standpoint. This ecclesiastical spirit colours every page of *Chronicles* and vitiates its history. It is a purely "priestly" history, and, exactly as in its pet Priestly Code, we get long dry lists of names, a barren genealogical scheme takes the place of stirring narrative, the language is poor and stereotyped, the historical setting often artificial, and the one aim is to magnify the ecclesiastical system. It is not history deliberately falsified. The writers are too sincere for that. Born ecclesiastics, their one aim is to impress on their readers their own (1) firm conviction that the organised post-Captivity priestly system always existed, and (2) their own intense belief in

¹ History, for the editor of *Kings*, was prophecy teaching by example, and, as each king is introduced, he is judged by the Deuteronomic standard, and the stereotyped judgment, "he did that which was evil (or good) in the sight of the Lord," is passed upon him. Hence the editor all but ignores some of the greatest kings and periods, because they transgressed his Deuteronomic code, or do not afford illustrations of his thesis; e.g. Omri (1 Kgs. xvi. 23-28), was the founder of the greatest Israel dynasty, and one of its greatest kings. He crippled Moab, and so impressed Assyria that, long after him, they call Israel "the land of Omri." Yet *Kings* dismisses him in two or three verses as a sinner. (See Moabite Stone *re* Omri in Hastings' *D. of B.*, iii. 407 and 621.)

² A critic writes: "No longer a nation; is a 'Church'—we all say that, but it is a bit untrue. I think it was a 'nation' which fought the Romans so desperately in 70 and 130."

God's Moral Governorship of the universe as Israel's creed from Adam onwards. In a word, they throw back into a far-away past the condition of things of their own day. The Chronicler overwhelms us with his long list of books as his authorities for the history, *e.g.* "The Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel," "the Book of the Kings of Israel," "the Book of Nathan, or Gad, or Ahijah, Iddo, Samuel the prophet" (*e.g.* 2 Chron. ix. 29), as the case may be; whereas examination proves that practically all his material was taken from our Book of Kings or *Samuel* (*e.g.* cf. 1 Chron. x.-xi. with 1 Sam. xxxi. and 2 Sam. xxiii. 8-39; or 1 Chron. xvii.-xx. 8 with 2 Sam. vii., viii. x., xii.), sometimes *verbatim*, at others condensed, expanded, or altered to suit his views.¹

* * * * *

The main facts of the monarchy are too well known to be repeated here. We confine ourselves to a rapid review of man's conception of God up to 760 B.C.; the gradual rise of Jehovah's organs and representatives in the persons of priests, prophets, kings; and the social condition of Israel.

Conception of God (1050-760 B.C.).—Jehovah is still viewed as in human form, but a more spiritualised idea of Him is dawning. As in *Judges*, the "Angel of the Lord" still represents Him (*e.g.* 2 Kgs. i. 3, 15), but even this pale manifestation of God is beginning to jar. In 2 Sam. xxiv. 16 (cf. 1 Kgs. xix. 5-7; 2 Kgs. xix.

¹ *Chron.*, from first to last, centres its interest in Jerusalem, magnifies Judah at the expense of Israel, and extols David and Solomon; David's census-sin is put down to Satan, and we hear nothing of the bad influence of foreign wives on Solomon; indeed, Pharaoh's daughter is the only one named, and he will not allow her to live in Jerusalem, near the holy Ark. His praise of David and Solomon leads the Chronicler to huge exaggerations, *e.g.* David's army is a million and a half, and (1 Chron. xxii. 14), "of his low estate" he gives £1,000,000,000 (*i.e.* taking talent of gold = £6150; of silver = £410) for the building of the Temple, and Solomon sacrificed at its dedication 22,000 oxen and 120,000 sheep and goats, and so on! The exaggerated interest in the Temple liturgy, and the part taken in it by Levites, musicians, singers, door-keepers, etc., culminates in ascribing the whole organisation of Temple orchestra and song to David, who thus provided for the proper rendering of the Psalter. Great importance is attached to genealogical lists, for clerical pedigrees counted for much as to eligibility to office.

35) the "angel of Jehovah" is a creature angel, for God commands him to leave off his work of destruction. In 1 Kgs. viii. 11, the "Glory of Jehovah" exhibits Him as a cloud filling the new Temple, thus receding still further from any visible human form of God. But, as already stated (p. 100, *sup.*), the Ark is still regarded as His "house" and the pledge of His actual presence.

As before, Jehovah is purely Israel's God. He has no claim on other nations, they lie outside his sphere. Thus David is sure that in Philistia he is outside Jehovah's protection and subject to Philistia's gods (1 Sam. xxvi. 19; cf. Judg. xi. 24). Similarly, Solomon builds his Moabite wife a temple for her god Chemosh, as he alone, not Jehovah, can protect a Moabitess, and Ahab does exactly the same for Jezebel. Naaman, to enable him to sacrifice to Jehovah even in Syria, takes two mules' burden of Israel's (= Jehovah's) earth for an altar. The whole tone of the passage (2 Kgs. v.) shows that the sacred writer shares Naaman's belief in the efficacy of this method. 2 Kgs. iii. 26-27 clearly proves Israel's firm conviction that Moab's god Chemosh is irresistible in his own land and the cause of a signal Israelite defeat.

Images of Jehovah are still common. We constantly hear of ephod and teraphim. Many scholars insist that ephod at this time still stands for an image of Jehovah. It certainly seems to do so in *Judges*, as Gideon's and Micah's ephods prove. So in David's day: "There was an image, called an Ephod, in the sanctuary of Nob, which Abiathar takes with him, and by means of it serves David with divine oracles"¹

¹ (Montefiore, *H.L.*, 43, 67.) As often stated, *ephod* and *teraphim* constantly go together. *Teraphim* were idols, apparently in human form (e.g. Michal's), and were used in divination (Ezek. xxi. 21; Zech. x. 2), and so was the ephod so used. The sword of Goliath was kept at Nob "behind the ephod" (1 Sam. xxi. 9), and the ephod is often named as an oracle which the priest carries or bears with him "in his hand" (1 Sam. xxiii. 6). It may have been a receptacle in which the sacred lot was kept, but this hardly suits Micah's or

(1 Sam. xxi. 9; xxiii. 6, 9). After the Captivity *ephodbad* is always the priestly garment. David not only consults such an oracle, but allows his wife Michal to keep other images (teraphim) in his house; such a zealous Jehovah-worshipper would hardly allow any purely pagan images in his home. Hos. iii. 4 mentions "a sacrifice, an image, an ephod or teraphim" as indispensable accompaniments in the Northern Kingdom of Israel.¹ As a prophet he elsewhere condemns images, even of Jehovah, for two reasons: (1) Like the Reformers, the prophets viewed material images of a spiritual God as pagan; (2) they knew that the image itself ended by becoming worshipped as a deity. They were right. So pronounced was Israel's tendency to turn every holy object into a fetish that Hezekiah (727-698) had to break in pieces Moses' Brazen Serpent, "for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it; and he called it Nehushtan," *i.e.* "a mere piece of brass" (2 Kgs. xviii. 4, R.V.). Though the prophets were right, yet the custom, up to *c.* 700 B.C., was so hallowed in Israel that their crusade against images met with as much opposition as Leo the Isaurian's decree against image-worship in 726 A.D., which the whole Christian Church refused to obey.

Priesthood.—Local shrines and altars on heights and hills and under green trees are as numerous as before, and priests their caretakers. Far from objecting to them, Elijah names it a sign of a godless generation that "the children of Israel have forsaken Thy covenant, thrown down Thine altars" (1 Kgs. xix. 14). At these hallowed shrines the priests are there

Gideon's ephods, nor the later strong reprobation of the Ephod-cult—Jehovah could be consulted by Ephod, Urim, and Thummim, lots (usually headless arrows or rods). The question put by the inquirer admitted of a plain answer, "Yes" or "No," "This" or "That," *e.g.* "Shall I go and fight or not?," "Is Saul or is Jonathan guilty?"

¹ It is admitted now that the golden bulls of Jeroboam (cf. Aaron's Golden Calf) were *not* pagan idols, but symbols of Jehovah Himself. The Deuteronomist writer brands this as "Jeroboam's sin" (in the full spirit of *Kings*, see p. 125, *sup.*), but Israel certainly did not think so then.

to cast lots and give oracles before the image, to decide suits "before God," to give directions to sacrificers and others as to the proper ritual, and, if required, to minister at the altar. But the sacrifice does not yet need a priest. Elijah sacrifices with his own hand (1 Kgs. xviii. 33) and Elisha (xix. 21), so do David and Solomon (*e.g.* 2 Sam. vi. 17; 1 Kgs. viii. 5; ix. 25). But 2 Kgs. xvi. 15 shows that, at the royal sanctuaries, regular public offerings were usually made by the king through the priests. For reasons already stated (p. 107, *sup.*), the priests greatly magnified their office under the monarchy: (1) They were now recognised judges in disputes, and the "decisions of the sanctuary" formed a *Torak* or body of sacred law administered by the priests; (2) The greatest importance was attached to the exact use of the proper ritual in approaching the deity,¹ and it was elaborate and only known to the priests in its fullness; (3) Important sanctuaries were arising with their regular staff of priests, *e.g.* Shiloh, Bethel, Nob, Gilgal, Dan, Beersheba, Gibeon,—all soon eclipsed by Solomon's Temple.

Priests were entitled to payment for their services. Their judicial functions brought in fees (Mic. iii. 11); there was a customary fee in kind for each sacrifice (*e.g.* 1 Sam. ii. 12 sqq.); a tribute of first-fruits was their due (Deut. xviii. 4);² some form of tithe (Am.

¹ Worship in our sense there was little or none. The Festivals were largely "the occasions of merry thanksgiving and feasting," and "every slaughter of cattle partook of the character of a sacrifice" and feast (Montefiore, *H. L.*, 186). The Sabbath was not yet a day of rest (Ex. xxxiv. 21 (C, c. 800), but 2 Kgs. iv. 23 allows riding on the Sabbath to visit a "man of God"). The worship of this period was all but exclusively ritual and sacrificial, not at all a service of uplifting moral and spiritual edification. Ritual = religion then; hence Amos' and Hosea's denunciations of such outward piety fell on deaf ears.

² Deut. xviii. may be of 650 B.C., but its priestly "customs" go back to very ancient days.—In Judg. xvii. 5, is a curious phrase, "Micah filled the hand of one of his sons and he became his priest," *i.e.* at the installing ceremony he placed portions of the sacrifice in his hands. The same expression, however, is found in Assyrian and Babylonian inscriptions for "entrusting authority to any one." As to tithe, Abraham is pictured as paying it to Melchizedek, and gods had it paid them from earliest days.

iv. 4); and fines were exacted and paid to them for certain offences (2 Kgs. xii. 16; Am. ii. 8). In the smaller village-shrines the priest depended largely on the number and generosity of his clients, and often his emoluments were small. But the greater priestly offices were now important posts. The priests of the royal and national sanctuaries were among the high officials of the realm, men of wealth and culture, rising more and more in dignity, and gradually consolidating into an aristocratic guild of their own. But even these important priests of the royal chapels were far from independent of State-control. They were officials and creatures of the king, under his patronage and protection, dependent on his favour as servants under his orders. Ahimelech the high-priest, great-grandson of Eli, humbles himself as an inferior before David, a mere subject of Saul (1 Sam. xxi. 1 sq.), and abjectly before Saul his king (xxii. 12 sq.). Even though, through superstitious fear of laying hands on God's "holy" (= taboo) man, Saul's body-guard hesitated to slaughter Jehovah's priests (xxii. 17), no one interposed in the priests' defence when they and their families fell victims to Saul's blind fury. No doubt they expected to see Saul fall dead on the spot.¹ David took Abiathar, the sole survivor, under his protection, but as in his service; and the sons of Zadok, priests of the royal chapel, were the king's servants as absolutely as any other officials of State. They owed their place to the fiat of King Solomon, and his will was law in all matters religious as well as civil; he makes and dismisses chief priests at his pleasure (1 Kgs. ii. 26, 27, 35). In the cases of the family of Eli and the sons of Zadok we already see the

¹ Till the end of O.T., "suffering = sin" in Hebrew eyes, and especially in connection with tampering with "holy" things and in priestly days. Thus *Kgs.* calls both Asa and Uzziah godly men who did right in God's sight, but one had gout, the other was a leper; priestly *Chron.* assures us Uzziah's leprosy was because he burnt incense on the altar (a priest's duty), and Asa's gout because he (1) allied with Syria and did not rely on God, (2) put a prophet in prison, (3) consulted a doctor (2 Chron. xvi. 7 sqq.).

hereditary principle at work. But the hierarchy was not a hierocracy by divine right as it became after the Exile. Robertson Smith is right: "The student who carries the hierocracy back to these early monarchy days has still to learn the very elements of what is necessary to a true appreciation of Hebrew antiquity. It is certain that as against the king, they represented no distinct power in the State, but rather were entirely the creatures of his smile or frown;—on a faint suspicion they actually were annihilated without a single word of remonstrance being anywhere raised." A Deuteronomist *Kings*, still more a priestly *Chronicles*, magnify the priestly office under the monarchy all they can; their picture is true of the priesthood of their own day, not of the older period they are portraying.

Prophets.—1 Sam. ix. 9 tells us: "he that is now called a prophet was beforetime called a seer." Really the two are quite distinct. The seer of 1 Sam. ix. 6 sqq. is the clairvoyant with the gift of second sight found among primitive races the wide world over (p. 64 *sup.*). Prophets, from the first, were men of God with religious national aims. Seers foretell coming events, so do prophets occasionally,¹ but the rousing of the nation's slumbering conscience, not prediction, is their essential function. By all means let us call prophets "seers" if we will, so long as we do not forget that national religious reform was their one real work as God's commissioned mouthpieces. There were prophets before the rise of prophets proper. If we accept both versions that

¹ These prophets are preachers of a Righteous God ruling His universe on moral lines (p. 30, *sup.*). They are also trained watchers and readers of the "signs of the times" in contemporary history, which is their text-book. With a righteous God, a sinful Israel, Assyria knocking at the gate, they see Israel's Captivity long before it comes; also knowing God's compassion and Covenant Promise, they are sure that a new and better Israel will arise from the ashes of the old. In some cases, e.g. Jer. xxviii., Jeremiah foretells Hananiah's death within the year,—but these are very exceptional. Jer. xxxvi. 1 sqq. is also suggestive as showing the way in which prophetic books were written from memory, as much as 23 years after the events.

Samuel gives us of Samuel, he was a seer, and he also had the true note of the prophet, for his one life-work was to rally Israel round their Jehovah and raise their spiritual tone. Moses was a prophet before him. Yet, strictly, we cannot call Moses or Samuel "prophets" any more than "kings" or "priests." They combined in themselves many functions afterwards put into commission and distributed among several separate and distinct "men of God." Moses is at once ruler, judge, legislator, prophet, priest; Samuel judge, priest, prophet, seer. As we saw (p. 115 *sup.*), "prophets" proper were a quite new departure of Samuel's day, the outcome of a wave of religious and patriotic enthusiasm. Henceforth this "national" and "religious" awakening is the prophets' rôle. They are the nation's conscience, speaking from within Israel's own heart as the Voice of God Himself to prompt and rebuke, to vindicate the laws of a righteous God in national matters, to rebuke apostasy, sin, and wrong in Jehovah's name. In the prophets' eyes Jehovah and Israel, religion and nation, were so identified that they could not be divorced. Hence the earlier prophets took an active part in the State, morally and politically. It was Samuel who placed Saul and David on the throne. Nathan¹ not only denounces David's sin, but chooses his successor. Elijah comes boldly to rebuke Ahab for Naboth's murder, and also denounces the dynasty of Omri; while Elisha set in motion the revolution

¹ Such instances as Gad (2 Sam. xxiv., the Census), and still more Nathan (2 Sam. xii.), coming forward as a preacher of social morality before David in the matter of Bath-sheba, and again, Elijah (1 Kgs. xxi.) confronting Ahab and pronouncing in God's name the punishment to fall upon Ahab and his house because of the moral wrong done (Naboth's murder) in Jezreel, seem to mark a new stage, a moral conception of God and of man, the beginning of that great ethical movement culminating in an Amos or Isaiah. But is it a new stage? We have seen (p. 103, *sup.*), the clear moral factor in Moses' Covenant. No doubt it was above the heads of most Israelites of Moses' generation, and the anarchy of the Judges' period was not calculated to foster it. But it was there all the while in some hearts, and Nathan and Elijah voice it, while the eighth-century prophets courageously brought out and preached all that Moses' moral idea of God involves as against a sinful Church and State.

which overthrew it. Elisha was also the embodiment of the national spirit in the Syrian wars. After Elisha the prophets mostly withdraw from national and party conflicts; but they continue to oppose, warn, and counsel king and nation whenever occasion demands, though rather as great national teachers and reformers than politicians.

We are apt to look upon prophets as isolated figures rising up very rarely, one by one, here and there. As the footnote (¹) shows, it is a right instinct, though not strictly true. Prophets were in one sense a permanent order, and there were whole companies of them, "schools of prophets,"¹ societies or brotherhoods, not celibate, living by themselves under a superior for mutual edification, and sometimes turning their religious zeal into political channels (*e.g.* 1 Kgs. xx. 35). But side by side with these "prophets" are other outstanding personalities, bearing the same name of prophet, yet a class apart, head and shoulders above the others,² and often in opposi-

¹ These "schools" were communities for edification, not education (though 2 Kgs. iv. 38, vi. 1, imply that they "sat before" Elisha, as a kind of instructor). They were not celibates (2 Kgs. iv. 1). From 1 Sam. xix. 18 sqq., where a locality Naioth (= "dwellings") is named as their home near Ramah, taken in connection with 2 Kgs. vi. 1-7, it has been assumed that they were cenobites dwelling in huts, but Driver (*Hastings, D. of B.*, iii. 478), questions this. Settlements of them are named at Bethel (2 Kgs. ii. 3), Jericho (ii. 5), Gilgal (iv. 38). At all times these prophets continued to be numerous (1 Kgs. xxii. 6, xviii. 4), and we hear much of them in the canonical prophets. At all the places named as their settlements there were "high places" or local shrines, and constantly we hear of them in close league with the priesthood and acting in concert with them, *e.g.* in Amos and Jeremiah; thus it was the "priests and prophets" (Jer. xxvi. 7 sqq.), who arraigned Jeremiah before the princes for blasphemy against the Temple.

² Dr. Burney writes me a valuable note: "The distinction I draw between the 400 Yahweh prophets of 1 Kgs. xxii., and Elijah, Micaiah, Elisha (and, I may add, the 100 prophets hidden by Obadiah), is that the former were prophets of the Canaanite form of Yahwism (according to which Y. was represented by the image of a bull), and the latter the prophets of Mosaic Yahwism. The former were content to live and let live, and so did not come into collision with Jezebel; the latter by emphasising Yahweh's exclusive claim (the 1st Commandment) came sharply into antagonism with her."

The older view of "false prophets" was that they were prophets who had degenerated, become a time-serving, unprogressive guild; like the priests, they had become State-Church dignitaries, professional exponents of traditional orthodoxy and conventional morality, apt to prophesy sweet and smooth things so as to court popularity or position.

tion to them, *e.g.* Nathan, Gad, Micaiah, Elijah, Elisha, Amos, Hosea, and so forth. There were long periods without such towering religious giants, but their work was carried on all the same by such prophetic communities as the "hundred prophets whom Obadiah, who feared the Lord greatly, hid in a cave" (1 Kgs. xviii. 3 sq.). Under the monarchy we hear much of "false prophets." Whichever view we take, (1) that they were prophets of a lower or Canaanite type of Jehovah-worship, or (2) that they were prophets who had lost their first zeal, degenerated, and had become unprogressive time-servers, dependents (like the priests) on royal favour and acquiescing in the royal lax policy,—their character and influence remain the same. In their own and the people's eyes regarded as "prophets of God," they were no longer inspiring national teachers, rebukers of wrong, awakeners of the national conscience, but simply time-serving preachers of respectable religionism, shutting their eyes to glaring national or royal sins. 1 Kgs. xxii. 6 gives us a graphic picture of these "false prophets," with their narrow range of vision and elastic traditional ideals.

Kings.—Israel's king ruled as Jehovah's chosen representative and servant. He was king by divine right. This comes out clearly in the purely religious character of Saul's and David's appointment to office. In both cases God Himself chooses the king through His prophet. Immediately is the king anointed with *the* holy oil¹ reserved for holy things and persons wholly consecrated to God's own service. Saul is presented to the people as "him whom the Lord hath chosen" (1 Sam. x. 24). The people have no voice in the matter except to ratify God's choice of their king as a matter of course: "And all the people said, God save the king." As the Lord's "anointed," the king is

¹ 1 Kgs. i. 39: "And Zadok the priest took *the horn of oil out of the tent* and anointed Solomon" (R.V.), *i.e.* not an (A.V.), but *the* oil-horn, filled with the holy oil, out of the Tent where the all-holy Ark was kept.

"holy" unto God (= *taboo*), and to lift a hand against him is death. Thus David instantly slays the Amalekite who, at Saul's own request, had put him out of his agony: "How wert thou not afraid to stretch forth thine hand to destroy the Lord's anointed? . . . and David smote him that he died" (2 Sam. i. 14; cf. 1 Sam. xxvi. 9). As the Lord's "anointed," again, kings were God's vicegerents on earth, His organs, and looked upon themselves as the religious heads of the nation, its chief sacrificing priests. David and Solomon not only offered sacrifices in person at God's altar, but, standing beside it, pronounced "the blessing in the name of the Lord" upon the people, a very priestly act¹ (2 Sam. vi. 18; 1 Kgs. viii. 55).

Social Condition.—Foreign Trade, a new departure, had far-reaching effects on Hebrew character and life. As we saw (p. 113), the Canaanites introduced nomad Hebrews to agriculture, and this was Israel's normal occupation till the monarchy, except East of Jordan and in the hills of Judah where they mainly remained shepherds. But Palestine was a high-road of commerce between Egypt, Mesopotamia, Phœnicia, Arabia and the East, from time immemorial. Two of the best trade-routes ran through Palestine: one between the Euphrates and the Nile, the other from Arabia to the Levant. Till the end of Saul's reign, the Hebrews were too busy fighting, settling down, and adapting themselves to farming and civilisation, to engage in trade. To dwell in peace under his own fig-tree was the Hebrew's ideal then. Commerce he left to the Canaanites dwelling in towns, so that "Canaanite" got to mean "trader" in Hebrew. But very soon Israel learnt to tread in Canaan's footsteps.

With David a new era opened. All the Canaanite towns were soon his; he had also founded his important capital. With David now head of a peace-

¹ Note also: "David danced before the Lord . . . girded with a linen ephod" (2 Sam. vi. 14), a priestly garment, as 1 Sam. xxii. 18 (cf. 1 Sam. ii. 18) clearly proves.

ful, united, and fairly organised kingdom, the trade-routes through Palestine again offered a security for traffic not enjoyed for centuries. Phœnician and other commercial princes were only too glad to make alliances with David on preferential-trade terms. David and Solomon themselves engaged largely in foreign trade, and their Hebrew subjects soon followed suit. Commerce was far more profitable than farming, and Israelites rapidly developed a genius for commercial transactions large and small. From Solomon's day onward trade and wealth boomed, and all enterprising Israelites naturally left the country districts for the towns, which grew rapidly in numbers and importance. Already behind the records of Solomon's reign stands clear proof of vast trade and wealth (*e.g.* 1 Kgs. x., cf. iii. 13), and Hosea (*c.* 750) calls Israel a very "Canaanite" (= trader), while Is. ii. 6, 7 speaks of the Hebrew of his day as "striking hands with the children of strangers; their land also is full of silver and gold, neither is there any end of their treasures."

With this vast increase of prosperity and wealth the usual evils naturally followed in their train. On all sides we hear of luxury (*e.g.* Am. vi.), covetousness, cheating, oppression of the poor and needy (*e.g.* Am. ii. 6; viii. 4 sqq.; Hos. xii. 7; Is. iii. 15; Mic. ii., iii.). The smaller landholders were also in a bad way. Heavy taxes, bad years, damage from invaders, compelled them to borrow. Their land groaned under heavy debts and mortgages at usurious rates, and the poorer farmers had to sell their ancestral lands to a new class of trade-rich men. Thus large estates replaced the old yeoman-farms. Hence Is. v. 8: "Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth." The smaller men could not hold their own against rich rivals, so they swelled the ranks of wage-earners. Free men often literally became slaves to clear their debts.

It may be asked: "Could these oppressed people

find no redress at law?" For long after the establishment of the monarchy there was apparently no written law. "Custom" (p. 99, *sup.*) ruled. The first written Hebrew Code we know of, the Book of the Covenant of about 800 B.C., is itself based on "custom law" of great antiquity. Now "custom" is fluid and elastic when the administration of justice is more or less haphazard, as always in the East. The king could be appealed to personally by the humblest as judge (2 Sam. xiv. 5 sqq., xv. 2; 1 Kgs. iii. 16 sqq., vii. 7), and his judges (2 Chron. xix. 5, 11) and higher officials also administered justice after a fashion, so did the priests and heads of districts (= "elders"). But from 1050-800 B.C. "custom" was fast losing its old power, and, with no written law to replace "custom" and no uniform judicial system, recourse to law tribunals for redress of wrongs was precarious. As a rule, it was one law for the rich and another for the poor; Oriental bribery and corruption was rife, and a man had to depend mainly on himself for redress of wrongs, while the poor had to suffer patiently.

As just stated, the first attempt at a comprehensive Law Code is "The Book of the Covenant." It simply sets down in writing such "customary" practices and decisions as are old and well-established (Exod. xx. 22-xxiii. 33). Thus it deals with the legal position of slaves, culpable injuries to life and limb, damage to property, whether cattle or crop, daughter or slave. It proceeds on the principle of retaliation (Exod. xxi. 23 sqq.). Civil and moral or religious offences are on a par. All violations of religious customary observance are crimes at law. Cases are to be brought before the "elders" of the district; but the weightiest matters are to come "before God"¹ (xxi. 6;

¹ Dr. Burney writes me: "In the three Book of the Covenant passages, Ex. xxi. 6, xxii. 8, 9, the phrase 'elohim' has the definite article. This I take to mean 'the gods,' *i.e.* the household gods or teraphim in whose presence the slave's ear is fixed to the door (of his master's house, as in Deut., not to the

xxii. 9), *i.e.* before the priests as judges, for their decision.

Polygamy was allowable. David and Solomon had many wives, and, probably, so had exalted persons who could afford them. Elkanah (1 Sam. i. 1-2) was doubtless representative of a considerable class, and a man might have as many concubines as he chose. Even the late Deuteronomy Code (650) legislates for such cases as: "If a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated, and both have borne him children," etc. (xxi. 15). The husband was the master, the wife the "owned one," and every woman in a family the "property" of its head. Adultery was venial in the husband, a grievous sin in the wife, and an unchaste wife was severely dealt with; an unchaste husband only if he sinned with the wife of another, *i.e.* it was a question of infringement of property-rights. A husband could divorce his wife on suspicion of unchastity, or recourse was had to trial by ordeal, but "putting away" a wife was the prerogative of a husband for any trivial cause. Parents had full power over their children and could sell them or even put them to death. But as a rule children and slaves were kindly treated, and slaves were regarded almost as members of the family.

With increase of wealth the old simplicity of manners disappeared. Private individuals copied the palaces of kings, and magnificent houses of hewn stone were common and gorgeously furnished. Wealth and leisure, however, were not all spent in "lying upon beds of ivory, chanting to the sound of the viol and drinking wine in bowls" (Am. vi.). During this early-monarchy period music and literature, as well as general culture, stood at their highest. The name of David has ever been connected with music and song, and the best written and most brilliant part of the

supposed door of the local sanctuary), and the oath of compurgation is made. If this is so, it presupposes a very early date for the Book of the Covenant. Cf. my *Judges*, pp. 117 footnote §; 330 footnote."

Hexateuch is of 850-800 B.C., forming a series of prose narratives to which nothing in the later books can be compared, except perhaps the equally old 2 Sam.

Travelling at this time was comparatively safe, for public, if not private, law was strict (cf. Judg. xvii. 6; xviii. 1; xix. 1; xxi. 25); kings saw to that. The refrain in *Judges*, "in those days there was no king in Israel," to explain the mutilation and robbery of travellers then, implies comparative freedom from such risks under the monarchy; but it was only comparative. True, good and energetic kings, with a small standing army at their back, and the land divided into administrative circuits under governors, (1 Kgs. iv. 7 sqq.; xx. 14 sqq.) did maintain some law and order; but the king's eye was not everywhere, many were not good, officials were lax and venal, men and manners rude, justice was haphazard and corrupt. Hence travellers were exposed to plunder and ill-usage on the way (Hos. vi. 9; Jer. iii. 2; Ezr. viii. 22) and seldom went alone, but in caravans, and mainly for trade or religious observances. Roads were often simple bridle-paths; but there were also "king's highways" (cf. Numb. xx. 17), (probably as bad as modern "Sultan's roads,") which were repaired, levelled, cleared of stones, whenever kings used them (cf. Is. xl. 3; lvii. 14; lxii. 10). Apparently there were no bridges across rivers, only fords. (See art. "Roads and Travel in O.T." in Hastings' *D. of B.*, v. 368-375). Some went on foot; others rode on asses or mules. Horses and chariots were only for war, though kings at times used them on their journeys. Travellers had to provide for themselves in the way of food; but a certain amount of hospitality to strangers has ever been the rule in the East. Of inns or *khans* we hear nothing in the Old Testament, but, on caravan routes, they probably existed.

CHAPTER X

AMOS, HOSEA, ISAIAH, MICAH

WITH an Amos (*c.* 760-750 B.C.), Hosea (*c.* 750-737), First Isaiah (740-700), Micah (*c.* 724 and later), Jeremiah (*c.* 620-586), Ezekiel (593-573), and Second Isaiah (540), we come upon a succession of religious geniuses, spiritual giants, who dwarf all before or after them till Christ. These great prophetic personalities represent a religious tidal-wave that left its high-water mark far and away beyond any point reached elsewhere in the Old Testament. They gave Israel's religion its specific character and direction. It is to the religion of these men that our monotheism to-day largely owes its origin and its form. So highly enlightened are their ideals, their picture of God and His relationship to man, that even after twenty centuries of Christian teaching, our souls are drawn out to these prophets. As we read the two Isaiahs, we instinctively feel that all that is best in us and noblest is being forcibly appealed to by a noble spirit akin to that of Christ Himself. Their God is the God whom Christ reveals, a God righteous in all His ways and holy in all His works, a God who loves mercy more than sacrifice, and a right life more than correct services, a God who wants to be worshipped in spirit and in truth.

And their teaching is so simple, so practical, so direct. There is nothing esoteric about it, no abstract theology, nothing that the simplest man cannot grasp. Seek God from the ground of your heart, clasp your brother-man's hand, and do the right, is the sum of their religion. From first to last, they make religion

a character and a life, a matter of the heart, and weld together love of God and love of man in a bond that cannot be broken. What God asks of man is a right character and a life going out of self to the service of others. Nothing else will satisfy Him. He is not to be bribed by long prayers, gifts, sacrifices, or by many Church-services, to wink at man's evil ways. The creed of these prophets is: "God hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God" (Mic. vi. 8).

This is the prophetic teaching to which Christ sets His own seal. Forerunners of Christ, these men of God foreshadow His Sermon on the Mount, His revelation of the Fatherhood of God and Brotherhood of Man, His idea of religion as a character and a life, His Kingdom of God on earth.¹

To appreciate the better these prophets and their life-work, let us rapidly reconstruct the political, religious, and moral background of the Israel of their day up to 700 B.C.

Political Situation.—Under Solomon and David a united Israel had been a great power. On Solomon's death it split up into two kingdoms, a northern Israel and a southern Judah. There then existed around Palestine a number of equally small nations and kingdoms. In alliance or at feud with each other, they paid little heed to the large world outside their own circle. Suddenly, big Assyria menaced them and filled them with a foreboding shared even by Syria, by far the most powerful of the group. Already between 885–860 B.C., the great Assyrian conqueror,

¹ Throughout, these prophets are ever pointing to a Golden Age of peace, goodness, joy on earth. Others before them have dreamed of such a bright era, but always as a thing of the past. These prophets hail it, not as behind, but as ahead of them. They hail it as men hail the dawn, nothing doubting but that the night and the things of the night are shortly to pass away, swallowed up in the glorious light of the perfect day. A second Isaiah sees the Golden Age dawn, not for Jews only, but for all Gentiles as well. God's will is that all men, heathen nations included, shall share in this glorious consummation, the Divine goal for which all humanity is making.

Ashur-nazir-pal, advanced as far as Lebanon and the Phœnician coast. But it was his son Shalmaneser III.¹ (859-825) who first came into conflict with Damascus, Israel, and other adjoining states. In 854 he had to meet an alliance against him formed by Benhadad II. of Damascus and including Ahab, King of Israel, and nine other states. The battle at Karkar ended in favour of Shalmaneser, but was inconclusive. In 842 Shalmaneser made a fresh attack on Syria, defeated its king, Hazael, laid siege to Damascus and exacted tribute from Tyre, Sidon and Jehu of Israel. From that day, except for occasional revolts, Israel was apparently Assyria's vassal. Adad-Nirari IV.¹ (811-783) forced Damascus to capitulate unconditionally, and exacted tribute of Israel, Edom and Philistia. From 782-745, Assyria was under a cloud, whilst Israel at the same time flourished under Jeroboam II. Then came the great Tiglath-Pileser IV.¹ (745-727), who raised Assyria to a height unreached before. He is the real founder of the great Assyrian monarchy; he brought Babylonia under direct Assyrian sway and annexed a great part of Syria. In 733 he defeated Rezin, King of Syria, captured Damascus (732), invaded Israel, took several towns, as well as all the land of Naphtali, and compelled Israel's King Pekah to pay heavy tribute. Pekah was murdered in 731, and Tiglath-Pileser confirmed Hoshea as King of Israel. A governor was set up in Damascus, and Ammon, Edom, Moab, and Ahaz, King of Judah, were forced to pay tribute—(Ahaz, as we mention later, had asked Assyria to protect him against Syria and Israel). On Tiglath-Pileser's death, Hoshea, Israel's king, revolted against Assyria. Shalmaneser V. invaded Israel, and besieged Samaria. After a three years' siege the city fell in Sargon's first year (721). Israel became a province of Assyria, 27,290 of its best inhabitants were exiled, and foreign colonists re-

¹ Shalmaneser III. (not II.), Tiglath-Pileser IV. (not III.), as a new earlier Shalmaneser and Tiglath-Pileser have recently been discovered—Adad-Nirari IV. is also called Ramman-Nirari.

placed them. Israel's national independence was at an end.¹

Judah staved off the same fate 130 years longer, but from 740 B.C. its peril from Assyria was clear. Syria and Israel had joined hands against Assyria, and, to force Ahaz to join them, they threatened to invade his Judah. Isaiah bade Ahaz pay no heed to these "two tails of smoking firebrands" (Is. vii. 4), but he was too frightened to listen. He invoked Assyria's aid (734) and got it, but at the price of becoming Assyria's vassal. His son Hezekiah (727-698) had two alternatives open to him: (1) to form an alliance with Egypt and defy Assyria; this was the scheme of a political party in Judah, of which Shebna was probably the head (Is. xxii. 15-25; 2 Kgs. xviii. sq.); (2) to accept Assyria's yoke and protection, *i.e.* not to break with Assyria; this was Isaiah's policy. Hezekiah was a weak king and tried both policies. He sent his tribute to Assyria, and favoured Egypt on the sly.² Assyria saw through his double dealing, taught Hezekiah a sharp lesson,³ and eventually besieged Jerusalem, but, for some reason, had to beat a hasty retreat (701). Judah obtained a short respite, but, as Ch. XI. will show, her doom was sealed from the moment that Ahaz did homage to Tiglath-Pileser at Damascus, and became his vassal in 734.

¹ From Burney, *Judg.* 1; Hommel's "Assyria" in Hastings' *D. of B.*; Johns' *Ancient Assyria*. These Assyrian key-dates, *e.g.* 854 as Ahab's last year, 842 Jehu's first year, 722 as Samaria's fall, rectify defective Hebrew chronology. Back-reckoning gives 931 as Jeroboam's and Rehoboam's accession, and 970 for Solomon's. Mineptah's date (p. 95 *sup.*) gives Exodus from Egypt = *c.* 1225. Assyrian chronology proves 2 Kgs. xv.: "Pekahiah reigned 2 yrs., Pekah 20," to be wrong. Pekahiah and Pekah together only cover 3 years in all.

² From Assyrian inscriptions we know (1) that in 711 Philistia, *Judah*, Edom, and Moab were already seditious, and Sargon made a campaign against Philistia (Is. xx.), Judah probably escaping by making timely submission and paying heavy indemnity (Is. xxii. 1-14). Sargon describes himself as "subjector of the land of Judah, of which the situation is remote." This failure of the Egyptian policy gave Isaiah's policy the ascendant and led to Shebna's fall.

³ Here, again, Assyrian history tells us that in 701 Sennacherib took 46 fenced cities and many smaller cities of Judah, and a vast number of their people, and camped in Lachish (south-west corner of Judah); "and Hezekiah himself I shut up like a bird in a cage in Jerusalem. . . . I added other tribute to his former assessment." He gives a strong account of his humiliation of Hezekiah. At present, 2 Kgs. xix. (cf. Hdt. ii. 141) and Assyrian facts do not seem to tally, but his murder by his sons in 681 B.C. is a fact.

Moral Situation.—This was at a low ebb (pp. 137 sq., *sup.*). Justice was bought and sold (cf. Mic. iii. 11), big estates swallowed up small proprietors, officials and the aristocracy oppressed the poor and lived in shameful luxury and laxity of life. The picture of the treatment of the poor by the rich is a sad one in the prophets: "they sell the righteous for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes" (Am. ii. 6). The poor man cannot call his life (Jer. ii. 34), or honour, or patrimony (cf. 1 Kgs. xxi.) his own. While the rich "lie upon beds of ivory, eat the lambs of the flock, chant to the sound of the viol, drink wine in bowls, and anoint themselves with the chief ointments" (Am. vi. 4 sqq.), the poor go naked and hungry (Is. lviii. 7), as helpless against the oppressor as the widow or orphan (Is. x. 2; Zech. vii. 10), and a poor man cannot hope for justice (Am. v. 12; Is. xxxii. 7; Jer. v. 28). Of the Israelites of his day Hos. iv. 2 sq. says: They swear, break faith, murder, steal, commit adultery, and one bloody deed treads upon the heels of another. Is. iii. 9 sq. speaks of the shamelessness with which Israel, like Sodom, proclaims its sins without blush or concealment (cf. Jer. xiii. 23).—It is a sombre picture, even with full allowance made for the pet tendency of preachers to paint things over-black.

Religious Situation.—With all the local or village shrines and bigger sanctuaries in Israel, the worship at these places did little or nothing to promote the moral and spiritual life of Israel, either in individuals or in the nation as a whole. True, the priests saw to it that the sacrifices and ritual were elaborate and correctly done. But of worship, in our sense, there was little or none. The religious Festivals were largely occasions of sacrifice and questionable mirth, "sensuality, the unrestrained and secular jollity of feasts,—half-sacrifices, half-picnics" (Montefiore, *H.L.*, 345). The Sabbath was a day of rest, (Ex. xxxiv. 21) and of sacrifice apparently. To the Hebrews, certainly up to 700 B.C., worship was all but exclusively

sacrificial and ritual, not a service of uplifting moral and spiritual teaching and edification. It was ritual, not moral acts, that constituted religion.

Hence Israel's views on its relationship with God, and His requirements, were very simple. Jehovah is *our* God; us alone does He know of all nations of the earth. He has covenanted with us to be on our side, and His fortunes are linked with ours. We are His chosen people. Provided we have no other God and pay Him His dues, He is in honour bound to protect and bless us.—What were Jehovah's dues in their eyes? In the eyes of priests and people alike, all that Jehovah required was a due performance of the proper sacrifices and ritual services at His shrines. If it was desired to please Him still more, to draw the bond of union between Jehovah and His one chosen people still closer, or to appease Him when angry with Israel's sins (= neglect of sacrifice), all that was needed was to redouble these sacrifices and services. Hence, in times of peril, priests and people feverishly turned to Jehovah's altars, and vied in pious rites morally worthless, yet of magic power in their eyes. Naturally, when the crash came in 721 and 586 B.C., many viewed the God of the beaten nation as beaten too, and turned to the gods of Nineveh or Babylon.

* * * * *

Such was the political, moral, and religious situation of Israel. How did these prophets face it as God's commissioned mouthpieces and messengers to His people? To begin with, what kind of men were these prophets, and what their guiding principles?

Amos, Isaiah, and Micah were men of Judah, Hosea was of Israel; though Amos of Judah was called to prophesy to Israel, not Judah. In social rank they varied as much as the Apostles, and Isaiah was their Paul. Amos was a herdman of Tekoa, "a rustic, probably not very attractive in his exterior, but whose words gush forth with all the power of a

mountain stream" (Jastrow, *Heb. and Bab. Trad.*, p. 284), Micah was probably an educated artisan, Hosea possibly a priest, Isaiah a man of position and a born statesman.

If we are to understand the message and life-work of these great prophets, we must at once rid ourselves of a common misconception already noted (p. 132 *sup.* and n.). Prediction of future events was *not* their essential rôle, neither were their messages verbally imparted to them miraculously from heaven while they were in a state of passive ecstatic unconsciousness (cf. pp. 13 and 64 sq., *sup.*). They are occasionally seers, but, as a rule, they foresee the future mainly in the sense that a righteous God's moral rule makes Israel's history to these trained readers of the "signs of the times" an open page, in which all who have eyes to see can read the future in the present. As to their message, God spoke to them exactly as He speaks to us all, from within their own heart and mind. Ecstatic visions occupy a very secondary place in the canonical prophets, and many of these so-called "visions" are merely figurative expressions.¹ Under inspiration the prophets were their own proper selves, fully conscious, but their faculties were abnormally quickened, prompted, enlightened by the Holy Spirit. Excitation there

¹ All the prophets have a regular religious nomenclature, mannerism, technique peculiar to them as a class. It is all the more striking, because it retains old phrases and ideas truly descriptive of early "seers," such as, *e.g.*, Balaam, but not at all of the canonical prophets. Before 800 B.C. the seer's state of ecstasy, trance, vision, is constantly met with exactly as in Numb. xxiv. 4, 16. Then, "The Spirit of the Lord will come mightily upon thee" (1 Sam. x. 6), was no empty phrase. We meet it even in Elijah's day. But we know that the canonical prophets no longer normally saw visions, heard voices, or fell in a trance. Yet the old phrases are still retained. The prophet tells us he "sees" and "hears," and "the hand of the Lord comes mightily upon him." The explanation is simple: it was the traditional mode of speech in the "schools of the prophets." These, of course, were not "schools" in our sense, but guilds for mutual edification or inspiration. In these guilds grew up, during the ecstatic stage of prophecy, a nomenclature exactly descriptive of the actual experience of the earliest prophets, and—as ever in religious institutions—language is very conservative, retaining phrases and ideas long outgrown. So no wonder that prophecy had a language of its own ready to hand for any prophet's use, even an Amos, who says of himself, "no prophet was I, nor a prophet's son."

still was, for these men are Orientals, but self-consciousness was not lost. In the very few instances where these canonical prophets still see visions and hear voices, their faculties are very much awake, for they have a clear memory of it all, and give us the whole scene most accurately.¹

The key-note to all their teaching lies in their conception of God as the Moral Governor of His world. In their eyes God is essentially Righteous and rules the world on absolutely moral lines. In all His works and in all His ways there is nothing contingent or arbitrary; it is all the necessary and essential outcome of God being what He is in Himself. He can only will and act as His own perfect character determines Him to will and act. What He loves is righteousness, what He hates is injustice. He has no respect of persons, neither is He to be bribed by sacrifices. What He demands is clean hands, pure thoughts, righteous conduct, rather than sacrifices and new-moons, sabbaths and festivals. Hence with a righteous Jehovah and a sinful Israel before their eyes, these prophets foresee Israel's punishment and Captivity long before it comes. Assyria is not knocking at Israel's door by accident. She is Jehovah's chosen instrument, His rod, to stamp out Israel's delusion and wrong. Thus their main business is to denounce iniquity as a breach of Israel's Covenant, and to pronounce God's impending judgment on a faithless nation. But they are also very mindful of God's tender love for His prodigal son, Israel, and well aware of His fidelity to His "everlasting Covenant." Israel may break it, not

¹ It was a mental process, not of cool reflection, certainly, but akin to the intuition and creative genius of the poet or artist who, after dwelling long in thought on a work of art he has in his mind's eye, suddenly sees it flash before him in unthought-of finish and beauty so clearly that he can retain the vision and carry it into execution. It is creative fancy, not dreaming, but awake at the pitch of genius. It takes one form in excitable Orientals, another in a Socrates, who was, at times, so rapt in meditation that he was deaf and blind to all external impressions, once rooted twenty-four hours in one spot, seeing such deep revelations that he was sure they were God-inspired.

He. So they have also words of comfort and hope. Not for one instant does their faith in Jehovah, and in His final purpose for Israel, waver. Israel must be purified of its dross as if by fire; but a better and stronger new Israel will rise from the ashes of the old. Of this, Hosea and Isaiah have no doubt at all.

God, to these prophets, is still *Israel's* Jehovah. But what a change has come over the national phrase in their minds! He is no longer a God whose sphere begins and ends with the boundaries of His land or the fortunes of His people. Though His Israel is still specially dear to Him, His hand controls all human history, and Nature but does His bidding.¹ Calamity comes from Him as well as prosperity. True, the eighth-century prophets do not *formally* declare Jehovah to be the one and only God; not till Deuteronomy and II Isaiah is His Godhead thus declared in set terms. Amos and Isaiah simply ignore all other gods. All need of them is gone. Jehovah has usurped all their functions and driven them out of the field. To Amos He is all-powerful in heaven and in hell, on Carmel and in the depths of the sea, in Caphtor and Kir, in Edom and Tyre. More majestic still is Isaiah's idea of God. As the thrice-Holy One, Jehovah is immeasurably exalted above everything in heaven or earth. Combining the "righteousness of God" in Amos with His "tender and long-suffering love" in Hosea, Isaiah gives us His exquisite picture of a God who is "holy" or aloof from all that is unclean and wrong, but "very nigh" to all who seek Him, longing for man's trust and love. He even pleads with man: "Come now,

¹ But Jewish particularism dies very hard, and prophetic belief in God's love for the nations was a slow growth. Up to 700 B.C., only in Isaiah (Is. ii. 2-4) do we find it, and in Micah. To Amos the nations are only God's rod or tool for Israel's purification. Ezekiel regards them as God's and Israel's wicked foes. We have to wait till the Second Isaiah (540) for the true universalism where the nations are drawn in and converted for their own sake.

and let us reason together." As for the nations, He includes them in His purpose of salvation (Is. ii. 2-4; that fine passage, Is. xix. 19-25, is long after Isaiah).¹

This ethical monotheism was bound to flow from their lofty moral conception of God. Kuenen (*Hibbert Lect.*) rightly says: "When, in the consciousness of the prophets, the central place was taken, not by the might, but by the holiness of Jehovah, the conception of God was carried up into another and a higher sphere. From that moment it ceased to be a question of 'more' or 'less' between Jehovah and the other gods, for He stood not only above them, but in dis-

¹ In reading an *Isaiah*, *Hosea*, etc., we must remember that in O.T. days "a book was always a compilation, it grew from age to age . . . and there is hardly a single O.T. book which does not contain portions of different periods, at times centuries apart" (Jastrow, *Heb. and Bab. Trad.*, 286), e.g. *Isaiah* is as composite a work as the Pentateuch. We usually assign the first part of Is. to I Isaiah; xl.-lv. to II Isaiah; and lvi.-lxvi. to III Isaiah; but the problem is really much more complicated, and within these groups lie many chapters of quite different dates, e.g. Is. xxiv.-xxvii. are very late indeed. The compiler evidently had several groups or loose leaves of Isaianic oracles, which he put together more by affinity of subject than in order of time or authorship. So with *Hosea*, the text is unusually corrupt. Hence often, when I appeal to a chapter of Is. or Hos. (e.g. in Messianic prophecy), I do so very provisionally, cf. my reference to Is. xix. *sup.*, a magnificent chapter, but is it I Isaiah's? Many scholars doubt it, and assign it a very much later date.

Amos, Hosea, Isaiah characteristics.—"The God of Amos is the apotheosis of right, He is the conscience of the world that can neither be corrupted nor sophisticated; the God of Hosea was born in the heart of a man whose love the grossest wrong could not quench. Retribution is the divinity of the one; redemption of the other. Amos' was the first to take hold. Hosea had to wait a century before his greater thought found a fruitful soil in Jer. and Deut." Amos' motto is: "Let justice roll down like floods, and righteousness as a mighty stream" (v. 24); even on foreign nations he pronounces God's doom, not for wronging Israel, but for violating the principles of humanity. This is the first O.T. assertion of international morality. Hosea is the father of Deuteronomy and its spiritual and humane conception of religion. . . . In his faithless wife, first driven from his home, then brought back to it and tenderly watched over and loved, he sees a parable of God's experience with Israel, His spouse, and applies it throughout his prophecies. Faith in God's undying love is his theme. "Outraged love may smite harder than offended righteousness, but its blows are remedial and kind, not retributive; its aim is not to satisfy justice, but to win back the erring." Isaiah, as said in the text above, is a combination of Amos' righteousness and Hosea's love. In literary style Isaiah is a past-master, he is a poetical genius, e.g. Is. v. 1-7, the parable of the vineyard; v. 26-30, the picture of the swift, irresistible onrush of Assyria; i. 2-8, Judah's devastation; ix. 8-21, the oracle against Samaria. From Amos onward, these prophets not only strike a new moral note, they adopt a new method. Their spoken messages to heedless ears they now commit to writing as well, both to reach a larger audience and to be for a witness to future generations. Hence they are known as canonical or writing prophets.

tinct opposition to them. If Jehovah, the Holy One, was God, and if He was God *as* the Holy One, *then the others are not*. In a word, the belief that Jehovah was the only God sprang out of the ethical conception of His Being."

From the same source springs the prophets' crusade (1) against images, and (2) against the common belief that mere prayers, sacrifices, ritual services and pompous worship are in themselves all-powerful with God. (1) The emphasis laid by these prophets on imageless worship does not imply that these men had such a transcendent idea of God that they wanted to avoid all possible approach to anything like anthropomorphism. Quite the reverse. They commonly speak of God as in human form, a God whose eyes are open to our needs and His ears attentive to our prayers, who lays bare His arm and with a mighty hand delivers His people. Some of their figures of God make Him act and speak so like a man and in so homely a way that, at times, they almost startle and shock us, and it is precisely because of this human touch that these men of God give us a real living picture of a Personal God who so strongly and warmly appeals to our hearts. Yet these same prophets set their face like a flint against all images of Jehovah, and for three main reasons: (a) They are "Nehushtan," mere things of brass and wood and clay, utterly unfit to be symbols of a living holy Jehovah; (b) they become, like the Brazen Serpent, fetishes, and end by being not symbols of the deity, but gods in themselves, so that men "burn incense unto the image" and worship it (2 Kgs. xviii. 4); (c) (and this comes first and foremost), they not only savour of, but lead to, heathenism. The Books of Kings, and the writings of the prophets themselves, show us that the Hebrews had openly adopted the Asherah poles (rude images of a goddess), and images of Molech and other deities, and set them up in and around Jerusalem (*e.g.* 2 Kgs. xxiii.). Hence Hosea deliberately calls the worship

of even Jehovah-images Baal-worship. Moses had said, "Thou shalt make thee no molten gods," *i.e.*, probably, images of strange gods; these prophets go beyond this and set afoot a crusade against all images, even of Jehovah.

(2) Equally must we ascribe to their lofty conception of God the prophets' wholesale condemnation of mere sacrifices, and ritual services, and all Israel's parade of outward worship. Of course, we must not take this to mean that there are to be no sacrifices and no temple services. Both the one and the other were as essential to true Jehovah-worship then as Church-services and Holy Communion are to-day. Their sweeping judgments are not on the institutions themselves, but on the false importance attached to them in their day, both by people and priests alike. To these prophets religion is essentially a character and a life, and (unless such services bear fruit in a right life,) they view correct services and many sacrifices as nothing worth. Our Lord says exactly the same thing in S. Matt. vii. 20 sqq. Hence the withering terms in which Amos (v. 21) tells these priests and people: "I hate (saith the Lord), I despise your feast-days; though ye offer Me burnt-offerings and oblations, I will not accept them." Hosea openly calls these altars, sacrifices, and ritual services "whoredom" and "sin" (ix. 1; ii. 5; viii. 11; x. 8), and blames the priests for it all:¹ they profane their office, pander to the people's taste for these sensuous services, and do it all for interested motives. "They

¹ This prophet and priest quarrel is a law of nature. A priesthood is essentially conservative, not creative. The priests' business is to preserve religious traditions unchanged, "the faith once and for all delivered to the saints." The prophet re-states the old tradition, lets in new light and ideas, brings it abreast of the best religious thought and aspirations of his day, puts "new wine into new bottles, that both be preserved." Prophets, with their progressive ideas and practical ideals, are ever intensely distasteful to conservative priests, who hug the traditional creed which served their fathers well. Religion needs the priest to keep the prophet from going too fast; it needs the prophet to keep the priests and their tradition from stagnation, from ever lagging behind the needs and ideas of their day, and so losing all hold on men's minds and hearts.

feed upon the sin (= ritual services) of My people and set their heart on their iniquity"; "I desire, saith the Lord, mercy and not sacrifice, and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings" (vi. 6; viii. 13). The most striking passage of all is Is. i. 10 sqq. Here Isaiah hangs side by side two masterly pictures, the picture of a religion of sabbaths and holy days and many prayers and manifold sacrifices, or man-made religion, and the companion-picture (i. 16 sqq.) of a religion which "ceases to do evil and learns to do well," or God's idea of religion. The oft-quoted Mic. vi. 6-8 pithily frames this fundamental prophetic doctrine in a very telling form.

Such were the inspiring ideals and lofty moral teaching of an Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah. As God's mouthpieces and in His name they came before the nation as the Voice of God Himself: "Thus saith the Lord." Interpreters of His will, seeing God's handwriting in all history, their moral lessons are all learnt in the school of the actual history of their own day. Their teaching is never in the form of generalising sermons as to-day. Point by point, it bears directly on some event of their own day, or some outstanding phase in their own generation.¹ Their one formula is,—not as to-day: "If you do this or that, then this or that will come upon you," but—

¹ *E.g.* all Messianic prophecy is (1) an idealised Golden Age picture, *plus* (2) contemporary history. (1) The root-idea is ever a coming Golden Age. The God of Israel is holy and good; all history is His handiwork and reflects His character and will; man can hinder, not foil His eternal plan of a righteous Kingdom on earth. His Israel, with whom He has made an everlasting Covenant, is the chosen means for the establishment of God's Kingdom. Sinful Israel will be purged of its dross by the fiery ordeal of affliction, and a new and pure Israel will rise from the ashes of the old. Then God will inaugurate His Kingdom of justice and goodness first in Israel itself, and, through Israel, among all mankind. This is the root-idea in all prophets. (2) But God usually works through great personalities whom He raises and endows with His Spirit, *e.g.* Moses. Hence prophets frequently see the coming Deliverer in big men of their own day, *e.g.* Zerubbabel, Cyrus. As God promised David, through Nathan, a king in his house for ever (2 Sam. vii. 11 sqq.), a Davidic king was also looked for. Is. vii.-xi. is an assurance to the reigning, humbled Davidic house that this David-promise cannot fail, so from its humility will rise a shoot of Jesse greater than David. Similarly, the Suffering Servant of II Isaiah is Israel itself, purified by its terrible affliction, and redeeming others as well.

“Woe unto you *who have done* this or that,” or “Hear the Word of the Lord, ye that have done thus or thus, verily the judgment of God shall come upon you.”

And they themselves practised what they preached. The Word of God spoke in their lives as clearly as on their lips. Speaking in God's name, standing before men as His heralds, battling with sin and wrong as champions of truth and the right, their whole life was that of “servants of a holy God.” Micah's picture of himself is true of them all: “Truly I am full of power by the Spirit of the Lord, and of judgment, and of might, to declare unto Jacob his transgression and unto Israel his sin.” Most striking of all is their unreserved self-surrender to God. The call to prophecy comes: “Go, prophesy to My people.” It must be instantly obeyed, though scorn, derision, hatred are to be their only wage. The command comes to Hosea: Take back thy profligate wife to thy home, love her still, watch tenderly over her; or to Jeremiah: “Thou shalt not take to thyself a wife”; or to Ezekiel: Thy beloved wife shall die, and thou shalt not mourn for her. They instantly obey. Of course, these personal experiences were all symbolical of Israel's coming plight, and, of themselves, drove home the prophet's message as speech never could do. Hosea, Jeremiah, Ezekiel saw this, but they would equally have obeyed at once had they not seen God's meaning in it all.

One famous historical scene will illustrate the attitude and tone adopted by these prophets when they came before the people in the name of God; it is so typical.

In the reign of Jeroboam II, about 760 B.C., there suddenly enters into the holy city of Bethel a grim, gaunt Judæan herdsman, Amos of Tekoa. In the cathedral city itself this layman rustic, with outspoken and uncompromising boldness, denounces to the faces of priests and people alike the vice, arrogance,

and oppression of Israel, especially its upper classes, and pronounces all the sacrificial and ritual religiousness of the day a hollow sham, hateful to God. "You say," exclaims Amos, "Jehovah is *our* God, us alone does He know, therefore He must be on our side: daily do we tread His courts and come before Him with our offerings of rams and the fat of bullocks; we observe His sabbaths and new-moons, we keep the appointed feasts." This is Jehovah's answer to you: "I hate, I despise your feast-days, your burnt and meal-offerings I will not accept." God is not a man thus to be bribed by gifts and offerings. Your routine of outward services He calls an offence and a sin: "Come to Bethel, your sanctuary, and transgress; at Gilgal multiply transgression; bring your sacrifices every morning . . . for this liketh you, O ye children of Israel, saith the Lord"; "Seek not Bethel, nor enter into Gilgal, saith the Lord. Seek ye Me, and ye shall live, . . . ye who turn judgment to wormwood and cast down righteousness to the earth" (iv. 4 sq.; v. 4 sqq.). What Jehovah demands is a right life, not sacrifices; true service, not services. The worship He wants is the practice of humanity and justice: "let judgment run down as waters; and righteousness as a mighty stream." Nothing short of this will satisfy Him.—Again, you expect a "Day of the Lord" when your Jehovah will stand up for you and crush your foreign foes. That "day of the Lord" is at hand, but it is not going to be a bright day for you, but dark and full of doom (v. 18). "The Lord hath sworn by His holiness that they will take you away into Captivity with hooks, and your residue with fish hooks" (iv. 2); "for your Gilgal shall surely go into captivity, and Bethel shall come to nought" (v. 5). It is not Assyria, it is your Jehovah Himself who is bringing this doom upon you as a judgment for all your sins. Say not to yourselves: Jehovah is our God, us alone does He know. Hear Jehovah's answer to that: "You only have I known of all the

families of the earth; *therefore* I will punish you for all your iniquities" (iii. 2). Not a whit more will God spare you than other nations that do wrong; indeed He will spare you less, for to whom much is given, of him is much required. God has not two standards of morality, one for you and one for other nations. Jehovah is a righteous God, and with Him right is right and wrong wrong all the world over. You say: "Jehovah's honour is at stake if Assyria beats Israel." Not so! Jehovah's honour is at stake if He allows a sinful Israel to continue a nation. Assyria's triumph over a sinful Israel is Jehovah's triumph of righteousness over injustice and sin.

Naturally, Amos' outspoken language was sheer treason and blasphemy in the ears of self-satisfied priests and worshippers in holy Bethel. The head priest, Amaziah, sent a letter of protest to the king, indicting Amos of treason, and also ordered this ranting preacher and socialist agitator to quit the northern realm and go back to his Judah: "O thou *seer*, go, flee thee away into the land of Judah, and there eat bread, and prophesy" (vii. 12), *i.e.* go elsewhere and ply thy trade of seditious fanatic and earn a precarious livelihood with thy quack prophesyings; go to thy native Judah, we do not need thee here!

What we read in Amos is but repeated in the other prophets. Naturally, it was strongly resented by priests and people alike. What was wrong with the good old creed of their fathers, that they should give it up for the new fads of these ranting upstart preachers! This lofty moral teaching was too high for the degenerate, easy-going Israel of that day. It fell on deaf ears and dull hearts. The people "heard, indeed, but understood not; saw, but perceived not. The eyes of the people were holden, and their ears heavy, and their heart fat." Even the most optimistic of the prophets, Isaiah, has to own of his countrymen so dear to his heart: "the whole head is sick and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto

the head there is no soundness in it" (i. 4 sqq.). Jeremiah expects the Ethiopian to change his skin, or the leopard his spots, sooner than Israel repent and give up its evil habits (xiii. 23). The prophets failed in their day, for Israel did not repent. But they saved faith in Jehovah when the crash came. *Then* the prophets' lesson, which had sunk deeper than the prophets knew, came back to these Israelites and they took it to heart. They saw then that their Captivity was all due to their neglect of God's law of righteousness. They saw, too, that a righteous God could do no otherwise than punish them as He had done. Thanks to the prophets, loss of faith in Jehovah was not involved in the ruin of Judah in 586 B.C.

* * * * *

Three features in the prophetic teaching seem to us to-day passing strange :—

(1) Extraordinary to us is the fact that, till about 600 B.C., religion is a national, not an individual matter. With us religion is a personal relationship between God and the individual soul, whereas, in these prophets' days, religion is a matter between the nation and its God. They are preachers, not to individuals, but to the whole nation, and inveigh against *national* sins. The individual counts practically for nothing till 600 B.C.¹ The family is the lowest unit recognised; in himself the individual has little or no standing at all. This is why when Achan, or Dathan and Abiram sin, their guilt involves not only themselves but their whole families as well. Hence even these sublime prophets,—till Jeremiah and Ezekiel—cannot rid themselves of the idea that

¹ This must not be pressed too far. The prophets' idea of religion as a matter of the heart involves moral responsibility, *i.e.* appeals implicitly to the individual. Isaiah's "remnant," or "Holy seed," consisted of individuals who realised their personal duty to God. The sense of sin, of repentance, of prayer, was with men then. But the corporate sense predominated: "Our fathers sinned, and we suffer" was the spirit of their general creed. The nation came before the individual and all but blotted him out.

God deals with nations, not individuals. They appeal to Israel and society at large to mend their ways, but seldom to the individual soul. The corporate sense is strongly developed, but not the sense of the infinite value of the individual soul in God's eyes.

(2) This largely explains another very strange feature common to these prophets and to all Israel before the Exile. There is not a trace of any expectation of life after death in our sense of the term (see *Note*, end of chapter). Naturally, if a man has no distinct individuality on earth, he expects none in the world beyond the grave. Rewards and punishments, as well as a full active life, belong only to this life. "That thy days may be long and prosperous in the land," was all man looked and hoped for. True, he believed in the "pit" or Sheol (cf. p. 89, *sup.*). But this Sheol-land of gloom and shadow beyond the grave, a kind of vast subterranean tomb with barred and bolted gates, in which ghosts retain but a shadowy flickering outline of their old personality, forgotten of God and man, did not concern the Hebrew much. If he gave a second thought to himself at all beyond this actual life, he consoled himself with the conviction that he should not wholly die, for he should live on in his family, tribe, and nation. He saw in anticipation the good of his family, the welfare of his beloved nation, and in their blessing he felt abundantly blessed. He was more than content to have poured his little stream of life and service into the tide of family and national life, and in some degree to have swelled it. As to the possible annihilation of his family or nation, this was a calamity too awful even to contemplate. Jehovah had established His Covenant with Israel, an inviolable and everlasting Covenant, so the nation at any rate was safe. Jehovah had also promised to make the days of them that love Him (= all Israelites) long and prosperous in the land. As for any other hope of immortality he had none. Hence his anxiety to live on in his family, lest his name be clean blotted out.

It was this that made childlessness such a terrible affliction in Hebrew eyes, and led, not only to polygamy, but to the "custom" making it a brother's duty, if his brother died childless, to marry his brother's widow and raise seed unto him, so as to save his brother's name from annihilation.

(3) This Hebrew conviction: "I shall not wholly die, for I shall live on in my Israel which can never die," in itself explains why these prophets were so universally unpopular with their gloomy prophecies of a fallen Israel, a Holy Land desolate, and Israelites themselves serfs in a strange land. Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah openly tell their countrymen that their days and their Israel's days are numbered; though the two latter (not Amos) do open a door of hope for Israel *after* the Captivity. Not only do they proclaim the fall of the nation as inevitable, but they set their faces as a flint against all attempts to avert this catastrophe by alliances with Egypt and other nations against the invader. When Hezekiah and his court entered into negotiations with Egypt and other neighbours for an alliance against Assyria, they had to do it behind Isaiah's back and without his knowledge. During the actual siege of Jerusalem, Jeremiah bends his whole energies to make his countrymen bow to God's decrees, and surrender to the King of Babylon! Imagine our own feelings in the late war had the Archbishop of Canterbury been for ever dinning in our ears that, for our national sins, we must bow to God's decrees, and that our downfall at Germany's hands was inevitable, while our alliance with France, Italy, and America was only an additional sin and a glaring act of disloyalty to God! From their spiritual standpoint the prophets were no doubt right, but, from the practical and material point of view, their attitude was past the comprehension of their fellow-countrymen. They exasperated king, statesmen, priests, soldiers, and people alike. Well can we understand practical statesmen and army commanders

begging the king: "We beseech thee, let this man (= Jeremiah) be put to death; for thus he weakeneth the hands of the men of war that remain in this city, and the hands of all the people, in speaking such words unto them" (Jer. xxxviii. 4).¹

Yet at heart these prophets were the truest of patriots. Jer. xx. 7 sqq. shows how he shrank from the heart-breaking task of denouncing Israel and predicting evil. The bare idea of Israel's downfall stabbed them to the quick every whit as much as it did their countrymen. Yet how could they do other than they did? If they refrained from speaking, or couched their denunciations in mild form, it was disloyalty to God, disloyalty to the people's best good, disloyalty to their own truest and deepest convictions. No better proof can we have of their sublime grandeur than the self-sacrificing courage with which they delivered a message as distasteful to themselves as to their hearers. Here again they were forerunners of Christ, treading the same hard road He had to tread; and even as Christ wept over the Jerusalem whose doom He was predicting, so did they. These prophets actually did weep over Jerusalem (Jer. xiv. 17; ix. 1; xiii. 17). No words

¹ Jeremiah's experience as a prophet is typical, though an extreme case. His Cassandra forebodings made him bitterly hated, especially as their dire fulfilment stared men in the face. His own town, Anathoth, plotted his death; his prophecy in the temple all but cost him his life; his book of prophecies (Jer. xxxvi.) so exasperated the king that Jeremiah and Baruch had to hide for their lives. During the last siege, he was first a prisoner in a private house, then cast into an empty cistern, then kept under military guard. The Babylonians treated him well as one of their friends, and he irritated his countrymen by dissuading them from fleeing to Egypt for refuge, so they forced him to go there with them. The last we hear of him is in Egypt, again denouncing and prophesying evils to come. He suffered much from his countrymen, he suffered much more from the anguish of his own soul. If they loved their country, he loved it ten times more; and he fully believed that his "words of God" denouncing it and foretelling its doom were not mere predictions, but the effectual cause of Judah's fall. Had not God's express commission, "I have this day set thee over the nations, to root out and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build and to plant" (i. 9-10), made him the arbiter of his land's fate? So awful is his anguish of soul at this heart-breaking task thus set him that, in language as strong as Job's, he bitterly reproaches God for placing such a burden upon him. Read Jer. xx. 7-18, and cf. xv. 15-18.

better express their own heart-feelings than Christ's own: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, . . . how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens, and ye would not. Behold, your house is left unto you desolate." The prophets acted and spoke as they did, because, as God's spokesmen, they could no other. They spoke their noble convictions and lived their noble lives in the strength of the one inspiring ideal: "Let even my country perish, so long as God's right endures."

NOTE.

The statement on p. 158, "In Israel before the Exile there is not a trace of life after death in our sense of the term," is sure to be challenged. Later chapters should make my meaning clear, but to avoid misconception, let me define my position.

(a) All along, Israel had an idea of life after death. They always believed, as did all men everywhere then, that at death man's wraith went to Sheol, where existence was rather *vegetating* than living. Even this belief was something. The vitality of this early belief is a standing witness to man's instinctive conviction that death does not kill personality. It is a proof of immortality, for it is the voice of man's soul, spirit of God's spirit, telling him that he does not all die. Poor substitute as is Sheol for eternal life, it is the fertile germ out of which will spring a real belief in life eternal.

(b) As already said, up to 600 B.C. the individual was all but merged in the nation. The Israelite's Future Hope was centred in his Israel. Jehovah had made an everlasting Covenant with His Israel, linking His fortunes with Israel's. He had also made a Covenant with David (2 Sam. vii. 9-16) guaranteeing David's throne and Israel's continuance for ever. On the strength of these two sure promises, Israel's conviction of its own glorious future never grew dim. In its darkest hour, black as was the outlook, and heavy as was God's hand on a sinful nation, Israel knew that God's glorious Covenant-promises must come true as soon as Israel was purified of its dross. The Day of the Lord was at hand, and with it will dawn God's Kingdom on earth in a regenerate and glorious Israel. This so-called Messianic Hope with its Golden Age of prosperity, peace, and joy was Israel's real Future

Hope throughout the O.T., a glorified Israel the one thing to which they looked forward. Prophets speak of this glorious coming transfiguration of Israel as a resurrection (*e.g.* Hos. vi. 2; Ezek. xxxvii.), but metaphorically, *i.e.* they simply picture the nation's restoration from captivity to prosperity in the new Israel *under the form of a resurrection*. It is a *national*, not an individual, Future Hope. On the subject of individual resurrection the canonical prophets are silent.

(*c*) After the Exile religion becomes personal, and, in the presence of the problem of the sufferings of the righteous and the prosperity of the wicked (Jer. xii. 1), men here and there tentatively throw out hints of another life¹ in which, possibly, earth's wrongs shall be righted. But it is only an aspiration, a gleam seen only by a thoughtful few groping after a clearer light than the theology of their day warranted or revealed.² In all the Old Testament, only some half a dozen passages embody a definite hope of individual resurrection in our sense, and it is open to question whether a single one of them is of earlier date than 300 B.C., the period of our next paragraph. The passages are: Pss. xvi. 8-11; xvii. 15; xlix. 14, 15; lxxiii. 23-26, and especially Is. xxv. 8; xxvi. 19; Dan. xii. We deal fully with the question later, and state why Job xix. 25-27 is excluded. Even in these passages, several come under (*b*), for their individual resurrection is mainly with a view to the righteous dead sharing in the Messianic Kingdom.

(*d*) From 300-1 B.C., the modern belief in an individual resurrection to eternal life is frequently met with, but in apocalypses (cf. Is. xxv.-xxvi., Dan. xii.), and almost without exception outside the Bible. Several speak very definitely of Life after Death, Judgment, Eternity, Heaven, and Hell exactly as we do. Some speak of a resurrection of the body, others only of the soul

¹ Two sources fed these aspirations: (1) contact with Persian (and Greek) thought, with their belief in the soul's immortality; (2) some Psalmists, in their close mystical communion with God (*e.g.* Pss. lxxiii. 23, 24; xvi. 8-11), feel that not even death can sever their oneness with God; this communion with God must go on; as if, like Enoch and Elijah, they too must be rapt into heaven yet nearer to God. Hence two parallel lines of O.T. resurrection hopes: (1) a resurrection upon earth out of Sheol *at the Messianic Age* (*e.g.* Is. xxv. 8, xxvi. 19, and Dan. xii.), and (2) an *immediate* escape from Sheol at death in a continued life of conscious blessedness in heaven.

² Cf. Socrates, who felt in his heart of hearts that man's "spirit" or "personality," partaking of the essence of God, must rise after death, though he candidly owns that it is only a pious hope for which he can give no reason, and adds that he is not quite certain. He sees dimly, but feels strongly on the subject (see Zeller's *Socrates*, pp. 147 sqq., English translation).

or personality clothed in a purely spiritual body. By the time Christ came on earth, the conviction of individual resurrection to an eternal life of communion with God was clearly and definitely established in most Hebrew minds (*e.g.* Pharisees, not Sadducees). The people generally, however, still clung to a *national* resurrection, *i.e.* a glorified Israel here on earth as the Kingdom of God. Our Lord's Apostles shared this view, *e.g.* Acts i. 6: "Lord, dost Thou at this time restore the Kingdom to Israel?" while S. Mt. xxvii. 52: "And the tombs were opened and many of the saints that slept were raised," etc., proves that Christians of that day fully believed that the righteous Jews who had died would rise to share in the kingdom.

NOTE ON P. 145: THE SABBATH A DAY OF REST, AND OF SACRIFICE APPARENTLY.

We know nothing of Hebrew Sabbath-observance up to 700 B.C., except as a day of rest; all else is inference. In Babylonia (p. 80 *sup.*), the 7th, 14th, 21st, and 28th of each month were "favourable days, evil days" (*i.e.* apt to be unlucky), the others simply "favourable days." On these four days, great care was taken not to offend the gods. Hence the Babylonian equation: *am nikk libbi = shabattum*, "Day of rest of the heart (of the deity) = sabbath," *i.e.* a day for the gods to rest from their anger, a day for the pacification of a deity's anger, = sabbath. The day was "holy" (p. 61 *sup.*), work taboo. So in early Israel; but the Hebrews humanised it, made it a day of recreation from labour (Hos. ii. 11), fixed it *every* seventh day irrespective of lunar phases (its original idea, p. 80, n.), and gradually made it holy in our sense; its strictness also grew (Jer. xvii. 19-27). As "holy," it was probably a day of sacrifice, but we have no direct evidence in early days; Is. i. 13, etc., are all ambiguous on that point. Burney derives Sabbath from Sumerian SA (heart) BAT (to appease) = "heart appeasing." (See Jastrow, *Heb. and Bab. Tradus.*, ch. iii., and Driver in Hastings' *D. of B.*, iv. 317 sqq.).

CHAPTER XI

THE BOOK OF THE LAW, AND JEREMIAH

THE Book of the Law (Deut.), embodying all the prophets' ideals, and Jer. xxxi. 33, 34, with its great ideal of religion as a relationship between God and the individual soul, are two epoch-making revelations, and need a chapter to themselves. Israel's tragic history led up to both.

In 721 the Northern Kingdom, Israel, fell before Assyria. 27,290 of its best inhabitants (p. 143 *sup.*) were taken into captivity. Foreigners settled on their lands. In Mesopotamia these Israelite exiles were so completely absorbed by its native population that they left not a trace behind them. This is worth noting, and for this reason. It proves that Judah has simply the 130 years' interval *and its prophets* to thank for its escape from the same fate! For it is unanimously admitted that Judah's deeper religion, and it alone, saved the Jews 135 years later from the same extinction. Had Judah gone into Captivity in 721, the Jewish name must equally have been blotted out, for at that date there was little to choose between the religious condition of Israel and Judah. Indeed, it was in Israel, under an Amos and a Hosea, that a reaction against a heathenish worship of Jehovah originated and afterwards passed into Judah. Fortunately for Judah's survival as a nation, geographical and other considerations gave it over 100 years' respite. In this interval an Isaiah, a Deuteronomy, and a Jeremiah, backed by such kings as Hezekiah and Josiah, did a good religious work in Judah. Its fruits did not come up to prophetic expectations. It

produced at the time but a "remnant" of pious and God-fearing souls; yet from this "holy seed" (Is. vi. 13) sprang a new Israel which can never die. Thus it came about that, whereas Israel clean dies out after 721 B.C., Judah's Captivity but gave it a new lease of life. Isaiah and Jeremiah contributed much to this result. In their generation they were but little esteemed; after their death the Jews ranked them only just below Moses.

Isaiah still plays an important part in our period, and Isaiah, Deuteronomy, and Jeremiah (740-586) practically cover four long reigns. Two of these kings are weak, bad, reactionary; in each case they are followed by kings good and progressive on the whole.

Israel's fall in 721 made a deep impression on Judah, but they read it in a Pharisaic spirit. When proud and powerful Israel was laid low and little Judah saved, the Judæans saw in this a guarantee of God's goodwill towards them, and a recognition of their own superior piety. Judah had now entered into Israel's inheritance as well as her own, and Judah was now Jehovah's one land.

Isaiah's influence, politically, in the state was immense. From 740 B.C. his one policy for Judah was one of non-intervention in foreign politics. By every means at his command, he sought to keep Ahaz and Judah free from all entanglements in the politics of the two great powers of that day, Assyria and Egypt. He wanted both king and nation to devote their undivided energies to internal social and religious reforms. "In quietness and confidence (in the Lord) shall be your strength" (Is. xxx. 15) was ever his motto, and when he and Ahaz first come on the scene it was a wise policy. As already stated (p. 144 *sup.*), Israel was still there to act as a buffer northward, the wilderness eastward, and Egypt was a friendly neighbour. Suddenly (*c.* 734), Israel and Syria combined against Assyria, and tried to induce Judah to join them. To force his hand they threatened

to invade Ahaz' land. Isaiah bade Ahaz have no fear and pay no heed. Too frightened to listen, Ahaz invoked Assyria's aid. Assyria beat Israel and Syria, but from this moment Judah was Assyria's tributary and doomed. Had Isaiah's advice been followed, Assyria for her own sake must have crushed the Syria-Israel coalition, and Judah would equally have been saved, while retaining her independence. As it is, the next thing we see is Ahaz at Damascus doing homage to Tiglath-pileser, and there borrowing strange altars and cults for Jehovah's worship (2 Kgs. xvi. 11 sqq.).—Hezekiah, son of Ahaz, as we saw (p. 144 *sup.*), tried to play a double game. He sent tribute to Assyria his overlord, yet secretly abetted Egypt against Assyria, while professing not to break with Assyria. Assyria saw through this double dealing and besieged Jerusalem, but for some reason had to beat a hasty retreat (701). This wondrous preservation of Jerusalem may have contributed¹ to Hezekiah's religious reformation, a reform such as Isaiah longed for, but its success was partial. Under King Manasseh (697–638), Judah, which had all along remained Assyria's vassal, was whole-heartedly pro-Assyrian. A reactionary religious movement also set in, undoing all Hezekiah's good work. The old idolatrous cults and images were reinstated in the sanctuaries, from Assyria was introduced the worship of sun, moon, and stars, while the Canaanite practice of sacrificing the first-born to Moloch was transferred to Jehovah-worship (2 Kgs. xxi. 3–8). Manasseh himself, as Ahaz before him, made his son "pass through fire."²

¹ Dr. Burney writes: "I conjecture that Hezekiah's reformation (2 Kgs. xviii. 4) was probably earlier than this. Jer. xxvi. 17 ff. (very important as showing that there actually *was* such an attempt at a reformation, and that 2 Kgs. xviii. 4 is not simply based on the Deut. redactor's conjecture that what happened under Josiah was begun under Hezekiah), traces Hezekiah's reformation to the influence of *Micah*." Hezekiah's reform was on the lines of Josiah's (621), but not nearly so far-reaching, still it paved the way for it.

² "Pass through fire," the expression probably means "make over to the deity by fire," *i.e.* it denotes a sacrifice in which the victim was first slain, then burnt (Burney).

A revulsion of feeling set in half-way in Josiah's reign (638-608). The prophetic party was in the ascendant then, and an epoch-making religious reform came about in this way. A big Scythian invasion from the North swept over all neighbouring lands, even penetrated to Egypt, yet left Judah untouched. This wondrous escape immensely impressed Judah, and public opinion, now backed by the king, was all for religious reform. This sentiment reached fever-heat when Hilkiah the chief-priest announced that he had found the "Book of the Law" (Deut.) in the Temple. The elders and people were at once summoned by the king to hear it publicly read. Josiah and the "congregation" were so awed at the Divine threats, therein made, against disobedience to God's commands to abolish all images and high-places, and to centralise all worship in the Jerusalem Temple,¹ and there only, that they at once set about radical reforms. Hezekiah had apparently² spared the many local shrines of Jehovah, merely purging them of images and other heathenish rites and abuses. Josiah resolved to abolish them altogether (2 Kgs. xxii.-xxiii.) destroying and desecrating them, pulling their altars to pieces, smashing the pillars and sacred poles (Asheras), and forcibly carrying off the priests to Jerusalem. For once, priests heartily endorsed this prophetic reform. As they readily saw, this abolition of local shrines would enormously enhance the prestige of the Jerusalem Temple and their own. Their provincial rivals, now no longer priests in office (2 Kgs. xxiii. 9, this went beyond Deut. xviii. 6-8), would become mere assistant Levites to the

¹ Of course, the Jerusalem Temple is not named in Deut., which is purposely set in a framework of fictitious antiquity as the work of Moses himself at Horeb. The phrase in Deut. xii. is "in the place which the Lord thy God shall choose," and it dwells with insistent iteration on this as the one and only place for God's worship.

² 2 Kgs. xviii. 4 (and Rabshakeh's speech, xviii. 22), make out that Hezekiah treated the high-places exactly as did Josiah in 621. This is now believed to be an exaggeration. Hezekiah probably only purged these high-places of images, Asherahs, and other heathenish rites and practices.

Jerusalem priests. So the Jerusalem priests were heart and soul in this prophetic movement. Led by prophets, priests, and king, the people there and then made a sworn covenant with Jehovah to obey His "Book of the Law" (Deut.), which was henceforth to be the one authorised Law of the land. Promising as all this seemed, it was a momentary and spasmodic reform, merely skin-deep for the majority, and its influence was superficial. Far from the change of heart and the regenerated social and national life which Deuteronomy aimed at, all that the reform really effected was, as Jeremiah feared, a redoubling of ritual and sacrificial worship and a firmer belief than ever in its magical efficacy.

This Josiah-reform coincided with an occurrence of the greatest import within the Assyrian empire. The Babylonians wrested themselves free from Assyria, and the Babylonian king Nabopolassar allied himself with Medo-Scythian hordes, who eventually burst into Assyria, in 607, sacked and destroyed its capital, Nineveh. Nahum's prophecy was literally fulfilled, and Western Asia breathed freely again now that this tyrant-stronghold was demolished. Meanwhile, Egypt had invaded Judah and defeated it at Megiddo (608), where Josiah fell, but Egypt herself was crushingly defeated by Babylon at Carchemish (605). Babylon at once stepped into Assyria's empire and now became Judah's overlord. Judah fretted under Babylonian sway, and constantly rebelled. Instigated by Egypt, King Zedekiah renounced his allegiance to Babylon; Nebuchadrezzar replied by laying siege to Jerusalem (2 Kgs. xxv. 1). In 586 it was sacked, and, as Jeremiah had all along foretold with plain outspokenness, Judah went into Captivity, in spite of its worship-reformation and its new "Book of the Law," which, as Jeremiah again had told them, had done little or nothing to mend their ways. We shall presently see why Josiah's reformation, and even the Book of the Law, by no

means satisfied Jeremiah. As events proved, his verdict was right.

With the Captivity (586-537) Israel as a nation disappears, but the Jews survive as a Church, and the whole aspect of religion changes. Religion hitherto has been a purely national matter; henceforth it is going to be, rather, a personal¹ question between God and the individual soul. Jeremiah had foreseen this and made provision for it, as Jer. xxxi. 33 sqq. shows.

With this historical background, we are now in a position to estimate the place and value, in Hebrew religion, of the Book of the Law and of Jeremiah.

Deuteronomy is called the "prophetic" Book of the Law. Had Amos, Hosea, Isaiah combined to write a religious code of rules embodying all their highest ideals, they could not have done it better than their disciples, the prophetic writers of Deuteronomy about 650 B.C. It welds all their separate and partial truths into one organic whole. It contains the best conception of God and the highest moral teaching in the Old Testament; it is its Sermon on the Mount. Deuteronomy is a body of laws and institutions so framed as to direct the whole religious, social, and civil life of the people, and to make them an Israel after God's own heart. The monotheism of Deuteronomy is absolute and of the purest: "He is the only God in the heavens above or in the earth beneath; there is none else beside Him" (iv. 39, 35). To Him "belongeth the heaven, and the heaven of heavens, the earth, with all that is therein" (x. 14). Its conception of Jehovah combines Amos' "righteousness" of God, Hosea's "long-suffering love and tender mercy," Isaiah's "holiness" (= aloof from all that is unclean or wrong) and "nearness" (= "nigh unto all that call upon

¹ Of course, this does not mean that the "corporate sense" vanished. Fortunately, both for the nation and the individual, solidarity, or the subordination of the individual to the organic whole, was ever part and parcel of every Israelite's creed.

Him"). As a righteous God, He is still a terrible avenger of wrong and oppression. But Love¹ is His dominant note. He requires obedience, yet is infinitely compassionate and forgiving. He prefers mercy to sacrifice, and the one sacrifice really acceptable in His sight is the willing offering of a true and contrite heart, for He asks to be worshipped in spirit and in truth. If He is righteous and loving, He is also "holy," aloof from all that is unclean or wrong, for sin He hates and will assuredly punish. Israel is His chosen people,² but Israel must not presume upon this privilege. Constantly is Israel reminded that the relationship between Jehovah and Israel is purely moral and carries a heavy obligation with it. To whom much is given, of him is much required, and in their case sin is doubly heinous and its punishment all the more severe (cf. Deut. xxx.). Another note in Deuteronomy is its stress on justice and kindness between man and man. Love of God and love of man must go hand in hand. This spirit of justice and humanity must be extended not only to the Hebrew orphan, widow, hired servant, and slave, but to the stranger settled in the land and to the cattle at the plough. Israel is reminded of its own evil plight in Egypt and urged to copy God's compassion for them then. In Deut. v. the motive for Sabbath-observance is wholly humanitarian: "that thy manservant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou, remembering that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt." All images of Jehovah in any shape or form are now absolutely forbidden: "for ye saw

¹ The influence of Hosea is particularly plain in Deut. In it the essence of religion is love (Deut. vi. 5), the love of God to His people and their responsive love to Him is the ruling motive in worship and conduct; just as humanity and charity are its prime virtues as between man and man.

² *Deut.* is far more exclusive than *e.g.* *Is.* xix. The Ammonite and Moabite are excluded from the congregation of Jehovah "even to the tenth generation" (xxiii. 3); the Edomite, as a brother, and the Egyptian, because Israel once dwelt in his land, can be admitted in the third generation and must not be "abhorred" (7). But *Deut.* gives little or no thought to the nations outside Israel's pale. Canaanites are to be annihilated (in 650 B.C. were there any?).

no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake to you in Horeb." All high-places and local shrines, all worship and rites that in any way savour of heathenism, are abolished, every trace of them blotted out.¹ In Jerusalem alone is worship to be done; in the place where Jehovah chooses to "cause His Name to dwell there."²

Deuteronomy is "one of the noblest monuments of Israel's religion, its sublime and spiritual ideals are all but Christian in spirit." Yet there is a grain of truth, too, in the paradox: "Pharisaism and Deuteronomy came into the world the same day." This paradox implies that (1) in its centralisation of all worship in Jerusalem; (2) in its concentration of all power in priests' hands; (3) in its translation of prophetic principles into set rules,—a prophetic Deuteronomy all unconsciously paved the way for a legal³ Judaism which it could not foresee. Let us examine these three points more in detail.

(1) *Centralisation of worship in Jerusalem.*—The prophets combated stoutly Israel's deep-rooted idea that Jehovah, their tribal God whose fortunes were

¹ ² Kgs. xxiii. shows that the high-places were not only heathenish in worship, but the scene of foul and immoral doings with their bloody Tophet and its human sacrifices, as well as their consecrated sodomites and prostitutes, etc., etc. No wonder Deut. orders (Deut. xiii. 12-18) the wholesale annihilation of any city of Judah which should re-institute idolatry, and looked upon idolatry as on a par with murder, if not worse.

³ This centralisation had its drawbacks as we shall presently see. The village-shrines, because of their abuses, had to be abolished, but originally their influence had been good. There every village could perform its religious rites and hold its feasts of Passover, First Fruits, and Harvest. Beside that local altar, with a simple religious rite, domestic animals were slaughtered whenever hospitality or a family festival gave occasion. Henceforth, the villagers could have no sacrifices, no religious rites, and, if they desired to make offering to God or religiously observe the great festivals, they must now go all the long distance to Jerusalem. Deuteronomy licenses the slaughter of animals without the obligation of any sacrifice or religious rite, just as it provides for the Levites, or village-priests, to rank in Jerusalem on a par with Jerusalem priests (which they did *not*); but village religion must have suffered, had not the abolition of local sanctuaries incidentally contributed to the substitution of the synagogue for the Temple.

³ *Legalism* [e.g. I go to church, Holy Communion, confession, give to the poor, keep the Commandments—what more can God ask? (cf. S. Lk. xviii. 11-12)] views religion as a code of rules, and is apt to sacrifice spirit to letter, motive to deed.

leagued with Israel's, must be on their side, provided His chosen people duly paid Him His sacrificial dues. Now the centralisation of worship in Jerusalem would foster this very idea. Jerusalem naturally became what Sinai was in Moses' day, Jehovah's home. Even sixty years later, Ezekiel names Jerusalem "The Lord is there" (xlvi. 35). According to him, Jerusalem is Jehovah's dwelling-place (xxxvii. 26 sqq.), particularly His Temple there (x.), and He goes with Israel to Babylonia, till the new untainted Temple shall be built (xliii. 7). He is specifically the God of Israel (xxxiv. 30) and only indirectly of the nations. To this extent it may be true that centralisation of worship in Jerusalem fostered Jewish particularism and exclusiveness;¹ but it is not true that it encouraged individual Pharisaeism, *i.e.* the spirit of legalism in religion. In theory it should have tended in this direction, but as a matter of fact it did just the reverse, it fostered spirituality, and for this reason. We have seen (p. 171, n.²) that villages and provincial towns, now that their local altars were abolished, could only offer sacrifice in a far-away Jerusalem, too far to visit except rarely, on the great Festivals. Now we have yet to learn the ABC of Judaism, if we fancy that a Jew could be satisfied with such means of grace as his one or two or even three annual services provided at the Temple. The ordinary Jew was far more "athirst after God" than are we Englishmen to-day. The abolition of local sacrifices robbed him of one means of grace, only to give him another and more spiritual means of access to God.² It created

¹ Wellhausen writes: "The one Sanctuary naturally flows from the idea of one God only," and, in a sense, a multiplicity of sanctuaries was *in olden times* all but incompatible with strict monotheism. Just as the localising of Baal had made the Canaan-god to be split up into several independent deities, *e.g.* Baal-Peor, Baal-Hermon, so was it likely that the localising of Jehovah at *e.g.* Dan, Bethel, Gilgal, Beersheba, with their distinctive traditions, rites, etc., might result in His becoming as purely a local Jehovah as the *baals* He replaced (as happens to the Virgin and the Saints in Roman Catholic countries).

² Of course, a sacramental religion (*e.g.* Temple) can be deeply spiritual, and the "ministry of the Word" (*e.g.* synagogue) may be very legal.

the synagogue with its edifying service of prayer, praise, and the Ministry of the Word. In this way Deuteronomy, with its centralisation of worship, far from fostering Pharisaic legalism, promoted spirituality and encouraged the very spirit which the prophets sought to inculcate, the conception of a Jehovah not to be bribed with gifts, but to be worshipped in spirit and in truth.

(2) *Concentration of sacrificial power in priests' hands.*—Its critics maintain that Deuteronomy gives priests alone the right to “stand before the Lord, minister to Him, bless in His name,” that is, they become the sole mediators between God and man. Undoubtedly, Deuteronomy does give priests the sole right to minister at the altar. Moreover, it frames rules respecting the ritual of sacrifice and Temple-worship, as well as food and objects clean and unclean, and any breach of these ceremonial rules is branded, in a way that would certainly startle Isaiah, as a sin against God’s “holiness.” Here we undoubtedly see the hand of the priest.

Here again, in theory Deuteronomy should have resulted in a priestly and sacrificial Judaism; as a matter of fact, it worked out differently. The direct effect of Deuteronomy’s centralisation of worship in Jerusalem, and its monopoly of the altar for the priests, was to create the synagogue and a form of worship needing no priest. Indeed, even if a priest was present in the synagogue, the only part of the service reserved for him was the benediction at the end of the service; laymen could do all the rest as well as he. Thus Deuteronomy tended to supplant the priest by the Teacher and Rabbi, held in higher esteem. As Montefiore says: “Judaism knows no mediator between man and God.”

(3) *Translation of prophetic principles into set rules.*—Its critics maintain that a prophetic Deuteronomy dealt prophecy its death-blow by turning its principles into dogmas. The prophets’ one aim was to

base conduct, not on outward rules, but on inner principles, as Deut. xxx. 11-15 urges: "This commandment which I command thee this day is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off . . . but the word is very nigh thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart that thou mayest do it," etc. Such principles hold good always and everywhere, while rules are rigid and, as Christ shows of strict Sabbath-observance, constantly contradict the spirit of the very principle that gave them birth. Deuteronomy, says its critics, set a bad precedent in this matter. In its zeal to reform a heathenish cultus, it gave a body of hard-and-fast rules on Temple-worship and ritual, with minute details as to times, places, materials, and so on. Moreover, from the moment of its becoming the "Book of the Law" which Israel solemnly pledged itself to obey as the law of the land, its principles and rules alike became fixed and legalised. *The Book of the Law in its letter* was henceforth regarded as the sum total of all that could be said in theology, morals, or worship. Scribes took this Book of the Law and soon translated it into the Priestly Code, thus sapping prophetic religion.

Prophetic principles and prophetic religion were dealt their death-blow, forsooth, through Books of the Law! Is there, in all the Old Testament, a more prophetic or spiritual book than the Psalter? Yet practically nine-tenths of it was written between 550-150 B.C. by Jews *living under the Law*. We shall say no more here; we deal fully with this very question later on in our estimate of the Priestly Code.

To sum up, "Deuteronomy and Pharisaism were born the same day" is no more and no less true than "The Reformed Anglican Prayer-Book and Ritualism were born the same day." A special pleader can easily make out a strong case for either brief. There is a ritual and sacramental element in Deut., as in our Prayer-Book, because it is an essential factor of religion, and both books set it before us pure and in

harmony and proportion. In one sense Deuteronomy dealt prophecy its death-blow; the prophets are progressive religious reformers, their function and power lie in attack of abuses; reform these abuses, and their occupation is gone.¹ The reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah, as formulated in Deut., removed the abuses the prophets had denounced, and so the Book of the Law superseded the voice of prophecy. As a prophet, Jeremiah's quarrel is not with Deut.,² he long advocated it, but with the superficial, skin-deep character of the reform itself.

JEREMIAH (625-586 B.C.)

Under Josiah (621) the prophets' reforms were carried out, local shrines abolished, images and all heathenish practices banned, all worship centralised in Jerusalem. Israel was solemnly pledged to obey God's Law, a righteous Josiah was king. Prophets and Book of the Law alike had promised a Golden Age of peace, prosperity, and joy as the immediate result of obedience to God's Law. Surely then, this glorious Messianic Age must now dawn. Yet what actually happens? Josiah, now confident of a gratified Jehovah's favour, faces Egypt at Megiddo, and is badly beaten and killed! Judah is now Egypt's vassal at Egypt's beck and call for its very kings. Josiah's son is a prisoner in chains, and an Egyptian nominee usurps the throne. Egypt in its turn meets with a

¹ Other reasons for the practical cessation of prophecy after Jeremiah were: (1) Amos, Hos., Is., Jer. had said all that could be said, and their writings were in everyone's hands; (2) With the fall of the State, the prophets' occupation as reformers of the nation was gone. With Israel a Church, they naturally become rather theologians, and there is no more "open vision"; the Church's mission is to spread the knowledge of God and prepare the way for the coming of the Kingdom predicted by the prophets. All interest now centres on the how and when of the coming of the Kingdom; *i.e.* (3) Prophecy becomes apocalyptic.

² Of course, as stated earlier in the text, the priestly hand is visible in Deut. in the ritual and sacramental sections. In one sense Deut. is unique, for prophet and priest worked together for once in its composition harmoniously. Thus it is a blend of conservative and progressive elements. According to our own outlook we can either call this the perfect ideal, or label it a weak compromise and half-measure, and therefore bound to fail.

crushing defeat at Babylon's hands at Carchemish (605), and Judah has a new overlord, Babylon.

What of the prophets' promise of a Golden Age to a righteous Israel? Their lot is worse than ever! Were all Deuteronomy's promises empty words? Israel was bitterly perplexed and disappointed. One of two things: the reform was on wrong lines, or it had not gone far enough. Convinced that the Reformation was wrong, many went back penitently to the religion of their fathers, and high-places sprung up again all over the land; the majority, led by the priests, were equally convinced that their present disasters were God's call to complete their reform by redoubling the sacrifices and paying more attention to correct ritual.

Then it was that Jeremiah came on the scene with *his* answer. The Deuteronomy-reform took place only five years after his first appearance as prophet. At first, as Jer. xi. shows, he was clearly impressed by Deuteronomy's high moral tone, its denunciations of images, its banning of all heathenish practices, and he advocated it strongly. But he soon ceased to cherish any illusions as to the Josiah-reform. He sees its superficial character; he sees, too, the futility of trying to produce a change of heart by a change of organisation engineered by the State. He even hints that the Book of the Law is so much waste paper (viii. 8). Moral reformation has not gone hand in hand with ritual reforms. Outwardly man's service of God has changed, at heart not at all. The same old evils are all there: the same old idea of Jehovah as Israel's tribal God, the same faith in the magic power of sacrifice and ritual irrespective of a right moral life; it is the vanity and pure idolatry of the old external ceremonial religionism all over again. On one point Jeremiah sees eye to eye with the priests: The reform has not gone far enough,—but there he parts company with them. They say: It wants far more of the ritual and sacrificial element, if

it is to satisfy Jehovah. Jeremiah replies: No! but it wants far more repentance and real change of heart; that is what Jehovah demands, and nothing else will satisfy Him.

Jeremiah's one complaint against Israel is exactly that of Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah before him:—Israel will not understand what the true service of Jehovah means, because their whole conception of His character is at fault. They are so steeped in the worship of Baals that they liken Jehovah to Baal. The Jews tell him to his face that this is a lie; and that, at any rate, if it was once true, they have now set that right by their Reformation. Jeremiah retorts: "How canst thou say, I have not gone after Baalim" (ii. 23), or, if I did once, that sin is now laid aside? (ii. 35). The whole of your idea of Jehovah as *your* tribal God, whose fortunes are linked with yours, is Canaan's idea of Baal all over again; so is your belief in the magical efficacy of ritual and sacrifices. No wonder your character and conduct are as bad as can be, when you liken Jehovah to a Baal whose sacrificial worship goes hand in hand with foul lives, ribald laughter, debauchery, and all manner of heathenish sins and idolatry. Naturally, with such an idea of God, you fancy that you can serve Jehovah and your own lusts at the same time, if only you take care to give God His Temple-dues! What does God care for sacrifices? "Thus saith the Lord, . . . I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices; but this thing I commanded them, saying, Harken unto My voice, and I will be your God and ye shall be My people; and walk ye in all the ways that I command you, that it may be well with you" (vii. 22 sq.). You speak of your Reformation and your Book of the Law! Your Book is the work of a false scribe, and your Reformation a snare: "How do ye say, We are wise, and the law of the Lord is with us? But, behold, the false pen of the

scribes hath wrought falsely" (viii. 8, R.V.). Your Reformation! it is your old creed all over again. You are casting the new seed into the old foul furrows. You must plough deeper than that, right down to the virgin-soil of the heart. "Break up your fallow ground, and sow not among thorns; circumcise the foreskins of your hearts, ye men of Judah and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem" (iv. 3 sq.). Well says Jehovah of your religion: "They have forsaken Me, the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water" (ii. 13). And your Temple! very proud of it you are now that it is the one place of worship in the land, Jehovah's one home! "Hear the word of the Lord," fulminates Jeremiah standing in the Temple-gate, "all ye of Judah that enter in at these gates to worship the Lord. Trust ye not in lying words, saying, The Temple of the Lord, The Temple of the Lord, The Temple of the Lord, are these. . . . Will ye steal, murder, commit adultery, swear falsely, burn incense unto Baal, walk after other gods, and come and stand before Me in this house, which is called by My Name, and say, We are delivered to do all these abominations? Is this house, called by My Name, become a den of robbers in your eyes? . . . Therefore will I do unto this house as I have done to Shiloh; and I will cast you out of My sight as I have cast out all your brethren, even the whole seed of Ephraim" (vii. 1-15; cf. xxvi.).

Clearly, whatever hopes he may have entertained of the Reformation and its Book of the Law at first, Jeremiah soon saw that the vaunted reform had only cleansed the outside of the cup and platter; and, what was far worse, men's consciences were so well satisfied with this outward polish that they never dreamed of looking within.

Denunciation of sham and wrong was a main part of Jeremiah's arduous mission, but he will ever be best known as the founder of personal religion, or,

rather, its first great apostle.¹ Up to now in the Old Testament (p. 157 *sup.*), religion had not been realised as a relationship between God and the individual soul. Jeremiah is the first to show God as dealing with men one by one, and not merely in their family, clan, or nation. "After those days, saith the Lord, I will put My law in their inward parts and write it in their hearts, and they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know Me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord" (xxxii. 33 sq.). "In those days they shall say no more, The fathers have eaten a sour grape and the children's teeth are set on edge. But every man shall die for his own iniquity; every man that eateth the sour grape, his teeth shall be set on edge" (29 sqq.). From the Captivity onward, the great question is the problem of personal religion, and this new outlook soon has far-reaching results. We shall soon see a "Job," psalmist, and Ecclesiastes alike asking: "How can we reconcile a belief in a righteous God's moral rule of His world with actual human experience? Why do the righteous go to the wall and the wicked flourish? How justify the ways of God in His dealings with individual men?"

Jeremiah's new revelation will not only suggest answers to this problem, but go far beyond this and eventually rob Death of his sting and the grave of her victory. Face to face with the problem of the righteous begging their bread and knaves on thrones, one answer after another will awhile be current, e.g. "Virtue and prosperity do go hand in hand; adversity means sin in self or parents"; or, "suffering is essential to beauty of character and has its rich reward in

¹ As already hinted, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah were all along labouring towards this religious individualism. Their idea of religion as a matter of the heart and of inner conviction was one to which no national life really can conform. By its very definition, heart-religion involves a moral personality. Isaiah half realises this when he narrows down the religious element in the nation to a mere "remnant" or "holy seed." (Cf. I Sam. i. 10 sqq. = individual prayer.) But not till Jeremiah is this logically driven home, and only when the nation no longer exists, in the Captivity.

this life"; or, "true blessedness is of the heart and independent of material good things." But men will not long be put off with half-answers. If men are to be rescued from the pessimism of an Ecclesiastes, there can be but one answer, and Jeremiah's discovery suggests it. The universal instinct pointing to survival after death, even in Sheol, is true; man's life-story does not end on this side of the grave, only the first chapter of it. The righteous man's communion with God is too close to be broken by death: "I am continually with Thee; Thou hast holden my right hand; Thou shalt guide me with Thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory" (Ps. lxxiii. 23 sq.).

From the moment that religion became personal, a belief in an actual life of fellowship with God beyond the grave was bound to be the outcome of it, sooner or later. Not till long after Jeremiah, and only to a very few at first, did this idea suggest itself, and, at the outset, merely in the form of an aspiration. As stated at the end of the last chapter, till about 300 B.C. the one future hope of Israel was the Messianic Kingdom here on earth. God would again visit and redeem His people; Israel would once more be a great nation far exceeding in glory the splendour of David's and Solomon's days; God Himself would dwell in their midst as their King. But this Kingdom of God they expected on earth, not in heaven; in their nation and descendants, not in themselves. From 300 B.C. onwards, a belief in individual resurrection began to dawn faintly; it was felt that the righteous dead must share in this Kingdom. But, as already stated (p. 162 *sup.*), we have only some half a dozen allusions to this resurrection-hope in the whole Old Testament, and we have to go to the apocalypses for its full history and picture.

CHAPTER XII

THE CAPTIVITY; EZEKIEL; II. ISAIAH

ISRAEL'S true Captivity dates from 586 B.C. Ezekiel reckons it from 597, and for this reason. In 598 Judah revolted from its Babylonian overlord, who invested Jerusalem in 597. Its boy-king Jehoiachin surrendered, and, with the noblest of the men of Judah, Ezekiel included, was deported to Babylonia. About 10,000 men and their families went into Captivity. But it was not till 586 B.C. that, after another revolt, Jerusalem was sacked, its Temple and best buildings burnt, its walls dismantled, and the Captivity proper began after a wholesale deportation of the inhabitants of Judah.

The picture of the earlier exiles of 597 in Babylonia is given us by Ezekiel and supplemented by Jer. xxix. They lived fairly comfortably there in a little colony of their own, enjoying comparative freedom. They watched eagerly the fortunes of Judah and Jerusalem, with which they were in constant communication, fully expecting a speedy restoration to their old place at the head of the Judæan State. "False prophets" amongst them predicted their speedy release and fanned their delusive hopes, though Jeremiah (from Jerusalem) and Ezekiel (in their midst) pronounced these optimistic prophets liars. Jer. xxix. comforts the exiles, bids them be patient, wisely urges them to build houses, plant their fields, and settle down quietly in their colony, for their release will come, but not for seventy years.

The fall of Jerusalem, the destruction of Jehovah's

Temple, the death of their nation, staggered the Jews and filled them with horror and despair. In spite of all prophetic warnings, not for one moment had they at heart believed that Jehovah ever could thus cast off His Israel. For 700 years, every Israelite had been born and bred in the conviction that Jehovah's union with Israel was closer than that of mother and child, husband and wife. The fall of Jerusalem and of the Temple, Jehovah's own City and House, stunned them one and all and threw them into the depths of hopelessness. Jehovah had done the impossible, cast off His people, cancelled His everlasting Covenant, smitten Israel to the dust in His divine anger. It was all over with the nation. Even if repentance was not now too late,—it clearly was,—how could they possibly show their penitence, cut off as they were from all access to God? They were far away from Jehovah's land¹ where He dwelt, away from His Holy City and His House where alone sacrifice and worship could be offered to Him (Deut. xii.). They were literally under a vast Interdict. In a strange and "unclean" heathen land, how could they possibly approach Jehovah or worship Him as required by His Book of the Law which they had sworn to obey? They could not celebrate any sacrifice, keep any holy Feast, hold any ritual services; by God's own order, these were absolutely tied down to the Holy City and its Temple. Hence the heart-cry of Ps. cxxxvii: "By the waters of Babylon we sat down and wept, when we remembered thee, O Sion."

Then it was that a Jeremiah and an Ezekiel cheered them with bracing words of comfort and hope. Hitherto, their one theme had been denunciations and woes, the downfall of Jerusalem and nation. Now that God has set His seal to their words and made them true, they strike quite a new note. They

¹ Ezek. xi. 15: Ye are "far from the Lord," say the inhabitants left in Jerusalem to the exiles.

bend all their energies to brace the crushed and bleeding hearts of the people with the assurance of a new and glorious Israel soon to rise from the ashes of the old. Even a Jeremiah is optimistic now; but he is far away. Ezekiel is with them, and how they rally round him and treasure his comforting words in their hearts! A few years later, more welcome and inspiring than either is II. Isaiah with his "Away with sorrow, comfort ye My people. I shall deliver you, build up My Jerusalem, lay the foundations of My Temple. Can a woman forget her sucking child? Yea, she may forget, yet will I not forget thee, my Israel."

The fiery ordeal of 586 was terrific for Israel, and it sifted the chaff from the wheat. Voicing the popular creed of that day, some exclaimed: "Bel has beaten Jehovah," and apostatised. Others, equally puzzled and stunned by the paralysing shock, stopped short of apostasy, but murmured bitterly. Others, again, saw in it a punishment for sin, but their fathers', not their own: "Our fathers have sinned and are not, and as for us, we bear their iniquities," and they, too, murmured. Some cleaved to God through it all as never before. The more godly among them, "the righteous," "the poor and humbled ones," saw that a Righteous Jehovah could do no other than He had done. With shame and sorrow of heart, they turned to the God of their fathers, firmly resolved to cleave to Him and obey His law. Probably this "holy seed" of the future Israel formed but a remnant of the Jewish exiles, but they were in dead earnest.

Cut off from sacrificial services,—a deprivation as awful then as would be the total abolition of Holy Communion to-day,—all the more assiduously did pious Jews devote themselves to such religious duties as were still open to them, *e.g.* prayer, Bible-study, fasts, and penitence. Now it was, too, that Sabbath observance and the rite of circumcision acquired an exceptional importance as distinctive marks differ-

entiating Jews from all others. The meetings for Bible-study, prayer, and mutual edification, out of which synagogue-services afterwards arose, also first came into vogue during this period. Possibly the books of the prophets,—so real to them now,—were read at the services ; but the Book of the Law stood first and foremost by far. From Ezekiel's day onward, it was the bed-rock foundation of Israel's religion.

The most striking feature of the Exile is the vast stride in Israel's religious growth during these 70 years of trial and suspense. In religious thought and production it was a period of healthy and prolific activity. In 586 B.C. strange and crude was the medley of popular beliefs and superstitions prevalent among the exiles. Jeremiah and Ezekiel give us some notion of it. Stunned by Israel's Fall men asked: Is Jehovah beaten by Bel? Can Jehovah avail us in Bel's land? Whence God's awful wrath? Our fathers' sins or our own? If our own, why? Our ruin ran on the heels of our Reform; was it to blame? Were our fathers' high-places and many sacrifices more pleasing to Jehovah, and is He angry for our giving them up? Yet Moses' Book of the Law (Deut.) is God's own Word. Have we not obeyed it aright? Which have we neglected, its ritual *or* its moral laws?

Each of these divergent views had its advocates. We must remember how very recently these exiles had been weaned from their superstitious creeds and practices. Many were still wedded to them; most, if not all, viewed Jehovah as God only in His own land. Such was the unpromising material that Israel's spiritual leaders had to cope with and correct. In 60 years, they stamped out these false ideas and gave Israel a more or less coherent creed. Fully coherent and consistent Judaism never was. As repeatedly stated, the organic sense is weak in Jews, and they constantly hang inconsistent pictures side by side. To the end Judaism, more concerned with heart than head, practice than knowledge, never had

a logically systematic theology. Its creed was ever simple, childlike, many-sided, inconsistent; but for that very reason, it met admirably the equally simple and incoherent needs of ordinary men; it proved itself a creed not only admirably suited to the everyday moralities of the common life of all sorts and conditions of men, but also capable of evoking heroic endurance and self-sacrifice. Its many-sidedness reflects the many-sidedness of the Bible on which it is wholly based. A pious Israelite of Ezra's day and after could mould his life on the Priestly Code, yes, *and* on prophetic Deuteronomy, and Genesis, and "the Prophets."

True, the Priestly Code had not been enacted in 580, but it was in practice even then all the same. Many of its rites and traditions were in use long before their codification, well-known and in constant practice. Since 621, Deuteronomy with its prophetic ideals was also the law of the land. During the Captivity, both these religious schools of thought, the priestly and the prophetic, were largely developed, and they gradually converged towards each other (*e.g.* Malachi), though they never actually formed one organic whole. Hence, from 586, a twofold character is stamped on Israel's religion and literature. We have a legal school, *e.g.* Ezek., Haggai, Zech., Priestly Code, Chron., and a prophetic (or ethical) school, *e.g.* Job, Eccl., Proverbs. The Psalter is their ideal blend.

The Captivity also produced scribes—originally priests, later not necessarily or generally priests—men who devoted their lives to the preserving, copying, editing, and interpreting of the Scriptures, especially the Law. Ezra is the first scribe mentioned by name. The Priestly Code and Chronicles are their work, but there were prophetic or Deuteronomic scribes as well. After the Captivity, Israel's spiritual leaders were conservative and reflective, rather than creative. There is less "open vision," they rather drive home old truths.

EZEKIEL.

Ezekiel's prophetic career covers the years 592-570 B.C. He was one of the Temple-priests who shared Jehoiachin's exile in 597. He is a particularly interesting figure, the link between prophet and priest, a blend of both. As prophet he is keenly alive to the power of the spoken Word for man's conversion and, even more than Jeremiah, sees in religion an inner relationship between God and the individual soul (xviii.). But if he is a preacher of righteousness, still more is he a priest. His real claim to greatness is as the creator of the Church-State with its Priestly Code. His ideal, embodied in his Vision (xl.-xlviii.), was the model on which the Jewish Church-State was formed. What Augustine's "City of God" was to the Catholic Church, that the "Vision" of Ezekiel was to post-exilic Judaism.

Ezekiel's mission falls of itself into two distinct periods.¹ From 592-586 B.C., he is the stern prophet, rebuking sin, predicting a Judah's Fall and Captivity, expected by none but Jeremiah and himself. From 586-570 he is the consoler and organiser; he becomes the exiles' "pastor," their comforter and teacher, bracing and inspiring them for the brighter era he foresees in store for God's people. In his Vision he has before his mind's eye the whole organisation of the new Church-State that is to be, even to minute details, and ardently looks forward to Israel's Return and its new Temple.

Hardly any other "man of God" is so hard to define as Ezekiel. The most divergent estimates have been formed of him, *e.g.* "a priest in prophet's clothing"; "a creative genius, the last of the prophets and one of the greatest"; "no prophet at all, merely a pastor exercising the cure of souls, a spiritual

¹ These two periods sharply divide the book of Ezekiel. Up to Ezek. xxiv. he combats delusion; from xxxii. 21 he combats despair; in between comes the group of prophecies against foreign nations (xxv.-xxxii.).

director and a dreamer"; "the first of great theological thinkers, and the most influential religious personality since Moses." Each of these seems an exaggeration and a half-truth.

Ezekiel's position and environment made it next to impossible for him to be a prophet in the old true sense.¹ Prophets were national reformers, while even in 592 Ezekiel is quite isolated from the main current of national life. From the first day of his preaching, his only audience is a small colony of exiles, and he himself has been six years away from Judah. Memories of Israel's past, hearsay of its present, hopes for its future, are all he has to go upon. While professedly addressing a handful of exiles as his actual audience, in and through them he sees, in his mind's eye, an ideal Israel of the future. This imaginary Israel he mainly addresses. Picture an Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, or Jeremiah in their study thus addressing an imaginary audience and framing a constitution for an imaginary Israel! In a word, in Ezekiel, the prophet's living spoken word has largely given place to the literary activity of the reflective and creative theologian. Hence the true remark: "Ezekiel the prophet takes for granted the moral truths of his predecessors, but gives them more definite and almost dogmatic expression, combining them into a theological organic whole." Thus Ezek. i.-xxxix. has hardly a single element not traceable to the earlier prophets, while he borrows their catalogue of Israel's vices. Even his famous chapter xviii., on personal religion and responsibility, is but Jer. xxxi. 29, 30 logically driven home and with more distinct intellectual expression. The one feature peculiar to Ezekiel the priest-prophet is his stress on ceremonial holiness, *e.g.* his emphasis on the sin of

¹ Mr. Montefiore criticises this picture of Ezekiel, whom he greatly admires. In dealing with the Prophets and "Holy Writings" I have steeped myself in the Bible-text at first hand, purposely avoiding commentaries, and simply state my total impression. This method has the defects of its qualities.

Sabbath-breaking and other violations of the ritual law, even as Ezek. xxxiii. 25 brands the eating of flesh with the blood as a heinous sin. Sins of ritual are once more placed on a level with moral sins¹ and called "a contempt of sacred things."

For reasons already given (p. 175 *sup.*), prophecy virtually dies out with Jeremiah. The mission of Ezekiel and other "men of God" henceforth is to train the people, fit them to be God's Israel on their return home, prepare the new Israel for its divine mission to mankind. Prophecy virtually becomes pastoral Church-work. Ezekiel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi have little of the old prophetic fire. They are earnest theologians rather than prophets. Of course, II. Isaiah is a brilliant exception. Ezekiel's conception of God is at once grand yet narrow. God is the all-holy and almighty Ruler of the universe, exalting or humbling whom He will. In all He does, His guiding motive is the glory of His Name: "They shall know that I am God" (cf. esp. xxxvi. 22 sq.; xxxviii. 23). But, side by side, Ezekiel gives us another picture of Jehovah which rises but little above the old tribal God who cares only for His own people. He is essentially Israel's God, dwells in Israel's land (xxxvii. 26 sq.), and the Temple is His House (x.). The honour of Jehovah demands Israel's restoration to its own land, lest other nations should think meanly of Israel's God. The sin of other nations is their hostility to Israel; they are Israel's and God's wicked foes. Ezekiel's God also lays much stress on ritual. Ezekiel's idea of God has been well described as "Isaiah's conception of the thrice-holy One sacerdotalised."

Ezekiel's Code of Holiness.—In the form of a Vision, Ezek. xl.-xlviii. gives us a sketch of the new Sanctuary and its worship as it is to be on Israel's

¹ Ezek. xxxvi. 26 sq., shows that Ezekiel was alive to the moral factor, so does his famous ch. xviii.; but at heart a priest he was, and priestly his aims. Throughout Ezek., not the prophet, but the priest with an eye to right cultus, speaks; cf. his idea of "holiness" with the prophetic.

return to their land. Ezekiel's programme is noteworthy, for it was largely carried out a few years later in the Priestly Code of Holiness. The root-idea is that God is, above all else, Holy, and His people must be holy too. But "holy" is now used in its priestly sense of "aloof from what is ceremonially unclean." Thus a corpse is "unclean," so are certain foods and any food prepared by a Gentile; and to touch unclean things debar a man from coming near a "holy" God or His belongings, till the man is ceremonially cleansed (cf. "Early Man's Creed," p. 59 *sup.*). Moreover, all that in any way belongs to a Holy God is itself "holy." It must not be touched or used for any common purpose; it is *taboo* (p. 61 *sup.*). These two ideas,—(1) everything "common or unclean" defiles the "holiness" of God, and (2) everything set apart for God is "holy," *taboo*,—are the basis and key both of Ezekiel's Code and the Priestly Code of Holiness. This alone explains why both place moral and ritual offences exactly on the same level; and from their standpoint they *are* on a level, for this reason. Anything that defiles the "holiness" of God calls down instantly God's anger and imperils the whole nation; the least contact of what is "common or unclean" with what is "holy" is a dire offence to God; therefore neglect of any ceremonial rule, even if wholly unintentional,¹ is as defiling a sin as any moral sin and deserves death. Similarly of (2), "everything that belongs to God is 'holy' and must on no account be used for any common purpose"; then what of the land of Israel, for it is Jehovah's land, Holy Land? How then can its ground or produce be used for the common purposes of daily life? Now it is precisely to safeguard the new Israel from sins against God's "holiness," in

¹ *E.g.* in 2 Sam. vi. 6 sq., Uzzah had no intention whatever of defiling the Ark when he seized it to save a fall; none the less his "unclean" hands *had* touched and defiled God's "holiness." So far as actual results go, God's "holiness" is equally defiled whether it be done intentionally or unintentionally. Sacrifice covered ceremonial, *not* wilful moral, sin.

either of the two ways just discussed, that Ezekiel formulates His Code of Holiness :—

(a) All the Holy Land is Jehovah's and therefore "holy." But if His Temple, its sacred precincts, and the quarters set apart for its priests and Levites, are marked off as uniquely "holy" and set apart for Jehovah's sole use, then the rest of the land is pure in His sight and He gives the full enjoyment of it to His holy people. Jerusalem, as Jehovah's home, is to be called "Jehovah is there."

(b) The plan of the Temple is minutely given. Moreover, "the form of the House, and the fashion thereof, and the goings in and the comings out thereof, and all the forms and ordinances and laws thereof," as given to Ezekiel by God, are declared to be vitally important. Scrupulous attention to them is of the essence of Israel's religion. The Glory of the returning Jehovah fills the Temple. Henceforth He dwells there in the midst of His people in visible Glory.

(c) Only those priests of Levi who are sons of Zadok (*i.e.* the hereditary Jerusalem priesthood) are to be regarded as priests. The other Levites, who officiated at "high-places," are to "bear their iniquity" and be degraded to menial offices in the Temple. Besides their true sacrificial work, the priests "shall teach My people the difference between the holy and the profane, the clean and the unclean." Levitical purity is to be emphasised.

(d) Immense stress is laid on the strictest attention to the precepts regulating all details of worship, *e.g.* the ritual of the consecration of the Altar, the materials and fixed times of sacrifices, the treatment of the sacrificial flesh, the priests' cells, the measures and weights to be used in the cultus.

(e) Festivals are to be no longer agricultural Feasts as of old, but exactly-dated Church-Festivals pure and simple. Thus at the beginning of each half-year there is to be a day of atonement, not for a penitent people's sins, but an atonement of the Sanctuary to purify it of any "uncleanness" contracted through error or ignorance.

(f) Ezekiel has no place for a king in his Church-State, only for a colourless prince with very limited functions. True to the historical tradition of centuries, he retains a political head, but only as a figure-head whose duty is to guarantee the regular performance of Temple-worship, and safeguard the new priestly

constitution. He receives certain privileges and dues, but his own duties are very strictly defined.

Very clear in all this is the priestly character of Ezekiel's programme. A creative theologian and original thinker, his whole tone is that of one who himself belonged to the governing Sacerdotal body. A Jerusalem Temple-priest, he was educated in the priests' training college and taught its Torah.¹ The Book of the Law (Deut.) and Jeremiah's teaching he also knew well. The Book of the Law gave him his cue for his Code of Holiness, Jeremiah suggested the lines of his moral teaching. Ezekiel's own code stands half-way between Deuteronomy and the Priestly Code.

Did Ezekiel expect the fulfilment of his programme? Yes and No. Of course, a portion of it is only pregnant symbolism with deep underlying ideas of obvious meaning and easy practical application. For instance, the Holy Hill of Sion is to be turned into a "very high mountain," and a spring of "waters" is to issue from under the threshold of the Temple," cleanse the land, and purify by its life-giving waters that blot on the Holy Land, the Dead Sea. The Holy City is to be spiritually *and geographically* the heart of the Holy Land, with Jordan as Israel's east boundary, for the country east of it is too heathenised to be included in the Holy Land itself. Five tribes, now including Zebulun, Issachar, and Gad, dwell south of the Holy City, the others north of it. This is all clearly symbolical. But elsewhere Ezekiel was in deadly earnest. His expectations were fulfilled, but with modifications. Before the Return, other priestly circles entered into Ezekiel's labours, and bodily transferred the main ideas of his Vision to the Priestly Code which gave Judaism its final stamp.

¹ *Torah* (p. 107, and n. *sup.*): Priests acted as judges in matters of purity and ceremonial and disputes that "came before God." Their oral teaching and decisions in matters ritual and moral were preserved and became a kind of "custom law."

II. ISAIAH.

This "Great Unknown," the Second Isaiah, is a genius of the first order, and by far the profoundest of the prophets in his monotheistic revelation of God, his enlightened universalism, and his vindication of God's ways by the light of actual history. In him, the barriers of a local Jewish religion are completely broken down and the foundation laid for a universal world-wide religion. Henceforth God's salvation has for its objective the whole world of nations. Israel is God's chosen people, only because through it Jehovah wills to accomplish the salvation of all mankind (xlii., xlix.). Israel is Jehovah's "Servant," who, in accordance with His divine purpose, is to expiate through its fidelity, through its very sufferings, not only its own guilt, but that of the heathen nations as well (l.-liii.). God is already calling to all the ends of the earth to turn to Him and be saved, so that every knee shall bow to Him alone ; Israel His Servant is to be God's instrument in achieving this salvation.

It is the most profound revelation of the Old Testament, just as Is. xl.-lxvi. is its greatest puzzle. No one would any more dream of assigning Is. xl.-lxvi. to Isaiah (740-700 B.C.) to-day than of ascribing Ps. cxxxvii., "By the waters of Babylon we sat down and wept," to David. But of the personality of the "Great Unknown" (or "unknowns,") we can form no sort of conception. Isaiah is as composite as the Pentateuch. To-day, scholars usually assign Is. xl-lv., certainly, to one author, II. Isaiah (550-538), who combines in this section a cycle of poems on the "Servant of Jehovah," and also the great prophecy of the Restoration. Some add lx.-lxii., but they lack II. Isaiah's spiritual breadth and depth.¹ Is. lvi.-lxvi.

¹ Dr. Burney writes me: "lx.-lxii. display little or no sense of moral Jewish shortcoming, and refer not at all to II. Isaiah's great ideal of Israel's divine mission to the world at large. True, in lx. the nations flock to Jerusalem to offer homage and gifts, but there is no allusion to their conversion to the true

is, as a rule, assigned to Nehemiah's day, and after ; lxiii. 7-lxiv. 11 is usually put down to c. 360 B.C.

To appreciate the lofty grandeur and depth of the Great Unknown, nothing but a long and close first-hand knowledge of Is. xl.-lv. will do. Here we merely glance at (1) his conception of God ; (2) his Suffering Servant of Jehovah ; (3) his Salvation of the nations ; ((2) and (3) can go together).

(1) *Conception of God.*—It appeals to our heart, imagination, reason ; it is so winsome, sublime, and altogether reasonable ; it is monotheism at its best and purest. It lies in the same line with the monotheism of Deut. and Jer., but goes beyond them : moreover, unlike the older prophets, it gives reasons for its creed.

There is one God, the Eternal, and beside Him there is no other. Creation and history alike prove His omnipotence, while His wisdom, power, and goodness are beyond our ken :—I am He ; before Me there was no god formed, neither shall there be after Me ; I am the Lord, there is none else ; I form the light, I create darkness ; I make peace, and create evil. I the Lord do all these things ; I created the heavens ; I formed the earth and made it (xlv.). He, the Maker of all men, controls the fortunes of the mightiest, and the nations before Him are but as a drop in the bucket or a speck of dust on the balance (xl.). " My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways My ways. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are My ways higher than your ways, and My thoughts than your thoughts " (lv. 8 sq.). Jehovah is holy and jealous of His honour : " I am the Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour " (xliii.). But it is a moral " holiness," without blemish, aloof from all that is morally unclean or degrading. He hates to be

religion or of the extension to them of the Jews' spiritual benefits. Fine as is lx., it is tinged with the arrogant Jewish exclusiveness marking post-exilic Judaism and far removed from II. Isaiah's evangelical spirit."

likened to a silly image made of metal or wood which "men bear upon the shoulder, carry and set him in his place and he standeth, cry unto him, yet can he not answer" (xlvi.);¹ "I am the Lord, that is My name, and My glory will I not give to another, neither My praise to graven images" (xlii.). The holiness of God demands that all His acts shall reflect His own character and honour: "For Mine own sake, even for Mine own sake, will I do it; for how should My name be polluted? and I will not give My glory to another" (xlviii.).

God is long-suffering and of great kindness, full of love and tender mercy: "Can a woman forget her sucking child? . . . Yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee. Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of My hands" (xlix.). "God shall feed His flock like a shepherd, He shall gather the lambs with His arm and carry them in His bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young" (xl.). "Fear not, for I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by thy name; thou art Mine. When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee" (xliii.). "I have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions, and, as a cloud, thy sins; for I have redeemed thee; thou shalt not be forgotten of Me" (xliv.). "Comfort ye, comfort ye, My people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned" (xl.).

God loves the nations for their own sake and embraces them all in His loving salvation: "Look unto Me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by Myself, the word is gone out of My mouth in righteousness and shall not return, that unto Me every knee shall bow" (xliv. 22).

¹ It is a crusade, not against the worship of heathen gods, but against their existence at all. He loves to take his readers to an image-maker's shop to see how a god is made, e.g. see xliv. 9-20.

Even as Creation reveals God: "Lift up your eyes on high and behold: Who hath created these things?" (xl.); so is History His handwriting. Israel's own history clearly shows it: "Remember ye not the former things?" "Ye are My witnesses" (xliii., xlvi.). The fulfilment of prophecy reveals God; He can predict because He foreordains and brings to pass. History is the unfolding of God's plan from the beginning, which He reveals by chapters to His servants the prophets (xli. 25 sqq.; xlii. 9; xliv. 26; xlv. 21; xlvi. 10; xlviii. 3 sqq.). In history's open page the prophets foresaw the coming Captivity, and in Assyria and Babylon God's rods. But they also foresaw in it Israel's restoration. It is at hand now. Babylon is about to fall, Israel to be delivered; Cyrus, now at Babylon's gate, is Jehovah's Deliverer of His people by divine commission: "I am the Lord that saith unto Cyrus, he is My shepherd and shall perform all My pleasure. . . . Thus saith the Lord to His anointed (= Messiah), to Cyrus, whose right hand I have strengthened to subdue nations before him" (xlv.). Cyrus is God's servant to redeem Israel; "For Israel Mine elect, I have even called thee by name; I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known Me" (xlv. 4). "I have raised him up in righteousness; I will direct all his ways; he shall build My city and he shall let go My captives, not for price nor reward" (xlv. 13).

(2) *Israel Jehovah's Suffering Servant.*—Cyrus, in whom the power of the world is thus gathered up, is Jehovah's servant, but for Israel's sake and for Israel's redemption: "For Jacob My servant's sake, and for Israel Mine elect" (xlv. 4). In a far higher sense than Cyrus is Israel Jehovah's elect Servant. This "election" is an election to service, the service of mankind in the highest interests of morality and religion: "I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be My salvation to the end of the earth" (xlix. 6); "for a light to the Gentiles,

to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison-house" (xlii. 7).¹

Israel's call was for this express purpose of being God's Missionary to the ends of the earth, "a light to the Gentiles," and Israel's grievous sufferings were the indispensable condition of the world's salvation: "Listen, O Isles, the Lord hath called me from the womb . . . and said unto me, Thou art My Servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified . . . I will give thee for a light to the Gentiles" (xlix.). God has put His Spirit upon Israel His Servant: "My servant, Mine elect in whom My soul delighteth. I have put My Spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles; he shall not cry nor lift up his voice; a bruised reed shall he not break; he shall not fail nor be discouraged till he have set judgment in the earth, and the isles shall wait for his law . . . I, the Lord, have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand and give thee for a light to the Gentiles" (xlii.). But Israel, Jehovah's Servant, must first be made "perfect through suffering." The righteous "remnant's" patient submission to all manner of ill-treatment and mockery is the decisive influence in the work of salvation. Thus alone can it leaven the mass of the nation and convert the world: "I gave my back to the smiters and my cheeks to them that

¹ "Salvation is of the Jews" implies no favouritism on God's part, neither does "election." Salvation is of every race. God is no respecter of persons or races, and is known to all (Mal. i. 11). He is the "Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world." But as with individuals, so with nations. Partly owing to environment, still more to personal "genius," their gifts and functions differ, and, as in the physical body so in the Body of Humanity, the gifts and functions of the various members are all wanted for the good of the whole. Thus one member, Greece, developed an inborn genius for thought and beauty, so she is "elected" to teach mankind art, letters, philosophy. Rome's "election" was for law, organisation, government. The Anglo-Saxon race is "called" of God with a mission to teach man honour, truthfulness, freedom, respect for woman, chivalry. Hebrew genius was for religion, and mainly through Israel have come the idea of One righteous God, the idea of sin, of holiness, righteousness, forgiveness, the idea of duties as higher than rights, and of self-sacrifice as above self-seeking, *i.e.* "Salvation is of the Jews."

plucked off the hair; I hid not my face from shame and spitting" (l. 6). To their amazement it dawns upon the nations and their rulers that Israel, Jehovah's Suffering Servant, "marred more than any man," despised, rejected, full of sorrows, stricken and smitten of God,—as they fancied,—yet never crying or lifting up his voice, was all along bearing the sins of others, atoning for their sins, their saviour.

Throughout Is. xl.-lv. the Great Unknown unfolds to his readers the depths of God's eternal plan of salvation. God has chosen Israel, given His Servant the knowledge of the one true God, but only as His trustee to pass it on to others. From the day of Israel's first call there has ever been, even in sinful Israel, a godly kernel of good men, a "holy seed," a righteous few. These have been the salt of Israel, the leaven leavening its whole lump, the saviours of mankind, the true Israel, God's elect Servant. Upon this true Israel God's Spirit has ever been. It is "glorious in God's eyes and God is their strength," so that, even standing alone against the whole world, it must prevail: "neither be thou confounded, for thou shalt not be put to shame" (liv. 4). This true Israel is despised and oppressed both by Jews at home and Gentiles abroad, apparently God-smitten and God-forsaken, put in prison and cut off, as it were, from the land of the living by having to dwell in a strange land, and often hounded to death. Yet Israel, the Servant of God, comes out more than conqueror, lives on, prolongs his days, sees his seed, sees of the travail of his soul and is satisfied. By his knowledge of the one true God, by loyalty to his trust, by acting up to his divine mission of "a light to the Gentiles," by his very sufferings and their vicarious atoning power, this true Israel, God's elect Servant, accomplishes in his own person the ideal functions God had meant for the whole Chosen People. He "justifies many, bears their iniquities, makes intercession for the transgressors." He is the

High Priest and Saviour of the rest of Israel and of mankind.

Instinctively the Christian heart has ever turned to this wondrously beautiful and lovable portrait of the Righteous Suffering Servant as a prophecy of the Christ. It contributes more elements, and these of the profoundest kind, to the Christological ideal realised in our Lord than all the rest of the Old Testament figures put together. We can give it to-day, and rightly give it, a Messianic interpretation. But we must not go beyond this and say that the Great Unknown himself had a clear vision of the Christ 550 years before He came.¹

¹ Cf. p. 312 footnote on Is. vii. 14 *sub fin.*

CHAPTER XIII

THE RETURN FROM EXILE ; THE PRIESTLY CODE

II. ISAIAH had looked up to Cyrus, God's "servant," "shepherd," and "anointed," to free the Jews from Captivity and rebuild the City. So it proved. Cyrus' imperial policy, like our own, respected the religious views of subject races. In an extant cylinder-inscription, Cyrus states that he was called by the god Marduk to a mission of humanity.—"He (Marduk) showed compassion upon all lands together. He looked for, He found him, yea, He sought out an upright prince, after His own heart, whom He took by his hand, Cyrus, king of the city Anshan ; He named his name, to the kingdom of the whole world He called him by name."¹ This reads like a passage from Is. xliv.-xlv. With his fine political tact, Cyrus knew how to win subject hearts by redress of grievances and deference to national religious views. No wonder that the Jewish exiles based all their hopes of deliverance on him, and not in vain. He gave orders to rebuild the Jerusalem Temple and permission, general or partial, to the Jews to return to do this work.

In 538 B.C. two Jews of royal descent, Sheshbazzar² and Zerubbabel, together with Jeshua or Joshua the high-priest³ and other prominent Jews, went to

¹ From Dr. Burney, who calls my attention to "*whom he took by his hand*" (cf. Is. xlv. 1), "*He called him by name*" (cf. xlv. 3), "*after His own heart*" (cf. "*the man of my counsel*," xlv. 11); the two first expressions, applied to Marduk, II Isaiah actually puts into Jehovah's mouth.

² Sheshbazzar is a puzzle to scholars ; but the old idea of his identity with Zerubbabel, as well as the recent view that he was a *Persian* governor officially in charge of the expedition, are both generally discredited to-day.

³ Before exile, "chief-priest" (exc. a few anachronisms in Kgs.); after it, "high-priest," and much more exalted. In N.T. "chief-priest" = (a) high-priest, (b) ex-high-priests, (c) men of exclusive high-priestly families (Schürer).

Jerusalem and laid the *foundations* of the Temple. Because of "adversaries" the work stopped there, and seventeen years of inactivity follow. In 522 B.C. some 42,000 Jews, with their families, returned to the Holy Land. Their departure from Babylon raised great expectations which were not fulfilled. Many of these new settlers just paid Jerusalem a short visit, relieved their consciences by money-offerings for the rebuilding of the Temple, then went "everyone to his own city and to his own house," allowing God's House to lie waste. There was no enthusiasm or *esprit de corps*. Moreover, the returned Jews looked upon themselves as the only true Jews, the one solid kernel of the "new Israel," as compared with the actual Judæan residents. These they viewed as less pure in blood and at a lower religious level. As for the "Samaritans," descendants of the ten tribes and of foreign settlers, the new-comers would have no dealings with them. The native Jews of Jerusalem and Judæa strongly resented the new home-comers' supercilious attitude, feeling that they had equal rights and privileges of their own (cf. Ezek. xi. 15). The neighbouring Samaritans, now that their friendly overtures to the returned exiles were so cavalierly repulsed, resorted to open feud with the Jews generally, and put every possible obstruction in their way.

With foes without and disunion within, the Temple rebuilding made no headway. The prophets Haggai and Zechariah had to goad the people to the work by openly warning them that, until the "sin" of the unbuilt Temple was removed, Jehovah refused to bless His people. He would neither crush their foes, restore their dispersed tribes, nor make the heathen come to the Jews for salvation; while if they show zeal in His cause, He will shake the heavens and the earth and all the nations, and their Golden Age is at hand.¹

¹ Haggai and Zech. i.-viii. (520), because of Persian internal upheavals, —the Smerdis usurpation,—see God "shaking the nations" and confidently expect the restoration of Zerubbabel to the Davidic throne, fulfilling pro-

These words had the desired effect. By 516 the Temple was rebuilt. Unpretentious as was Zerubbabel's Temple, it was an important achievement. Henceforth it was the nation's heart, the magnet drawing Israel away from its many half-heathen local shrines to the one true House and worship of God. It also made Jerusalem the rallying-point for all Israel.

But much else needed reform. There was now a Temple, but how were the regular services in it to be carried on? Kings had largely provided the ways and means of old; now priests and services alike were wholly dependent on the people's free-will offerings, and these were only forthcoming from a pious few. The rich cared only for themselves. Oppression, greed, violence, injustice, calumny, fraud were as rife as ever (Zech. vii.). Moreover, the returned exiles wanted a form of Temple-worship in line with Ezekiel's views, the native Jews clung to the older Deuteronomic form. Worse still, the city was composed of a mixed population, and inter-marriage between Jews and non-Jews was by no means rare. To crown all, the city-walls were still dismantled, in ruins, and could not be rebuilt because of the Samaritans. Such was the state of things awaiting the exiles on their Return, and for seventy years after. They tried to adjust themselves to their new home amid surroundings that were neither joyous nor secure. Was this, forsooth, the Golden

phetic Messianic predictions. Temple and city rebuilt, and Judah's "sin" thus removed, Zerubbabel is to be recognised as Messiah, and prince and priest are to walk hand in hand. Zech. vi. has a remarkable scene representing Babylonian Jews with a crown which the prophet sets on the head of Zerubbabel (see Hastings' *D. of B.*, iv. 123, 967, 785 art. "Tobijah") in his private house, saluting him as "the Branch" or "the Shoot," *i.e.* the Messiah (Jer. xxiii. 5), and predicting that he will rebuild the Temple, rule on his throne, with Joshua as priest by his side in harmony with him. The prediction did *not* come off. Hence the many changes in the text—the "crown" becomes "crowns," one for prince and one for priest; vi. 11 now only crowns the high-priest; but vi. 12, 13a, left unchanged, palpably refer to Zerubbabel only; as the LXX shows, 13b originally read "and he shall be priest *at his right hand*" (cf. R.V. m.). The crown is to be laid up in the Temple as a memorial of the donors. Only Zech. i.-viii. = Zechariah's own.

Age which all their prophets had told them was to dawn at the close of their Captivity !

A Holy Land sadly in need of a new Reformation was what confronted Ezra the scribe, a man of high-priestly family, on his arrival in Jerusalem (458), armed with large powers in the Persian king's name, and accompanied by a large number of Jews. What most grieved him was to see Jews,—priests, Levites, and rulers included,—commonly intermarrying with the surrounding aliens in a way subversive of all purity of religion or race. This evil must at once be checked. He assembled the Jews before the Temple, and his stirring words produced a deep impression and the desired effect. But the reform of this evil, and other moral abuses, kept him from dealing with the real object of his mission (Ezra vii. 27), the worship-reform which lay nearest his heart.

Fortunately, Ezra's hands were greatly strengthened in 445 by the arrival of a layman of exceptionally strong personality, Nehemiah, a Jew in high favour at the Persian court.¹ Invested with the governorship of Judah, he came with a regular Persian military escort and a high prestige. He found himself face to face with a difficult task. Taking in the situation at a glance he saw that, before attempting any religious reforms, a defenceless and disunited Jerusalem must

¹ *Ezra and Nehemiah*, the subdivision into *two* books is very late ; the Heb. Bible originally only had one, "*Ezra*." These books are *Chronicles* continued and by the same author, as *Chron.* xxxvi. 22, 23 = *Ezra* i. 1, 2, implies. *Chron.* is an epitome of the pentateuch *plus* the older historical books, but from Cyrus onward is all *new* history, hence the division of "*Ezra*" from *Chron.* The materials or sources used by the author are "*Memoirs of Nehemiah*," [of which *Neh.* i.-vii. is a solid piece (exc. iii.) and possibly xii. 27-43 ; xiii. 4-31] ; and "*Memoirs of Ezra*" (as seen in *Ezra* vii. 27-ix. 15), distinguishable in both cases by the use of the first person, "I" or "we." These memoirs were probably used elsewhere, but the compiler adapted them. Other sources are professedly Persian official documents, e.g. *Ezra* i. ; iv. 7-vi. 12 and vii. 11-26, all, exc. *Ezra* i., couched in Aramaic, the official diplomatic language. Driver considers them reliable. A large part of *Ezra-Neh.* exhibits the Chronicler's familiar motives and manner (see p. 126, *sup.*) and, apart from the *Memoirs of Ezra and esp. Nehemiah*, and the Aramaic documents, its historical value is at times open to question. *Ezra-Neh.* profess to give us the history from 537-432, yet of 515-458 not a word is said. With this narrative O.T. history closes, though its literature goes on to 160 B.C. (e.g. *Dan.*).

be set in order. With great dexterity and tenacity, Nehemiah promptly got the walls rebuilt, thus safeguarding Jerusalem from outside foes, while his firmness, tact, and generosity restored Jerusalem to peace, order, and good-will.

This great work done, he returned to Persia and came back with a new commission. He now appeared, not as a political, but a religious reformer. He set about the reformation of the priesthood, the strict observance of the Sabbath, general obedience to the Book of the Law, provision for the maintenance of regular services in the Temple, the prevention of mixed marriages, and other ecclesiastical measures. A thorough patriot and a born statesman, strong and tactful, he was also a man of genuine faith, a strict observer of the Law, and firmly convinced of his divine call to the work of reform. His implicit faith in God, in his vocation and in himself, enabled him to achieve great things. His greatest achievement, hand in hand with Ezra, was the introduction of the new Book of the Law which converted Israel from a nation into a Church under the high-priest as its king and the priests as his assessors.

We have already seen (p. 167 *sup.*) how, in 621, Hilkiah the chief-priest one day announced that he had found the Book of the Law in the Temple. As a matter of fact it was the newly-written Deuteronomy. We also saw how it was at once publicly read to the assembled people, and how king and people alike were so awed by its words that there and then they made a solemn covenant with God to obey all its statutes.

Exactly the same thing occurs all over again in 444. Neh. viii. gives us a graphic picture of it all. On the first day of Tishri, "all the people gathered themselves together as one man" to hear the (new) Book of the Law read. The first day, "Ezra the scribe stood upon a pulpit of wood, and opened the Book in the sight of the people, and all the people stood up. And Ezra

blessed the Lord, the great God : and all the people answered Amen, with lifting up of their hands ; and they bowed their heads and worshipped the Lord with their faces to the ground. And he read therein from the morning until midday, and the ears of the people were attentive unto the Book of the Law." Day after day it was again publicly read and explained, and the people were so awed that they mourned and wept : " for all the people wept when they heard the words of the Law," conscience-smitten. They had an immediate opportunity of proving their zeal for the Law in a practical way. In the Book of the Law " they found written that the Lord had commanded by Moses that the children should dwell in booths (= Feast of Tabernacles) in the feast of the seventh month." Now this was the very month when the Book of the Law was being publicly read ; so this Feast was at once kept. Then on the 24th of Tishri, at a great day of Humiliation, all " the children of Israel were assembled with fasting, and with sack-clothes, and earth upon them," and the whole community pledged itself by a sealed covenant to obey all the Book of the Law.

What was this Book of the Law? Was it the Book of the Covenant (Ex. xx.-xxiv.) of c. 800 B.C. *plus* Deut. (650), *plus* the 85 new chapters now introduced? Or was it only these new chapters recently written in Babylon,¹ what is commonly called the Priestly Code?

¹ As repeatedly stated, we must carefully distinguish between *the age of the laws themselves* and *the dates of their publication as written codes*. Most of the P laws and ritual are extremely old and merely codify the oral priestly Torah going back to very early days. The 70 years' Exile made such a written Code imperative. For instance, suppose our Church services were completely interrupted for 70 years, and inexperienced priests, with nothing but our Prayer-Book to guide them, had to conduct a full service, with Holy Communion, how would the priest know what to say, *e.g.* before or after the sermon, his exact ritual duties, how to serve the altar correctly, and many similar details? In an elaborate sacrificial Temple-worship, the ritual of sacrifice, involving so much manual work and traditional ritual, was infinitely more complex, and it had not written rubrics instructing the priest what to do as with us. The pre-exilic priesthood knew the oral and traditional rules through long custom and practice. But a 70 years' interruption of Temple-services and sacrifices made it essential that the priests of the Return should have a written

The latter is now the accepted view, just as it is clear that the Book of the Law read and solemnly accepted in 621 was Deut. only. The strongest pleas support this view: *e.g.* The Book of the Covenant (Ex. xx.-xxiv.) openly approves of, indeed orders, the many local altars and the offering of sacrifices by laymen, two practices which the Priestly Code absolutely condemns. Again, the highly moral, humanitarian, and spiritual tone of Deuteronomy clashes with the legalism of the Priestly Code. Would the reading of mutually contradictory Books have produced the desired effect?

The Priestly Code (*c.* 500) views everything from the priest's standpoint. Because God now actually dwells amid His people in His Jerusalem Temple, everything and everybody near Him must be "clean" and "holy," or God's "holiness" will be defiled, the sin of sins. Fearful for God's holiness, the Priestly Code's one aim is, as Ezekiel wanted, to make the community a "holy people," a Church existing solely for the glory of God dwelling in their midst. Not the nation's prosperity or greatness, not man's happiness, is the end in view, but the one motive is "the Glory of God" and the safeguarding of His "holiness." Hence there is no king; God is the Church's King; even the colourless "prince," introduced by Ezekiel for Church purposes, disappears. The high-priest is God's one vicegerent on earth. Naturally, Temple, altar, priests, ritual, overshadow all else by divine decree. Not for man to question the reasonableness, the why or wherefore of ritual, fasts, and feasts, New Moons, Sabbaths, foods allowed or forbidden, things clean or unclean, scales or kinds of offerings, ceremonial purifications, and so on,—one and all they are decreed of God

Priestly Code to guide them as to correct ritual, and also to teach the layman his duties as regards purity and ceremonial. Ezekiel and his priestly disciples wisely made provision for this during the Exile; hence the Priestly Code with its plans and specifications for the Tabernacle, the laws for priests, the laws and ritual of sacrifice, the scales of offerings, the regulation of clean and unclean, and so on. Much of this is very old custom, but there are also indications of amendments and innovations.

Himself as His will and law, and any the slightest deviation from them is fraught with dire consequences. It is God's divine Will, every jot and tittle of it, even as by word of mouth He gave Moses minute specifications of the furniture of His House down to the very nails and pins (Ex. xxv. sqq., cf. Ezek. xliii.). Where God orders, man obeys, and God sees to the efficacy of His means of grace.

It may be asked : " But where does the moral factor come in ? In the Code it seems infinitesimal, for nine-tenths of it is ritual." " Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself " (Lev. xix. 18) ; " Walk before Me, and be thou perfect " (Gen. xvii. 1 = P), prove that the Code prizes morality. Nine-tenths of P is ritual, simply for this reason : Cultus, not morality, is the Code's rôle in Judaism, not because it is indifferent to morals, but because morality was already provided for. Deuteronomy, equally the Book of the Law and bound with it, and also the Prophets, had already dealt amply with morality. We are not blind to the Code's weakness. It is vastly inferior to Deut., full of archaic semi-pagan ideas and rites meaningless to us ; but we shall presently see (Ch. XIV.) that, as the Psalter proves, it did its work well and turned out saintly lives. None the less, passing strange, nay, childish to us are some of its rules, *e.g.* not only are lepers " unclean," entailing a " sin-offering " after a cure, but the walls of a house with fungus-patches are " leprous " and need blood-atonement for sin like human beings. Again, he who gathers sticks on the Sabbath, or he who makes such sacred oil as priests use, or eats sacrificial meats over two days after the sacrifice, is as bad a sinner as if guilty of incest, sodomy, or murder. Contact with a corpse also involves purification for sin. Ritual and moral offences *are* viewed by the Code as on a level for the following reasons, exactly the reasons already noted in Ezekiel's code (p. 189 *sup.*).

" Holiness " is the root-idea of the Code. Jehovah

has set Israel apart for Himself and dwells in their midst. He is Holy, they must be holy too. As in Ezekiel, so in the Code, "holy" is used, not in its moral, but in its pre-prophetic sense of "aloof from all ceremonial taint," a kind of *physical* purity. Again, with all primitive peoples anything set apart for a god's own use becomes his exclusive property. It is *taboo* (p. 61 *sup.*). It must on no account be used for, or come into touch with, anything common or unclean. If it does, this at once defiles it for God's use, and this breach of *taboo* involves awful consequences for the offender, whether he did it wittingly or unwittingly, for the pollution is the same in either case.¹ Till prophetic days (c. 800 B.C.), "holy" and "taboo" meant the same thing in Israel. Prophets are progressive, priests conservative. For 300 years, prophets tried to cut across this superstition and to give "holy" and "clean" a moral sense, but old habits and traditions were too strong for them. Priests and people alike clung to the old view. Now the Priestly Code is wholly based on priestly lore and customs in use from time immemorial. Thus "holy" in the Code still means "set apart for God's use"; "clean" still means physical or ceremonial purity. For instance, the Temple and all its belongings, its attendants and their vestments, its very utensils, are "holy," *taboo*. Only the "holy" can touch the "holy"; and the "holy" person or thing that comes near God's "holiness" or His "holy" property must take great care to be "clean." "Clean" and "holy" are often interchanged, but much is "clean" that is not "holy." A house, person, or vessel is "clean" after due purifications, but only

¹ Thus the Ark is "holy," and a layman touching it instantaneously falls dead *e.g.* (2 Sam. vi. 6). Achan appropriates property "devoted" to God's use, and is stoned with all his family. Without his "holy" vestments covering him, even a priest dare not approach what is "holy," for "holiness" is contagious, and the priest's ordinary dress (unprotected by vestments in the sanctuary) would afterwards make all it touched "holy to God," *i.e.* unavailable to its former owner. Hence the phrase used of a Holy Book: "it defiles the hand."

becomes "holy" if set apart for God's exclusive use. There are also degrees in "holiness." As set apart for God's use, all Israel is "holy,"—the people, the land and all in it. Everything in the Holy Land, from circumference to centre, must be holy. But the nearer you get to God's House, the nearer to God, and the holier the ground and all in it. So of God's House itself, uniquely holy as is all the Temple, there are positive, comparative, and superlative degrees in its holiness. And the greater the holiness, the more holy also must he or it be that comes near, the more elaborate, too, must be the rules and precautions to safeguard that holiness from whatever is common or unclean. Now seeing that the Priestly Code deals all but exclusively with ceremonial laws bearing on "holy" and "clean," the moral element in it is naturally small.

The principles on which the Code is based are very simple and modelled on Ezekiel's Code of Holiness. The Code practically resolves itself into this one idea: As set apart for God's own property and use, all the Holy Land, with its people, their goods, their time, their life, is God's own, and therefore "holy," *taboo*, not for common use, on pain of death or disaster. But God does not exact His full due. On condition that a portion of each is strictly set apart for His exclusive use, He graciously releases all the rest from *taboo*. It can freely be touched and used. His blessing rests upon it, but it *must* remain "clean," for Jehovah the Holy One dwells in the midst of it all. Thus :—

(A) All the Holy Land is holy to Jehovah, but if one portion is strictly marked off as uniquely "holy" to Him, as the place where He has "caused His name to be placed there," His Tabernacle, and if certain cities in each tribe are set apart for His holy priests and Levites (Numb. xxxv.), then the rest of the land is free and secure for Israel's use and enjoyment, with the one further stipulation, that every seven years *all* land shall enjoy absolute rest (Lev. xxv.). In the Tabernacle itself, the dark

innermost shrine, with the Ark in it as God's Throne, is the "holy of holies," taboo to all but the High-Priest; even he can enter it only once a year, and only after taking minutely scrupulous precautions so as to be absolutely "clean" (Ex. xxv. 22; Lev. xvi.). Into the next "holy place" none but priests can enter. Next comes the forecourt, in which the priests, assisted by the Levites, attend to the sacrificial cultus. Between this forecourt and the people's court are encamped the Levites, thus shielding the people from the Divine "holiness," so that God's "wrath may not come upon the congregation of the children of Israel" (Numb. i. 53) for daring to come near His "holiness." Spotless "cleanliness" is, of course, absolutely demanded of high-priests, priests, and Levites (*e.g.* Ex. xxviii. sq.; Lev. xxi.; Numb. viii.), for the Divine "holiness" will smite anything "unclean" coming near it (Lev. xxi. sq.; Numb. xviii. 2 sq.).

(B) All time is Jehovah's in Israel, but if one day in seven and certain specified Feasts and Fasts are set apart as "holy," the rest of the time is released from taboo.

(C) All Israelites are "holy" to Jehovah,—their circumcision, the consecration and redemption of the male first-born (Ex. xiii.; Numb. xviii.), and their poll-tax (Ex. xxx.) are Israel's own acknowledgment of it,—but if a portion of the holy nation is set apart, *viz.* priests and Levites,¹ God is content.

(D) All Israel's produce is "holy." But if the "first-fruits" are set apart for God, and His priests get their tithes and dues, the rest is free.

(E) In all cases of "sin" (= breaking rules of "holy" and "clean") the sinner's life is forfeit to Jehovah. But He graciously pardons, if the sinner acknowledges his sin and forfeiture of life by turning to Him with another victim in his stead, or the prescribed offering as a substitute. But God only accepts and forgives, if the offering is presented in the divinely prescribed way. The forgiveness is a pure act of God's grace, but the penitent must approach God in the correct way and according to correct ritual; this is a *sine quâ non* of forgiveness, and only through

¹ Carefully distinguish "priests" and "Levites," for in P Levites are *not* priests of a lower grade. Properly speaking, all male Israelites should be priests, but God has graciously arranged for a permanent representation of the people in the priesthood chosen from the tribe of Levi. The Levites represent the *first-born* who are really God's property. Hence, as Numb. iii. 40 sqq. tells us, each first-born is replaced by a Levite, but as only 22,000 Levites are available, and there are 22,273 first-born, 273 first-born pay 5 shekels each to equalise.

the mediating priest's due performance of the proper ritual and atoning usages can the sinner be saved from God's wrath. The sinner must satisfy both God and His priests, for the priest is the sole mediator between God and man.

As repeatedly stated, we must not fancy that Ezekiel and his school, the priests and scribes of 550-450 B.C., invented these ritual rules. We hear but little of this priestly teaching in the Bible before 586 B.C., because up to then the Bible Books emanate from the prophetic school, and it is *their* moral teaching that comes to the fore. But their endless denunciations of ceremonial and ritual worship (p. 152 *sup.*) prove how deep-rooted it was in their day. Priests and people alike were convinced that the ritual cultus of their fathers was a far truer worship than the "morality" preaching of the prophets, a mushroom growth of yesterday. The Fall of Jerusalem, and the Captivity ensuing on the very heels of the Reformation of 621, deepened this conviction. *Post hoc, ergo propter hoc.* It was not ritual worship that was wrong, but ritual worship prostituted to *baalim* and idolatrous cults. So, with Ezekiel, ritual came once more into its own as the essence of religion. Right on from pre-Mosaic days it had really all but monopolised the field in popular and priestly esteem ; its precise rules for sacrifice, its proper forms of purification from "uncleanness," its prescribed rites on various occasions, were hallowed and viewed as the religion alone acceptable to God. These precise rules, rites, formulas had always been carefully, jealously, treasured and safeguarded by the priests of Israel from time immemorial. The rise of great sanctuaries, and especially of Solomon's Temple, furthered the systematisation of priestly ritual ; still more was it fostered by the centralisation of all worship in the Jerusalem Temple. The Exile, with its synagogue worship, might be thought likely to wean Israel from this ritual worship of God. As a

matter of fact it did the reverse. Feeble substitutes these irregular synagogue-gatherings seemed to many exiles, poor substitutes for the solemn and effectual ritual of the Temple. This Temple-worship, they felt assured, was but temporarily suspended, and, lest the old correct ritual customs and practices should be forgotten in the seventy years of Captivity, Ezekiel and his priestly disciples committed to writing the true priestly tradition which had been orally handed down before, so that the priests on their Return should serve the altar correctly. Naturally, when Israel became a Church after the Restoration, with priests at its head, this priestly ritual and ceremonial had the field all but to itself. Hence, although our Priestly Code only dates from 550-450 B.C., it is really extremely ancient in itself. It exhibits merely the final development, systematisation, and triumph of elements and principles in vogue since Moses' day.

This ancient and semi-Mosaic character of the Code alone explains why both the Book of the Law (Deut.) in 621, and the Book of the Law (Priestly Code) in 444, both brand-new literary creations, were at once accepted by Israel as Moses' own. This ascription to Moses seems passing strange to us, till we remember (*a*) the archaic and Mosaic character of the Code,¹ and, still more, (*b*) that no one could tell it was not Moses' own, for the simple reason that there was no Bible in our sense till 444 B.C. True, when the people pledged themselves in 621 to obey the Book of the Law (Deut.), there and then Deuteronomy was canonised and became Holy Scripture. But it was not till 444 that the real formation of a Bible, with several Books in it, began, and the first Canon of Scripture came into being. A Bible

¹ As so often said, the Priestly Torah does go back to Moses' day. He was the first to give at the door of the Tent those oral decisions on matters "coming before God," which the priests continued to give after him. As Ex. xxxiv. shows, the oldest laws were very like the Priestly Code.

now came into existence comprising the two Books of the Law (Deut. and Priestly Code), *plus* the older writings of Genesis, the Book of the Covenant (Ex. xx.-xxiv.), and Joshua. There were other "writings" extant then, *e.g.* *Judges, Samuel, Kings*, also the Prophets, but they were not thought worthy of a place side by side with the Holy Law. The Hexateuch, or at any rate the Pentateuch, alone formed the Bible of 444 B.C. Even in the Pentateuch itself great changes were made. The older books were first thoroughly revised and brought into closer harmony with the spirit of the Priestly Code. The Code itself was now given a historical setting of its own to vindicate, as of Divine origin, the Priestly Law and such new institutions as the enhanced value attached to Sabbath-observance, circumcision, the priestly ritual and hierarchy, the centralisation of worship, and the new feasts and fasts.¹ The eighty-five new chapters, and also shorter interpolations, were distributed among the various books for this very purpose, *e.g.* Gen. i. was inserted with its story of the Creation leading up expressly to the Sabbath-observance advocated by the Code; the Flood is given a new setting closing with a command not to eat blood; and the history of Isaac's birth has in view the new meaning now attached to circumcision. Similarly, to bring them into line with the Priestly

¹ P might be called "Origins of the Institutions of Israel," for, according to it, these institutions were not all at once, but progressively, revealed and amplified from age to age as occasion demanded. Thus the sabbath-ordinance has its origin and sanction in the Creation itself, as God's own Day of rest. The Flood gives occasion to the first permission of animal-food, with the proviso prohibiting flesh with blood in it. Circumcision first comes in with Abraham, while the Passover (and its name) is ordained in connection with the last Egyptian plague; and *all* the ordinances of worship were revealed at Sinai. And, as P's only legitimate sacrifice presupposes *one* central temple and altar, a legitimate priesthood, and regular ritual, the patriarchs in P never offer sacrifice. No sacrifice before God's institution of the Tabernacle and its cultus could be anything but impious, like heathen worship. On the same principle of progressive revelation, these institutions were not all first revealed to *Israel*, *e.g.* the Sabbath is instituted at the Creation, *i.e.* a revelation to *all men*; but the extension of Revelation gradually narrows, *e.g.* Adam (all men); Noah's son *Shem* (= Semites); Terah's line, *i.e.* Abraham (= Hebrews). Hence the genealogies and their value.

Code, the Passover, an old agricultural festival, is given quite a new significance, while the Day of Atonement, of very late origin, is made out to be a Mosaic institution, and the most important and holiest of Holy Days; the centralisation of worship in the Tabernacle is also made out to be the rule already in Moses' day, while priests and Levites are represented as a caste set apart by Divine order from the very first.

The Priestly Code thus cuts across plain facts of history, is wholly based on theocratic motives and ideals, and throws back its own ideals into a remote past. Its symbolical ideas are transformed into tangible history, simply because its authors honestly and verily believed that what is done, and ought to be done, in their day was always done by true Israelites in all ages, exactly as we Churchmen throw back, in all honesty of conscience, our own view of episcopacy into the New Testament. In their eyes, for instance, sacrifice not done by priests, or offered outside the Temple, is sheer profanity; hence in the Priestly Writings the early patriarchs never offer sacrifice in person, nor good kings either, yet we know they constantly did so.

Such was the Priestly Code of Holiness. What estimate are we to form of its moral and religious value? This question we discuss in our next chapter.

CHAPTER XIV

MORAL AND SPIRITUAL VALUE OF PRIESTLY CODE

WHAT estimate are we to form of the Priestly Code's moral and spiritual worth? On this point, from New Testament days onward, opinions have been very divided. One school condemns it wholesale, the other exalts it as a God-given guide to heaven. Let us state the case for and against the Code as impartially as we can; though it is very difficult for either Christian or Jew¹ to hold the scales without bias.

(A) *Against the Code.*—The case against the Code, as it strikes the ordinary Christian steeped in Paul's Epistles and the Gospels, is easily stated. From this standpoint, its weak points "jump to the eyes," with its meticulous attention to trivial external details, its stress on the mechanical performance of mere ritual and ceremonial acts, "its weak and beggarly elements." This spirit of legalism seems such a sad fall off from

¹ As Montefiore, *H.L.*, 355 sqq. and 467 sq. well points out, (1) The best O.T. historian, if unversed in Rabbinical literature, is a most inadequate authority for the post-Nehemian era, because (2) O.T. history ends with 432 B.C. and helps us practically not at all to a correct estimate of the evolution of Judaism from 400 B.C. onward, its most important period. The apocalypses give us but the mere fringe of it, and the O.T. Canon, already in existence in 130 B.C., thus leaves us *in mediis rebus*. (3) In the O.T. we see only tendencies to a fully established Judaism, still in the making even in Jesus' day, and not complete till about 200 A.D. This is known as Rabbinism, and it alone gives us the real clue we need for the delineation of the religious evolution from 400 B.C. which led up to it. (4) Montefiore, *H.L.*, 358, rightly adds that we must avoid two snares: (a) "Christian theologians too habitually look at post-exilic Judaism through Pauline spectacles," (b) the Jew looks at it from the standpoint of modern Judaism. The one safe guide, according to Montefiore, is to steep yourself in such documentary evidence as we have in post-exilic O.T. literature (for though O.T. history ends in 432, O.T. literature goes on to 160 B.C.), e.g. the Psalter; while the only commentary of any real use to a right understanding of post-exilic O.T. Judaism is to be found in its child, Rabbinism, spirit of its spirit. The "end" explains the earlier stages and gives them their true inner meaning.

the living truths and inspiring principles of the prophets, with their heart-religion and their worship of God in spirit and in truth. In a word, the Priestly Code, looked at in this light, does not fall into line with our idea of religion as a character and a life. Our idea of Religion is that it should work from within outwards, as the self-utterance of a heart so full of the love of God that it constrains us to uprightness of character and the service of our brother-man. True religion should stress the spirit rather than the letter, the motive rather than the deed, character above action.

Now, says the Paulinist, the Priestly Code does the very opposite. In it acts, not motives, count. The moral factor, the man's frame of heart, is all but a negligible quantity; it is punctilious attention to the Code's ceremonial etiquette alone that matters and works with magical efficacy. From first to last the Code tells us: Do this prescribed action, refrain from this unclean thing, and you earn merit with God; if you do this wrong act or come in contact with that unclean thing, then go straight to a priest with the prescribed offering in your hand, and this will of itself avert God's wrath and punishment. And what is the outcome of such a Creed? From fear of punishment or hope of reward, men perform the duties prescribed and go on their way rejoicing that it is so easy to make God and the world thus walk hand in hand. Morally and spiritually, such compliance does little or no good and almost invariably degenerates into a hollow dead form. Religious observances which do not touch will or heart leave men as they were, and not infrequently beget hypocrisy and Pharisaism.

Moreover the Code, urge its critics, fosters a totally wrong idea of God. He is a God so "Holy," so aloof from all that is common or unclean, that He is all but inaccessible in His awe-ful and unapproachable Glory. All immediate access to Him is forbidden to His people. For a layman to draw near, except

by proxy through His priests, means instant death. Even of the priests themselves, none but one, the chiefest, dare enter the Holy of Holies into the immediate Presence, and that only once a year. Naturally, such a transcendent conception of God gave the Jews the idea of a God to whom they looked up with awe, but not a God who appealed to them as a Father, neither could they feel for Him the love and trust of children. He is a stern Judge, noting all man's actions with an exacting eye, keeping a record in which He credits to him all acts of obedience to His Law, while debiting all transgressions of it, the balance for or against him in God's Book deciding the man's fate. Hence, in legal Judaism, religion becomes increasingly a matter of pure calculation: not, How much can I do for God? but, How little may I do and yet secure the reward I seek? The inevitable tendency is for the relationship between God and man to degenerate into a kind of legal contract, under which man gives God only just so much as he is absolutely obliged by the terms of the bond.

Hence, it is asked, how can such a religion, (1) in which acts, not motives, count; (2) in which a man's heaven or hell is arithmetically computed; (3) in which it is so easy for a man to make terms with his conscience and his God by merely conforming to a fixed scale of outward formalities,—how can such a religion produce in its votaries anything but formalism, sanctimoniousness, and hypocrisy? Is it any wonder that heart-religion and true morality receded into the background, as our New Testament shows? A religion of the Law must produce either self-righteous Pharisees, or else drive men into despair, as St. Paul found.

With St. Paul, these critics of the Law deny it all moral or spiritual value. St. Paul is not content with branding it as worthless for righteousness. He deliberately adds: it was given "for the sake (*χάρτιν*) of transgressions," *i.e.* not to make us good,—this is

utterly beyond its power,—but only to make us see how bad we are. This is its one objective. Therefore, says Paul, God intended it merely for a season as a temporary make-shift till Christ came. The Law, far from ridding us of sin and making us better, has but one aim, to bring us to the verge of despair and thus drive us, as it drove St. Paul, to Christ for salvation. That was its one divine purpose, to make us realise our absolute need of a Saviour from sin and death. It was “our schoolmaster leading us unto Christ.” Now Christ has come, its work is done. Neither God nor man has any further use for it and its “beggarly elements.” Paul abolishes the whole law with a stroke of the pen, not the ritual law only, but the moral law as well with its “ministration of death written and engraven on stones” (2 Cor. iii. 7 R.V.; cf. Rom. vii. 7, where he speaks of the sin-producing effect of the Tenth Commandment).

This is a sweeping indictment! But is Paul right? If so, how can his Master have seen good points in the Law? He certainly did, or He never would have said: “The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat; all things, therefore, whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do” (St. Mt. xxiii. 2); “ye pay tithe of mint . . . and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith; *these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone*” (*ibid.* 23); “till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled” (v. 18); “I am not come to destroy (the law), but to fulfil” (17). Some scholars discount these St. Matthew pro-law passages; but, surely, if Jesus had in any way by practice or teaching set the Law at nought as valueless, would His disciples have respected it as they did after His Death? We are ready enough to accept Paul’s scathing denunciation of the Law, but we forget that the Twelve were amongst its champions. They devoutly observed it and expected their converts to do so too: “Thou seest, brother (Paul), how many

thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the Law, etc." (Acts xxi. 20 sqq.). Clearly, then, Christ and the Twelve do not see eye to eye with St. Paul in their reading of the Law. Which of the two verdicts are we to choose? The next section may help us to see how far the right is on the side of Jesus and the Twelve.¹

¹ We shall plead fully the case for the Law on its own merits, but this by the way. Sitting in judgment on Judaism, well for us if we took to heart four words of Christ: (1) "*Ye shall know them by their fruits.*" Judaism (550-1 B.C.) bore the Code and Chron., yes, and Psalms, Prov., Job, Ruth; it had its Temple ritual and its edifying ministry of the Word in its synagogue-services. What *one* label will serve for such manifold expression of spiritual life? (2) "*We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced, we have mourned and ye have not wept.*" We brand the Code as too legal, and the wisdom-literature (e.g. Prov.) as mere morality-preaching; (3) "*This (legal rules) ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other (prophetic heart-religion) undone.*" True religion needs both Law and Prophets; one alone leaves it one-sided and lop-sided; (4) "*They have Moses and the Prophets, if they will not hear them, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead,*" i.e. Judaism meets all wants. All said and done, religion is largely a matter of temperament, i.e. men are born High, Low, or Broad. There have always been and ever will be those who prefer to be born into a Church which tells them what to believe and what to do, categorically; there have also always been and ever will be others for whom religion cannot be tied down to mere obedience to, or acceptance of, organisation, creeds, or rites, i.e. some prefer Mosaic legalism (cf. James), others prophetic heart-religion (cf. Paul). Where good men in all ages have thus agreed to differ, there must be good grounds for the difference. The one test of an institution, creed, or rite is: "Does it produce the frame of heart responsive to and receptive of the Spirit and Presence of God?" If so, it is doing all God asks and wants and is God-blessed. God wants equally a legalist James, a broad Paul, a moderate Peter. If a true Church is to gather to her bosom men of a variety of thought, of "all sorts and conditions" as God makes them, she herself must be, like Truth, many-sided. She must have a Moses, Isaiah, and Job, each facing Truth from different aspects, yet equally loyal to her leading principles. A living comprehensive Jewish Church met all these wants in her "Moses and the Prophets" as Christ assures us (Lk. xvi. 29).

St. Paul's indictment is biased, yet essentially true in idea. He saw Jews making a legalism, which did not suit *his* temperament, the one way to heaven; and Jewish Christians making Christ *plus* the law God's one way of salvation; i.e. James, Peter, etc., found "Moses and the Prophets" their true spiritual meat, as Christ implies in Lk. xvi. 29. No! Paul retorts: It must be the one or the other. "If righteousness come by the law," even in part, "then Christ died in vain" (*δωρεδω*). Salvation is of "grace," God's pure gift, *not at all* man's own achievement by "works of the law." The tendency of all reformers is to exaggerate. We can no more take *au pied de la lettre* Paul's sweeping denunciation of the law, his old creed on which he had turned his back, than we can unreservedly take Luther's denunciation of Rome. The colours of the pictures are too strong, the values distorted, and give a false impression. The Twelve and Christians of 160 A.D. (2 Pet. iii.) found Paul "hard to be understood," so do many of us to-day. His misinterpreted creed led to abuses, even immorality, e.g. Antinomian Christians took his "faith without works" literally, and acted accordingly, and so do some to-day.

(B) *For the Code.*—At first glance, one would certainly suppose that the Code, with its stress on outward ceremonial, must have had a deadening effect on religion, turned it into a lifeless theological creed clothed in a web of formality and legalism, a religion of the letter and not of the spirit. Daily experience proves that the logic of theory is often at variance with the logic of facts and, as a matter of fact, Judaism did *not* produce these distressing results, rather the very reverse. Far from producing merely a crop of sanctimonious hypocrites, the Law nurtured a vast number of saintly lives. “By their fruits ye shall know them. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither a corrupt tree good fruit.” What were the fruits of Hebrew religion under the Law? If we really want to see these fruits, we shall look for them in the actual picture of the post-exilic period as painted for us by *Chron.*, *Prov.*, *Job*, *Eccles.*, *Malachi*, *Ruth*, *Dan.*, and especially *Psalms*, books written under the Law, and the Psalter often by men so steeped in the Law that they proudly declare: “The Law of Thy mouth is better unto me than thousands of gold and silver.” May it not be that we Christians are far too apt to judge Judaism by the picture of it painted in our New Testament 500 years after the codification of the Law? This plea is juster than we may think, for many reasons. Would we ourselves like Christianity or the Apostolic Church to be gauged by its decadent successor 500 years or even 200 years later? Again, in the New Testament we have a picture of Judaism as seen through the eyes of writers who never could forgive the Jews, because certain Jewish priests and scribes had secured the Death of their Master and were now showing hostility and animosity to themselves. Moreover, Jews themselves own that the age of Jesus was a crucial and unsettled period for Judaism, one “of religious ferment and fanaticism, an age of violent oppositions. Sadducee and Pharisee and Zealot,

Essene and Outcast, all figure upon the religious stage. The defects of all parties show themselves strongly in fierce antagonism and morbid exaggeration," a dark state of things very unlike 550-130 B.C. or the real Judaism inaugurated by the Temple's fall in 70 A.D. (Montefiore, *Hibb. Lect.*, 546). Confessedly, in Jesus' day, there were some very bigoted, fanatical, narrow scribes and Pharisees, or our Lord would not have denounced them so uncompromisingly, and Jews to-day own it. But there are extremists to-day, scribes and Pharisees by the score; yet we have no right to judge either Judaism or Christianity by the standard of that extreme militant section which catches the public eye and ear precisely by reason of its extreme views, and seems much larger than it is simply because it shouts so loud. We concentrate our gaze on those bigoted Jews, the extreme wing, whom our Lord denounces rightly. We forget the scribe of whom Christ said: "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God," the "ruler" whom Jesus "beholding, loved," the multitudes of simple responsive souls who "heard Him gladly" and to whom His own heart went out in love. We forget the large class of "meek," "humble," quiet religious souls, "Israelites indeed, in whom there is no guile," thousands upon thousands of devout men and women scattered up and down Israel, like Nathanael and Simeon, watching for the "Consolation of Israel," the main body of real God-worshippers who say little, while the extremists shout loud and have the arena to themselves. We forget the Twelve Apostles, stout champions of the Law, who worshipped in Jewish synagogues and in the Temple side by side with non-Christian Jews, and only left these synagogues when driven out. We forget that Christ was no foe to the Law, only to its abuse, and urged His disciples to obey it (p. 217 *sup.*). Would our Lord Himself so regularly have worshipped in Temple and synagogue, if Judaism had been all wrong in His eyes? Paul,

not Christ, condemns the Law. Christ saw that the Law was good, but it was not the best; He had no idea of abolishing it, only of stopping men from making it the alpha and omega of religion: "these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone." His criticism was constructive, not destructive, with a sense of continuity and values.

Our Lord's reading of the Law appeals to all men, even to many Jews to-day, it is so essentially simple and reasonable, so unlike the sweeping and embittered indictment of Paul. In that simple and reasonable spirit we would fain approach the Law now, in the belief that if we take a Psalter, written by men living directly under the Law, steeped in it and glorying in it, we may best be able to gauge the real moral and spiritual value of the Law in the Israel of 550-150 B.C., with which alone we have here to deal. We might equally take *Job*, *Prov.*, *Chron.*, *Malachi* and the rest of the post-exilic literature, but we choose the Psalter here as our one guide and authority, because (1) it is the one Old Testament Book we all know best; (2) because nine-tenths of it was written by men living under and loving the Law between 550-150; (3) because it was the Temple Prayer-Book and Hymn-Book; (4) because its 150 psalms embody the spiritual experience, not of one man, but of a vast number of Jews for 400 years after the Exile, and therefore cover the views of—if we may be allowed the phrase—High, Low, and Broad Jewish Churchmen under the Law for a period of centuries.¹

¹ One critic urges that my use of the Psalter as a test of the moral and spiritual views of Judaism is as if "2000 years hence a writer, dealing with the twentieth-century religion, took our Prayer-Book collects as expressive of its spiritual depth, whereas our war-prayers to-day show the pitiful falling off really existing to-day in that form of spiritual utterance." But surely this analogy fails doubly: (1) Most of our Prayer-Book collects are of very great antiquity and *not* Reformation collects at all, whereas nine-tenths of the Psalms *were* written "under the Law"; (2) our war-prayers may show a falling off in *form*, but are they at all less *spiritual* than the collects, or written by less spiritually-minded people? Moreover, the Prayer-Book and its collects, we maintain, would *not* be a bad guide for a writer, 2000 years hence, on the Anglicanism of 1920 A.D., *i.e.* the views of the main body of English Churchmen and not extremists. But—and this is our point—we are concerned in

We want to gauge the heart-beliefs fostered by legal Judaism, and in the prayers, confessions, praise, meditations, aspirations, of the Psalter we have the typical pious Israelite's inmost faith laid bare before our eyes. Now does the Psalter give us that picture of Judaism sketched by its critics? Is its God an unapproachable God, a stern Judge to be feared, not loved and trusted as a Father? Is our pious Israelite (a) self-righteous, or (b) on the verge of despair? Is legal Judaism a formal external religion of little moral or spiritual worth? Let us see what the Psalter has to tell us on these points.

Conception of God.—"Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him, for He knoweth whereof we are made." "The Lord is full of compassion and mercy, long-suffering and of great kindness." "The Lord is my Shepherd, etc." "The Lord is nigh unto all that call upon Him." "He shall cover thee with His feathers, and under His wings shalt thou trust." "Whom have I in heaven but Thee, and there is none upon earth that I desire in comparison of Thee." "The Lord is my refuge, 'my Rock,' 'my King,' 'my Helper,' 'my strength and my Redeemer.'" "The earth is full of the loving-kindness of the Lord."

Loving-kindness, God is good, God is near,—this is the note of notes of the Psalter, a faith in a living and loving God, gracious and full of loving-kindness, near to us in all our needs, a God who rules and cares and helps and loves, our Father.

Is He a stern Judge, noting all our faults, balancing our good and bad points and passing His verdict on us accordingly?

the text with the Judaism of the O.T., *i.e.* from 550-150 B.C., not with Rabbinism. It is admitted that (1) nine-tenths of the Psalms are exilic, or post-exilic, *i.e.* written "under the Law"; (2) that the Psalter was the Temple Prayer and Hymn Book; (3) that the Psalter represents many writers, many minds, many shades of thought, *i.e.* it is a good guide to the views held "under the Law" from 550-150. If it be asked why Rabbinic Judaism did not go on writing Psalms, this is beyond our present subject, but even if true, does death of poetry also mean death of "spirituality" any more than our inartistic war-prayers mean spiritual stagnation? And Rabbinism of the Spanish-Arabic period did produce spiritual poets.

"If Thou, Lord, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand? But there is forgiveness with Thee." "The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger and plenteous in mercy. He hath not dealt with us after our sins, nor rewarded us according to our iniquities. As far as the east is from the west, so far hath He removed our transgressions from us."

God's tender mercy, however, does not dim the psalmist's sense of sin as defiling the soul, hateful to God, veiling God's face: Read Ps. li.:

"Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned." "Heal my soul, for I have sinned against Thee" (xli.) ; "Hide not Thy face from me"; "Cleanse Thou me from secret faults."

Again, if our Father is ever good and ever near, so that I can "rejoice in the Lord, and be glad," our pious Jew under the Law does not forget that He is "Our Father *which art in heaven.*"

"When I consider the heavens, the work of Thy hands, what is man that Thou art mindful of him?" "Whither shall I go then from Thy Spirit or flee from Thy presence? If I ascend into heaven, Thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, Thou art there also; if I dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall Thy hand lead me. If I say, surely the darkness shall cover me,—the darkness and light are both alike to Thee."

God so great, man so small; even though God is our Father, rightly does the Psalter strike as our key-note: "Stand in awe of Him." No servile fear this, rather the spirit of loving trustful reverence: "Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling." The psalmist freely recognises that love is higher than fear: "The fear of the Lord is the *beginning* of wisdom"; a man is to fear God so that he may end by loving Him from the ground of the heart. But, to the end, Judaism rightly saw that perfect love should never forget the reverence akin to awe which every true child feels to the earthly or heavenly father he loves and trusts.

Such is the God of the Psalter, a living and loving

Personal God, a Person as real as themselves to these pious Jews. Without scruple or hesitation do they speak of Him almost as if He were a man with eyes, ears, hands, feet. He is a God who rules the universe, yes, *and* whose eyes are open to our needs, His ears ever attentive to His children's cry. His eyelids try the children of men, His right hand helps and His strong arm delivers all who call upon Him. He opens His hand and all things are filled with good, He hides His face and we are troubled; He sends forth His breath and life is created, He takes it back and we die. Even as ourselves, He loves and hates, grieves and is glad, is angry and pleased, chides and repents. Very simple, but very warm and inspiring is the psalmist's portrait of God. If we want the theologian's or philosopher's conception of God, we must not seek it in the Psalter, it is not there. The psalms speak not at all of God as "transcendent" or "immanent," neither do they seek to define His metaphysical nature. The Psalter's idea of God is unsystematic, inconsistent often; yes, and just because it is exactly the picture of God which the child of God instinctively frames for himself, it appeals to every man's and woman's heart, and through it we are brought directly into the actual Presence of the Lord, our Father and King, our Master and Saviour, a God who "cares" and "loves" and "hearkens" and "helps," a God who is holy and good and very near; and this is the living God we all want.

Personal Religion.—Is our pious Israelite under the Law either self-righteous or on the verge of despair? Self-righteous? Yes, and No. Roughly speaking, as an Israelite he is self-righteous, as an individual he is not; and for this reason. From first to last in Israel's conception of God, there *is* a note that jars on modern ears. Israel ever laid claim to God as *his* God in a way that made him narrow and exclusive. Strange, for in all other respects the pious Jew had as true an idea of God as ours. He knew Him as the

one and only God, the source, stay and goal of all that is; a God righteous, holy, loving, our Father in heaven; a God of whom he spoke as a person, though he well knew that a God who is everywhere and knows every secret thought and is almighty Creator is not like ourselves. But with it all, God, Ruler of the Universe, was to a Jew Israel's God as He was not the God of other men, He was *Israel's* God, and Israel *His* people. This idea was a source of weakness, yet of strength, in Israel's religion. Of weakness, for it fostered a narrow national pride which (except in II. Isaiah) ever made them look down upon all outside their own race as "ungodly" heathen, and on themselves as "righteous" Israel. Indeed, even in the Psalter, the nations are constantly viewed, not only as the wicked foes of Israel, but of God Himself. Say as Jews may, and do say, that their aloofness and particularism are the defects of their qualities, of their intense patriotism, intense faith in God, intense zeal for His cause, the plain fact remains that, *as a nation*, their divine election and consequent pride of race made them the most exclusive and self-righteous people on earth. And the individual Jew was not quite free from this self-righteous spirit, and for this reason. Even when, after Jeremiah and Ezekiel, religion had become purely personal, so innate in every Jew was the corporate sense, so essentially did he identify himself with his Israel, that he was ever apt to appropriate to *himself* a "righteousness" to which, undoubtedly, Israel could rightly lay claim above all other nations then. We see this note of personal self-righteousness in some psalms: "Judge me, O Lord, according to my righteousness" (vii.). "The Lord rewarded me according to my righteousness, etc." (xviii., cf. xxvi.); though we shall presently see how keenly alive most psalmists are to this danger.

But if the claim: "Jehovah is *our* God, we are *His* people," fostered exclusiveness and national pride, it was equally a source of great strength. The Israelite

knew well that *noblesse oblige*. Underlying Israel's whole Law is this principle: "Be ye holy, as I am Holy." This ideal of a people consecrated to God body, mind, and soul, individually and collectively, is grand and sublime, and it exercised a wondrous vitalising and inspiring influence for good on Israel and Israelite alike. Each member of God's Israel realised, not only God's nearness to himself as an Israelite, but his own great responsibility to his Israel and Israel's God. The individual Jew realised that, for good or ill, he was pouring his little stream of life into the tide of Israel's life, either speeding or retarding the coming of Israel's Kingdom of God on earth. And if "Jehovah, Israel's God and King," was an inspiring ideal to the Jew, so was the Temple, God's own House in His people's midst; and what a sense of responsibility and of the near Presence of God it awakened in Jewish hearts! In a way all but impossible for us to realise, the Jew felt that, in God's Temple, he was in God's actual and immediate Presence, a Presence even more real than Christ's Presence in the Eucharist to a Roman Catholic. To the Jew the Temple was as heaven itself, it awakened all that was best and noblest in him, brought him into an actual communion with God of the closest kind. "My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth for the courts of the Lord; my heart crieth out for the living God. . . . For a day in Thy courts is better than a thousand." He meant it; no empty words these. There, rapt in God, all his troubles and puzzles vanish: "It was too painful to me, until I went into the sanctuary of God, then understood I" (cf. xxvii. 4 sqq.). Not only was it a great privilege to appear before God in His Temple, it had a hallowing effect on his character, for there especially did he realise what a barrier sin created between the soul and its God, as Ps. xv. shows.

Clearly then, if Israel's claim to Jehovah as *Israel's* God fostered national pride, exclusiveness, and a

tendency to self-righteousness, it also acted as a keen spur to personal religion and rightness of life. Indeed, Humility, and not Pride, is the Psalter's note. No one is more keenly alive than the psalmist to the danger of that self-righteous pride which whispers to itself: "Lord, I thank Thee that I am not as other men are." The Psalter ever raises its voice against this self-deceiving spirit. Over and over again, and in many keys, does it harp on Christ's own stirring note: "The meek shall inherit the earth" (Ps. xxxvii. 11);

"The meek will He guide in judgment"; "The meek will He teach His way"; "Thou wilt bring down high looks"; "The Lord is nigh them that are of a broken heart, and saveth such as be of contrite spirit."

Too keenly alive was the pious Israelite to man's littleness and insignificance, his feebleness, his misery, his sin, too conscious of the majesty of the infinite and eternal God, to pride himself on his own "self-righteousness."

St. Paul also tells us the Law's one aim is to convict man of sin and bring him to the brink of despair. Was our pious Israelite on this brink of despair? No doubt the deepest contrition for sin is vividly portrayed, *e.g.* in Pss. xxxii. and li., sometimes in very forcible language: "I am weary with my groaning; all the night make I my bed to swim; I water my couch with my tears" (vi. 6). The contrite heart in all ages has found no language more vocal of its penitential sorrow or its joy of forgiveness than the words of, *e.g.* Pss. xxxii., li., ciii., cxxx. But, strange to say, the note of personal sin is not nearly so pronounced as we are apt to fancy in the Psalter; for most of its penitential psalms voice Israel's contrition *as a nation* (see "I" psalms, p. 262, *inf.*). Far from driven to the verge of despair by the Law's terrors, the Israelite of the Psalter is, if anything, over-confident, not because he is self-righteous, but because he reposes such infinite trust in God's loving

kindness and abundant forgiveness, and looks up to Him as a child to father, *e.g.* Ps. ciii.

Its critics tell us: "In Judaism, acts, not motives, count." Is this true? Our own holiest service begins with the prayer: "Almighty God, unto whom all hearts be open, etc." Did our pious Jew not know God as one who reads all our motives and from whom no secrets are hid?

"Thou hast searched me and known me, Thou understandest my thoughts afar off, there is not a word in my tongue but Thou knowest it altogether. . . . Such knowledge is too wonderful for me, I cannot attain unto it. Whither shall I go then from Thy Spirit, or flee from Thy Presence, etc." "Thou hast set our secret sins in the light of Thy countenance." "If we have forgotten the name of our God, shall not God search it out? For He knoweth the secrets of the heart." "If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me." "Search me, O God, and know my heart." "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me." "Blessed are they that seek Him with the whole heart."

"Judaism is all ritual and little moral." If so, how explain the Psalter as the Temple's Prayer and Hymn-Book? In it we have not only

"I will go into Thine House with burnt offerings, I will offer bullocks with goats"; but also "Thou desirest not sacrifice, else I would give it; Thou delightest not in burnt-offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit"; and "Would I eat the flesh of bulls or drink the blood of goats?"

The Psalter endorses the sacrifice of bulls, it also exalts the sacrifice of heart-service, and the Temple-congregation sing both kinds of psalms alike and endorse both, well knowing that sacramental service can be every whit as spiritual as prophetic service and that each without the other is lacking and lopsided. If Judaism ignored the moral factor, how are we to explain this anomaly? or such a psalm as Ps. xv.: "Lord, who shall abide in Thy Tabernacle?" and promptly answering its own question thus: "the man

whose life and character are right"? or how explain the equally plain fact that the Rabbis had as their Atonement-Day Lesson Is. lviii.—exactly as in our own Ash-Wednesday service—a chapter which insists that the only true fast is moral well-doing?

"The Law," say its critics, "was a heavy yoke; rewards and punishments the only incentives to a religious life." Can any one read Ps. cxix., with its refrain, repeated in many keys, "The Law of Thy mouth is better unto me than thousands of gold and silver"; "I delight in Thy Law"; "Sweeter (is it) than honey to my mouth"—and yet endorse that indictment? I readily own that it passes our understanding how a Jew of those days could revel in the Priestly Code with its strict Sabbath and Festival ordinances, its dietary rules of meats allowed and forbidden, its many regulations as to tithes and first-fruits, its precepts of "clean" and "unclean," and so forth. But he did! All we have said on the pious Israelite's conception of God, as proved by the Psalter, has been written in vain if it does not show that his implicit love and trust towards his loving Father, even when he did not understand the hard road along which that Father was leading him, was a love and trust that nothing could daunt. His attitude was akin to Job's "though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him."¹ Of one thing he was sure and certain, Israel's God, his God, might and did chasten him, His child, but only because He loved him so, and had His son's best interests at heart. And as he looked back—how he loved to look back! (*e.g.* Pss. lxxviii., cv., cvi., cxxxvi.)—and saw how lovingly God had fathered His Israel from Egypt onwards, his own heart overflowed with

¹ I am well aware that *in Job's mouth* "this rendering of the text expresses a thought which is beautiful in itself, but inconsistent with the context and the frame of mind in which Job is here speaking" (Driver, *Job*, *ad loc.*) and that the real meaning is: "Behold, He will slay me, well, I wait for the death-blow, but nothing will stop me from vindicating myself before Him." But, in the text above I am using it as ordinarily understood, because it exactly represents our pious Jew's own feelings,

love and gratitude. He asked himself, *not* "how little can I do and yet be safe?" but, "how can I ever let Father see how I love Him as I long to do?" His one wish and happiness was to please Father, his one fear and grief to pain Him by his character and conduct. For His people's best good, God had given Israel the Law to keep *for His sake* as well as for their own. That was enough for our pious Jew. From that moment his one wish, as God's child, his one privilege and joy, was to fulfil Father's will as expressed in that Law. He might not, he did not, always know why Father asked him to do this or that which he did not understand. It was something to be done for Father; Father wanted it done, that was enough for him, and he did it gladly. He knew Father to be firm, yet at heart very gentle; experience had taught him that Father's grief or displeasure, punishment even, invariably followed his violation of His Law, and his evil deeds; while Father's approval and joy, maybe rewards, were his when he did well. He loved the approval and reward, and looked forward to them. But he did not do what pleased Father because of the reward, but because Father asked him, because he loved Him, because it was an honour, privilege, pleasure to do it. The more God's express wishes or laws had to do with the details of his daily life—his food, his time, his work, his crops, his person, his thoughts, his words—the more honour and pleasure it was to him. Something to be done for Father from morn to eve, something to be lovingly done which transfigured earthly life, turned its common metal into gold, made it beautiful and divine.

This is not mere play of fancy on our part. We merely voice the spirit inspiring such psalms as cxix. or xix. 7 sqq. Their one theme is: Gladly obey the Law, for it is so right, so sweet, so good; here and now it brings with it its own reward, intimate fellowship with Father; the more freely you obey it, the more joyously and lovingly you keep it for its own

sake, the more are you like Father (xvii. 15). Of course, hope of reward and fear of punishment play their part in Judaism as in every other religion, Christianity included, but no more. So long as religion is for the many and not for the few, the stimulus of reward is a necessity. But to not a few Israelite psalmists, the assurance of a close walk with Father is reward enough. So close is this walk with God that they feel sure that not even death can sever it. Read those sublime psalms, Pss. xvi. 8-11, lxxiii. 23-26.

Morality under the Law.—Naturally, a *Temple Hymn-Book* is not nearly so good an index to Judaism's moral background as would be *Prov.*, *Chron.*, *Job*, its contemporaries; but here we shall use the Psalter as before. It limits our scope, for, like other hymn-books, it deals but little with ethics pure and simple, yet it is steeped in morality. Over the Psalter might be written Isaiah's: "Cease to do evil, learn to do well, seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, plead for the widow and orphan"; or still more, Micah's: "What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" Take Ps. xv., for instance:

"Lord, who shall dwell in Thy Tabernacle, or who shall rest upon Thy holy hill? Even he that leadeth an uncorrupt life, and doeth the thing which is right, and speaketh the truth from his heart; he that hath used no deceit in his tongue, nor done evil to his neighbour. He that setteth not by himself, but is lowly in his own eyes; he that sweareth unto his neighbour and disappointeth him not, though it were to his own hindrance; he that hath not taken reward against the innocent. Whoso doeth these things shall never fall."

Justice, compassion, loving-kindness are the notes of psalmist morality. Their ideal is

"Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other. Truth springeth out of the earth and righteousness hath looked down from heaven."

Feed the hungry, help the poor and afflicted, champion the oppressed, is also a dominant note.

"Thou art the helper of the friendless"; "To help the poor and fatherless unto their right"; "Blessed is he that considereth the poor and needy." "Righteousness and judgment for all that are oppressed"; "He will regard the prayer of the destitute, . . . hear the groaning of the prisoner."

It is easy to take one-half of Judaism, the ritual or Priestly Code section, and then say that Judaism places ritual on a level with morality, but it is a gross libel on Judaism as an organic whole. It would be the easiest thing in the world to give a crushing reply to this indictment out of post-exilic Old Testament books. Even in the Priestly Code itself we find more than one anticipation of the Sermon on the Mount, *e.g.* :

"Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, saith the Lord; thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart" (Lev. xix. 18); just as Prov. xxv. 21 tells us: "If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; if he be thirsty, give him water to drink"; and xx. 22: "Say not thou, I will recompense evil," and xxiv. 29; "Say not, I will do to him as he hath done to me; I will render to the man according to his work." Very modern, too, is Job on the slave: "Did not He that made me in the womb make him? and did not One fashion us in the womb?" (xxx. 15).¹

Such is the Psalter's portrait of Judaism under the Law from 550-150 B.C. It stops just where we

¹ Rabbinic teaching is full of moral pearls, *e.g.* : "He that washes himself because of a corpse and touches it again, what avails his washing? So it is with a man who fasts for his sins and goes again and does the same; who will hear his prayer, and what avails him his humbling?" or, "Where the penitents stand, the faultless self-righteous stand not." "This world is like a vestibule before the world to come, prepare thyself in the vestibule that thou mayst enter into the hall." "Better is one hour of repentance and good deeds in this world than the whole life of the world to come; and better is one hour of blissfulness of spirit in the world to come than the whole life of this world." Judaism is singularly well balanced here, it does not overexalt or depreciate life here; it preaches God's Kingdom on earth as well as in heaven.

most long for information; we should like it to sketch in the next 150 years, so as to give us its picture of it in our Lord's day. For our Old Testament period, however, it amply suffices. It will perhaps be asked:—Even though the Psalter clearly proves how good and spiritual a life God-fearing Israelites lived under the Law, it seems paradoxical, and how are we to account for it? We study the Priestly Code, and what does it consist of? It is largely a long dry set of rules about ritual and sacrifice; Temple, priests, altar, Holy days; dietary laws; regulations concerning tithes, first-fruits, fees; quaint archaic definitions of "clean" and "unclean." How could such a legal and ceremonial code inspire men to lead such holy lives? No doubt the Priestly Code in all this had some disciplinary, educative, uplifting value. It held before men's eyes an ideal of duty to be achieved, laws to be obeyed, sin to be forgiven, a holy God to be glorified, a spirit of holiness to be realised in a man's own life. Moreover, touching man's life at every turn, even as to what he ate or drank, it gave a dignity and sanctity to life as a whole, even in its everyday homely details, which cannot but have been of immense value. Still, the fact remains that the Priestly Code in itself hardly seems adequate for the production of such splendid results as the Psalter undoubtedly reveals.

No one for a moment pretends that it was adequate, Jews least of all! Had Judaism only had the Priestly Code for its Law or Torah, we should never have had that vast array of saintly lives under the Law. The word Law or Torah is a most elastic and comprehensive term to a Jew. It means the Priestly Code,¹ yes, *and* the whole Pentateuch, often

¹ As Mr. Montefiore tells me: "That is the one thing it does not *ever* mean as a *separate entity*. After all, the 'Priestly Code' is a nineteenth-century discovery! No Jew, from, shall we say, 300 B.C. onward, ever heard of it. He *knew* of the one and indivisible Pentateuch, and of that only. The ordinary Jew did not ever know the Priestly Code as he knew, say, 'Numbers' or 'Deuteronomy,' as a *separate part* of the Torah."

the whole Bible, and oral tradition as well. The Code was only *one* of the portions of the Bible read every Sabbath in the thousand Jewish synagogues, and "meditated day and night" in Hebrew homes. Equally with the Code, the lofty inspiring teaching of Deuteronomy, with its warm moral and spiritual ideals, formed the "Book of the Law" and Israel's rule of life. The "Prophets" were not included in the actual Bible for some time after the Pentateuch had been canonised, but from 586 B.C. they were undoubtedly read and studied, and soon publicly read for edification in the synagogues. Together with Deuteronomy, the Prophets ever remained the eloquent and inspiring exponents of spiritual religion, and the Psalter clearly shows how steeped in their teaching was the Israelite. At no time were the Jews under the *sole* rule of the Code. A Jew no more confined himself to Leviticus than we do; "he could appreciate Leviticus, and he could also appreciate Isaiah" (Montefiore).

We are too apt to cut up Israel's religious history into so many watertight compartments, just as Ezekiel in his Vision divides the Holy Land into rectangular sections. We label 800-600 B.C. the age of prophetic or spiritual religion; 600 B.C.-1 the age of priestly legalism. No people, Israel or any other, thus moves forward on one line or in the mass. As repeatedly stated, ceremonial laws and sacrificial ritual were rife in the prophetic age; the Psalter proves the vitality of prophetic spirituality in the legal age. Really and truly there was far more living religion of the spirit after than before the Exile, if we gauge a nation's religious life, not by a few outstanding personalities, but by its tone as a whole.

To judge post-exilic Judaism aright, look at its varied literature: (1) priestly books, *e.g.* The Code, Chron., Ezra, Nehemiah; (2) a Psalter which is both priestly and prophetic; (3) Prov. and Job, almost exclusively prophetic (ethical); (4) Ruth, Esther,

Ecclesiastes; (5) apocalyptic Daniel,—and what will forcibly strike you is the richness and manifoldness of post-exilic Judaism. How are we to account for it? In two ways: (a) Post-exilic literature is essentially reflective and conservative, rather than creative. It enters on the labours of its predecessors, is wholly based on the Pentateuch and "The Prophets," and these faced Truth from many points of view. As Montefiore writes (*H.L.*, 543): "A main cause of the varied character of its religious beliefs was the heavy burden of a sacred Scripture whereof every sentence was necessarily true. The Babel of different doctrines in the Canon of the O.T. was regarded as equally accurate and divine throughout." (b) Long ago Robertson Smith gave us the clue to this "O.T. Babel of different doctrines": "The Semitic genius does not at all lie in the direction of organic structure. In architecture, in poetry, in history, the Hebrew adds part to part instead of developing a single notion." We have frequently referred to this Hebrew trait. The Hebrew Bible proves it up to the hilt, *e.g.* the Hexateuch is made up of four distinct and inconsistent layers, wide apart in date, style, tone, yet welded together as if one organic whole; so is Isaiah. In the same Gen. and Sam. we have two inconsistent accounts of the Creation, Flood, election of Saul as king, and of Samuel's rôle. Independent documents, mutually inconsistent pictures, are hung side by side with little or no attempt at harmonising them. Clearly the inconsistency did not jar on, or even strike, a Jew as it does us.

Now exactly the same tendency, the same lack of organic unity,—and for these two reasons,—comes out pronouncedly in Hebrew post-exilic theology. It is the reverse of logical, coherent, dogmatic, systematic; it is full of contradictions. Yet, strange as it sounds, herein lies its strength, and for reasons already given. Not knowledge, but conduct, is the end of life, and in actual practical life, as

H. Sidgwick (*Methods of Ethics*) was for ever telling us, common sense prompts men to order their life, not on one hard-and-fast line, but on two, three, or four fundamental principles, each of which finds a response in our nature. Hence, precisely because Judaism was simple, undogmatic, incoherent, it satisfied and quickened the religious aspirations of "all sorts and conditions" of ordinary men, and proved itself a religion, "not only admirably suited to the everyday moralities of common life, but also pre-eminently calculated to evoke that constancy and heroism which have sustained its adherents through centuries of suffering and persecution."

We hold no brief for Judaism. No doubt, in extreme cases, it did produce self-righteous Pharisees. Human nature is too frail not to take advantage of a creed which seems to attach high value to outward ordinances, if its votaries choose to focus their eyes on one of its factors and ignore the others. The Psalter proves how alive to this danger Jews themselves were. But is Pharisaism peculiar to Judaism, and are we Christians in a position to cast the first stone? Again, not for one moment do we hold up the Law as faultless. Its two weak points are self-evident, and many Liberal Jews recognise them to-day: (*a*) too much emphasis is laid on archaic rules of ceremonial, many of them survivals of primitive man's creed; (*b*) a greater defect still is its narrow particularism, making it all but monopolise the God of the universe as *Israel's* God, and regard other nations as in a very inferior position, both in respect to Him and to themselves. Here our whole contention is that the scathing impeachment of Judaism¹ on the part of Paul and his modern disciples is un-Christian and untrue. A religion should be judged by the frame of heart it produces in its

¹ I am not blind to such passages as Rom. iii. sqq., vii. 12, ix. 4, Gal. iii. 24, etc.; but if we take St. Paul's estimate as a whole, the total impression he means to convey, the wording of this sentence is not one whit too strong.

adherents and by its fruits as seen in their lives. Before we condemn Judaism wholesale, as we are so apt to do, well for us if we study its Psalter, Job, and II. Isaiah, and then ask with Christ: "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?"¹

¹ Judaism is really the confluence of two streams, the prophetic and the priestly. Israel's spiritual leaders had to deal with men as they found them then and as they are to-day. Prophetic ideals these post-exilic leaders still regard as of the essence of religion. But they also find in men's hearts a "sacramental" leaning, a tendency to view religious services, rites, institutions, not only as spiritual means of grace to those who come to them in a right frame of heart, but as effective instruments of grace in themselves to all and any who partake of them; moreover, they see how great is its power as a factor in man's religious life. They recognise that religion in this world of men, if it is to influence all and not merely a select few, must appeal to the eye and imagination as well as to the heart and mind. Ideals must be expressed in symbolic institutions as well as in words, and, all said and done, rites and acted deeds are as essential to a well-balanced religion as creeds. Call rites, if you will, the "accident of Religion," even as you may call outward and visible tokens of love the accidents of affection, yet neither religion nor affection can thrive without them. So Israel's leaders try to correlate prophetic truths and priestly ritual; with what success, the Psalter shows; it speaks for itself.

And they were perfectly right. Truth is many-sided, and no one-sided expression (be it prophetic or priestly) of spiritual realities will do. We want both the prophetic and the priestly atmosphere, though not their shibboleths, for two reasons: (a) men are influenced by unconscious habits as well as by conscious convictions, and (b), as already said (p. 218 *sup.*), religion is largely temperamental. In religion, one man's bread is a stone to another. A comprehensive Jewish Church (cf. Anglican to-day) saw that, and faced religious Truth from different aspects to gather all to her bosom. Hence my strong plea for Judaism. To me personally, legalism, Jewish or Anglican, appeals not at all. It does not feed my soul; it starves it. Yet when I see its good fruits, how it kept a kingless nation compact for centuries, saved it from the corrupting Hellenistic spirit, served as "schoolmaster leading men unto Christ," and the many saints it produced, far be it from me to condemn it, "lest haply I be found even to be fighting against God."

CHAPTER XV

(I.) THE "HOLY WRITINGS": INTRODUCTORY

THE Exile had quashed Israel politically. Henceforth the Jews are under foreign yoke. Amid their present misfortunes, the memories of the past are idealised and they live in that glorious past. In their Captivity a Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and II. Isaiah had comforted them; now even that source of comfort is gone. "We see not our signs, there is no more any prophet; neither is there any among us that knoweth how long. O Lord, how long shall the enemy reproach? Why withdrawest Thou Thy hand?"¹ To obey the Law of Jehovah and patiently await the Deliverer that should redeem Israel was the only vocation left.

Thus the political annihilation of Israel, the present misery, and the dearth of prophecy, all tended to hallow the past. Its sacred Books were now Israel's sheet-anchor, both as enshrining their glorious past and as God's own Word to them in which He made known the perfect way of life. Here is the key to post-exilic literature. Meditation on the past, ardent study of the Law and the Prophets, an eager looking forward to the "Day of the Lord" which is to usher in Israel's Golden Age,—are its key-notes. So we now enter upon the age of psalms, wisdom-literature, apocalypses, all drawing their

¹ I know well that this is a late Ps. (possibly Maccabæan), but it is appropriate here, for Haggai, Zech., Mal., Joel—even if we call them prophets with "open vision"—close the prophetic list *c.* 450, except Trito-Isaiah, and the fine apocalyptic Is. xxiv.—xxvii. For reasons given in p. 175 *sup.* and *n.*, prophecy practically ceases after the Exile.

inspiration from a deep meditation on the Law and the Prophets. In this chapter we sketch the main types and features of these "Holy Writings," in following chapters we shall review the individual books.

Up to Ezekiel, prophets were Israel's main teachers; now the scribes and the "wise" replace them. The prophet comes to the whole nation as God's spokesman; the scribe makes the Law the complete revelation of God's Will and the chief guide of life; the "wise" man is the prophet's successor and inculcates the same moral truths, but seeks to gain the individual's rather than the nation's ear. "The Law¹ shall not perish from the priest (= scribe), nor counsel from the wise, nor the Word from the prophet" (Jer. xviii. 18). Clearly, the writings of scribes will differ from those of the "wise"; the one will be more legal, the other more prophetic and ethical.

(A) *Scribal Writings*.—The deification of the Law by Ezekiel and the Code called into existence a new class of men, scribes, originally priests, men of letters who devoted themselves all but exclusively to the study of the Law (p. 187, *sup.*). Ezra is the great type of the new order. *Ezra* vii. describes him as "a ready scribe in the Law of Moses, . . . who had set his heart to seek the Law of the Lord, and to do it, and to teach in Israel its statutes and judgments." With these scribes the Law was the chief rule of faith and practice. To them we owe *Ezra*, *Nehemiah*, and *Chronicles*—all three form one book really—written entirely from the Priestly Code standpoint.

(B) *Wisdom-Literature*.—Of quite a different stamp are such books as *Prov.*, *Job*, *Eccl.*, (some) *Psalms*.

¹ The A.V. and R.V. translation of Jer. xviii. 18 is not quite correct. As Dr. Burney tells me: "Law (*torah*) is here without the definite article and means, not *the* Law, but a *verbal* giving of judgment by the priest on a point upon which he might be consulted: cf. same A. and R.V. misinterpretation of Hag. ii. 11, 12, which means: 'Ask now the priests a torah, saying, If a man carry holy flesh, etc.'" So, here again, it is not strictly correct to identify "Law" and "the Law," or "priest" with "scribe."

They also draw their inspiration from the Law and the Prophets, but not in the narrow legal spirit of the scribes. With the exception of Job and Pss., the wisdom-literature lacks the originality and fire of the pre-exilic writings, but is full of the charm of genuine feeling and sweet utterance, and often rises to a sublime energy of faith and devotion.

At first men were content, as in most of the psalms, with utterances of thankfulness to God for mercies received, with prayers for help, deliverance, and guidance, or with words of praise, adoration, and heart-felt trust. Soon, however, deep moral problems confronted these saintly Hebrew thinkers, and had to be faced. From the moment that Jeremiah (xxxii.) and Ezekiel (xviii.) made religion a personal matter between God and the individual soul, these problems were bound to arise. This prophetic revelation changed the whole aspect of religion, and the great question now crying for an answer is this: "How can we reconcile a belief in God's moral government of the world with actual experience? Why does vice prosper and virtue suffer?" So long as the nation was all in all, and the fortunes of the individual wholly merged in it, this moral problem was less puzzling. In its adversity, as Isaiah's "Suffering Servant" showed, a righteous Israel was bearing and atoning for the guilt of its wicked members. But from the moment that religion became personal, this answer would not do. The only answer that really meets the case is a belief in a life of actual fellowship with God, not only here, but in a life beyond the grave where all men's wrongs are righted by God Himself. But the Hebrew mind was very slow in reaching this solution of the problem. Did it reach it before 300 B.C., if as early? Meanwhile one writer after another faced and tried to solve the problem, never with complete success. By far the maturest Hebrew thought on this subject is to be found in the deep spiritual wrestlings of *Job*, and the pessimistic,

half-cynical scepticism of *Ecclesiastes*, a baffled seeker after truth who would believe and cannot.

Side by side with a *Job*, *Eccles.*, and a psalmist here and there, who face the problem of evil in its depth, stands another class whose facile optimism just skims the surface of it. They are moral thinkers and also the children of this reflective age, but on a lower level. They are men who survey life from a common-sense practical religious standpoint, without troubling themselves much with deep moral problems, moralists who seek to gain the ear of the young and the general public with their moral maxims, and inculcate upon them the principles of right conduct. With shrewd common-sense and a practical faith in God, they bring their moral insight to bear on life, and show that the wise man is he who lives his life with the fear of God in his heart, the fool he who is self-willed and flies in the face of God's moral law. *Proverbs* well represents this class of moral reflection. More or less prudential and utilitarian, it is not over-inspiring or inspired.

(C) *Apocalypses*.—The annihilation of the nation, the foreign oppressor's yoke, and the present misery also called into being a third class of literature at this period, again drawing all its inspiration from the older prophetic books. The present was blank; only memories of a glorious past, written in books, remained to God's Israel. Men were asking in anguish: "Has God quite forgotten His People and His Covenant-promises? When will He again visit and redeem His Israel?" Men turned to the prophetic books for some gleam of comfort and there made a discovery. The prophetic woes and judgments they knew by heart and by sad personal experience; but to their joy they found a number of still *unfulfilled* promises, promises of the full restoration of the kingdom to Israel, promises of a Golden Age of joy, plenty, peace, of triumph over all their foes. These promises they seized upon and were buoyed up with

new hopes, for the Word of God must be fulfilled. Out of the mass of these unfulfilled promises of the new and perfect Israel, and along the line of their Messianic visions, apocalyptic writers now mapped out Israel's future according to their hopes, even in the matter of fixing precise dates. Thus *Daniel* kept Israel's hopes alive by showing that the 70 years foretold by Jeremiah were 70 weeks of years, so that the longed-for era was only just drawing near.

(D) *Religious Romances*.—Another feature of this age is the production of religious romances, e.g. the graceful prose-*idyll* of *Ruth*,¹ the dramatic and popular, though greatly inferior *Esther*, and the pseudo-historical setting of *Jonah* and *Daniel*.

Perhaps the two points that most strike us in the "Holy Writings" are: (1) their new notes, e.g. angelology, eschatology, and universalism; (2) the miscellaneous and incongruous character of the "Holy Writings" thus grouped together.

(1) *Angelology*.—Most noteworthy after the Captivity is the sudden growth of a system or hierarchy of angels and demons in Judaism. *Before the Exile* angels only rarely appear in the Old Testament, and in the prophets hardly at all. Practically the only references to them are Gen. xxviii. and xxxii. in connection with Jacob, (and in these passages alone called "angels"); Isaiah's Vision (Is. vi.), where they are called "seraphim"; 1 Kgs. xxii. 19-22, where the host of heaven form Jehovah's Council; Gen.

¹ As stated later on, the style of *Ruth* so closely approximates to the finest examples of the golden period of pre-exilic literature that its post-exilic date is open to question. *Esther* is undoubtedly late third or early second century, and a romance. *Jonah's* date is much disputed, but probably late. The fable portions of it are self-evident, e.g. the sea-monster story, and the singing of a psalm (Jon. ii. 2-9, a later editor's interpolation) in the fish's belly; but the moral of *Jonah* is grand, viz. Jon. iv. 10-11 in which the nobler universalistic spirit of Judaism rebukes the lower, narrow, exclusive particularism of the Jews, to whom God's long-suffering patience with their heathen foes was a stumbling-block. Of *Daniel* we speak at length in our last chapter. *Esther*, *Ruth*, *Jonah* are only a few survivors of a larger literature of this type, and others are preserved for us in the Apocrypha, e.g. *Judith*, *Tobit*; they give us a good idea of the popular religious short stories recited by Hebrew storytellers c. 300-1 B.C. *Esther* and *Ruth* were written with a purpose.

vi. 2, where "sons of God" probably mean angelic beings. In the phrase "Angel of Jehovah," the Angel is not a messenger of God, but God Himself.

So with devils. Before the Exile we only hear of a devil in Gen. iii., under the form of a serpent; in Lev. xvi. as Azazel, an evil spirit dwelling in the wilderness; and in Is. xxxiv. 14, Lilith, a hag of the night, is a female demon. In popular religion demons abounded, but, before the Exile, an omnipotent God is the source of evil as well as good to Bible-writers. He hardens Pharaoh's heart; in His anger incites David to the sin of a census; sends an evil spirit upon Saul; makes the heart of the people fat, shuts their eyes and ears lest they repent (Is. vi.); "I make peace and create evil" (Is. xlv. 7, during the Exile). The "lying spirit" in Micaiah's vision, luring Ahab to his doom (1 Kgs. xxii. 22 sq.), is no devil, but from the Lord (cf. Ezek. xiii., xiv.).

After the Exile we suddenly find a whole system of angels and demons divided into regular orders from archangels and arch-demons downwards. God heads one hierarchy, Satan the other. How account for it? It must have arisen during the Captivity when the Jews came under direct Persian influence. Persian religion divides the universe between Ormuzd, a good god of light, and Ahriman, an evil god of darkness. Ahriman is ever at war with his rival Ormuzd, trying to mar all he does. Each god heads his host of angels or demons, who are respectively marshalled under subordinate officers as in an army. This idea of angels and devils appealed to Jewish thought in two ways: (1) A "holy" God is too transcendent and pure to come into direct contact with an "unclean" and defiling world. This hierarchy of angels, as intermediary agents, enables Him to deal with His universe without coming into actual touch with it;

¹ In Pss. lviii. (1 sq. R.V. m.), lxxxii. 1, 6, and Dan. x. 13-20 angels are patron angels of the nations. In Dan. xii. 1, Michael is Israel's guardian angel, elsewhere in the O.T. only God is.

(2) the idea of God tempting to evil was offensive to Jews after the Exile, so, in *Chron.*, Satan replaces God in tempting David to number the people (cf. 1 Chron. xvi. 1; 2 Sam. xxiv. 1). The other references¹ to "the Satan" are twice in Zech. iii., and often in Job, where he reminds God of man's sin or provokes it. It has also been urged that Judaism saw in Satan a solution of the problem of evil, otherwise irreconcilable with the Providence of a righteous God; but this is questionable, for it practically makes no further use of him beyond the cases quoted. In the apocalyptic and apocryphal books, and throughout the New Testament, Satan and demons are far more to the fore.

Persian ideas also stimulated Jewish religious thought in other ways. In the Persian *Avesta* there is a picture of a new heaven and a new earth to follow the final judgment and destruction of the powers of evil (cf. Is. lxv. 17; lxvi. 22; and Is. xxiv. 21, according to Charles and Moulton, Hastings' *D. of B.*, iv. 990). The idea of an individual resurrection and a millennial expectation likewise developed early in Parsism.

Eschatology.—To this we give a separate chapter later. Here we need only note that, from pre-prophetic days, Israel looked forward to a "Day of the Lord," a day of judgment when Jehovah would stand up for His Israel, crush their foes, and make Israel very great and prosperous. After the Exile all signs of this glorious Hebrew kingdom, so often foretold by the prophets, grew less and less, and seemed all but past praying for. But the darker the outlook, the brighter and stronger and more deep-rooted was the Hebrew conviction that God would somehow intervene, powerfully vindicate His own and His people's honour (cf. Ezek. xxxviii. sq. and Is. xlvi. 11), redeem and magnify His Israel. Apocalyptic writers spring up on all sides about 300 B.C. onward and fan this hope. They see the Golden

¹ Ps. cix. 6 is questionable.

Age suddenly bursting forth upon an astonished earth, and Messiah appearing to redeem and avenge God's Chosen People. With all their manifold differences, almost all apocalypses agree on certain points: The present age is very evil and subject to Satan and the powers of evil; the age to come is very good and to be brought in by direct act of God. The end of the present age is to be heralded by an epoch of unparalleled wickedness, like Daniel's "abomination of desolation." Then the "Day of the Lord" will dawn and Messiah appear suddenly. At His coming He will crush all His adversaries, and Satan with his hierarchy of devils will fall. Messiah then sits as Judge and metes out punishment to the wicked angels and men. Then the Kingdom of God is established on earth. The righteous dead Israelites are raised to share in it, and a reign of joy, peace, plenty, and righteousness is inaugurated.

Such is the broad outline, but the picture is variously conceived in different apocalypses. Sometimes Messiah is human, sometimes superhuman, at times the Deliverer is God Himself. The Kingdom is now political, now spiritual; at times it is to last 1,000 years, at others for ever. The resurrection is in some writers for the righteous only, in others for "many," in others again for "all," good and bad alike. But always it is a *Jewish* kingdom: other nations are either Israel's vassals or, if admitted on equal terms, have first been converted to Judaism. If there is a Messianic King—usually there is, but God is often represented as the only King,—he is frequently made out to be of Davidic lineage. Malachi adds that Elijah must first appear to prepare the way for Him. At times the present earth is the scene of the Kingdom, at others heaven and earth are transfigured and a new Jerusalem comes down from heaven; in later apocalypses, the Kingdom is transferred to heaven itself.

Universalism.—In large sections of the "wisdom-

literature" or "Holy Writings" (= Hagiographa) little or no stress is laid on those particularistic traits which mark off the Jew from other religious people. Only such moral and spiritual principles are emphasised as are the common inheritance of the godly everywhere. No special stress is laid on ritual or sacrifice; external exercises of worship lose their old significance and the claims of the Priestly Code practically fall into the background. The "wise" had no quarrel at all with Israel's ritual, law, sacrifices, and other institutions; far from it. But their one aim was to train individual men's hearts in the ways of righteousness, to give them moral and religious principles of universal application wherever men might live, so that each might be a law unto himself as Jer. xxxi. 33 sqq. indicated.

Now, how account for this universalism? The spirit of the age partly explains it. Although legalism is in the air, the prophetic school is also well represented in Judaism, and its many adherents, steeped in prophetic teaching, have risen through it to universal conceptions of God and His world, and are trying to win their fellows to adopt these large truths and live by them.

But quite another factor contributed largely to this universalism, viz., contact with other peoples from 600 B.C. onward. Israel's long residence in Babylonia was in itself a liberal education. The Jews are uniquely adaptable, readily assimilate ideas and weave them into their own system of thought. Not that they just borrow foreign ideas and transfer them bodily into their own creed; they are far too conservative and jealous of their religion for that; but they allow them to come in as suggestions to stimulate Jewish religious thought.

Far too much capital can be made of Israel's Babylonian and Persian loans; for instance, take the case of Jewish angelology and eschatology just discussed. It would be absurd to speak of Satan and

his angels as bodily borrowed from Ahriman and his demon-host. In their popular religion the Jews already had a Devil of their own and demon-spirits in plenty. What the Jews did borrow was the idea of a regular *hierarchy* of angels and demons each under a supreme head. So of their eschatology and belief in a resurrection. Not only did the Jews from earliest days share the general idea of souls surviving in Sheol, but along a (Messianic) line of their own they were slowly aspiring after a life of real fellowship with God after death (see p. 161 sq., *sup.* and Ch. XIX.). Here, again, all we have the right to say is that the Persian belief in a resurrection stimulated thoughtful Jews to convert their aspirations into convictions, and to develop this doctrine in a thoroughly Jewish form.

The same thing holds good of Babylonian influence and loans. The Babylonian priesthood were a highly-trained and fully-organised hierarchy, experts in the ritual and sacred books of their religion, judges and teachers, chroniclers and editors of the national history, while their temples had a most elaborate ritual and a rich stock of liturgical services (Ch. VI., *sup.*). Cheyne is of opinion that from Babylonia Ezekiel, Ezra, and other spiritual leaders received their suggestion of literary activity, a well-organised hierarchy, and an elaborate Temple-worship. True, the Jews were already beginning to develop all this for themselves before the Captivity; but only *after* the Exile does it actually and suddenly bloom in full-grown form and vigour. We shall see Jewish thought stimulated and broadened by foreign influences in other ways.

This broader outlook is stamped on every other page of the Holy Writings. The "wise" now see God fulfilling Himself in many ways; they see that man's moral life and the workings of Providence are but elements in the one great divine system embracing all things, both the world of Nature and the destinies

of men. The world is one organic whole, and God is the meaning of it. To this great divine scheme they give the name "The Wisdom of God" (Prov. viii.; Job xxviii.), while the wisdom of man consists in grasping and falling into line with the Divine Wisdom. The one motto of the "wise" is: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of all wisdom." Naturally, in such a universal divine system there is no room for petty national particularism.

Did this new idea of Wisdom come to Israel from the East, even as the kindred idea of the "Word" in St. John is undoubtedly a loan from Greek philosophy? The East certainly was the home of "wisdom-literature" from time immemorial. Their sacred books are full of it. But we can press this too far. We have seen how near the eighth-century prophets came to this universalistic note of one divine all-embracing system, while the moral ideals of the Hebrew prophets are clearly the source from which the "wise" draw their inspiration. Stimulative suggestion is all we can attribute to Eastern influences, or to Greek, if, as many scholars hold, not a few of the books of the "Holy Writings" come within the Greek period.

(2) *The "Holy Writings" a miscellaneous and incongruous group.*—*Prov., Ruth, Lament., Job, Esther, Canticles, Psalms, Daniel, Eccles., Ezra, Nehemiah, Chron.*, that is to say, moral philosophy, idylls, dirges, romance, love-song, hymns, apocalypses, prophecy, history, all massed into one group. What a strange medley it all seems! Why not, for example, have put *Daniel* with the prophets, and *Chron.* with the historical books? The reason is perfectly simple. It is all due to the fact that, by reason of late date or other cause, these books were originally all excluded from the earlier Canon of Scripture, and had to be put all together in a group of their own under one title, "Holy Writings," when they themselves became "Scripture."

Gradual Formation of the Canon.—As already stated (p. 211 sq.), the first Canon of Scripture was formed in 444 B.C., and only the Mosaic Books, under the name of the "Book of the Law," found a place in it. The Law came to Israel direct from the mouth of God Himself, so it was "holy" as no other book is holy. In 444 it alone was the Bible; nothing else was fit to stand by its side. But the Canon could not always stand at that. *Joshua, Sam., Judg., Kgs.*, the *Prophets*, were sacred books highly revered and treasured, Israel's sheet-anchor with the Law in the Exile. Yet for over 100 years these prophetic writings were not added to the Canon. God undoubtedly "spake in and by the prophets," but the Law was literally *from His own lips*, and the two could not be bracketed together. Not till about 300-250 B.C. was a second Canon formed including these other books. They were *all* massed in a secondary group under the general title of "The Prophets,"¹ thus: (a) *The Former Prophets*: Josh., Judg., Sam., Kgs.; (b) *The Latter Prophets*, Is., Jer., Ezek., and the Twelve minor prophets, the latter all massed into one book. Tradition ascribes the Second Canon also to Nehemiah; but its formation is of much later date.

The Bible is now "The Law and the Prophets." But it could not stop at that either. *Psalms, Prov., Ruth, Canticles, Eccles.*, and other highly-prized religious writings already existed when the Second Canon was formed and closed. Why were they not admitted? Simply because they were neither "Law" nor "Prophets"; *i.e.* they were not (1) from God's own mouth as the Law, nor (2) Law-enforcing "oracles of God" from His direct and inspired mouthpieces, the Prophets. The Law was *the* actual Word of God, the Prophets spoke His Word at His

¹ Note that each subdivision of "The Prophets" contains four Books. The *historical* Josh., Judg., Sam., Kgs. are included under the "Prophets" because (a) they are the work of prophetic schools, (b) the inculcation of prophetic religious truths, and not mere history, is their aim.

dictation, but how could these other books claim to be the Word of God? If a gulf was felt to exist between the "holiest" Law and the "holy" Prophets, far wider still was the gap between the Prophets and these other writings. Some considerable time had to elapse before the idea of canonicity could be made sufficiently elastic to include them. From the inclusion of *Daniel*, written about 160 B.C., the Third Canon cannot date much before 100 B.C. Then these books were *all* grouped under one heading as the Hagiographa or "Holy Writings." Some only found their way into the Canon at all with great difficulty; all ranked distinctly below "The Law and the Prophets."

The claims of the various books to admission into the Canon varied greatly. The *Psalms*, from their supposed Davidic authorship and their sacred use in Temple-worship, as well as on their own intrinsic merits, were always recognised as inspired. *Proverbs* early established its canonicity by reason of its edifying religious tone and (especially) the authority of its professed author. *Ruth* and *Lamentations* were long regarded as forming a kind of appendix to *Judg.* and *Jer.* respectively, and as unquestionably canonical. *Job's* inspiration was universally admitted, while its venerable antiquity as Job's own work was fully credited and carried great weight. *Daniel* was at once received as an inspired prophecy and assigned to a far earlier date than it can claim. *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* (originally one book "*Ezra*") were regarded as the last inspired works, *Nehemiah* being regarded as the last of the prophets; together with *Chronicles* they would be highly revered by an age living under the Priestly Code; *Ezra* and *Neh.* because of their canonisation of the Law in 444, the foundation of Judaism, and *Chron.* because of the prominence given to Temple-worship and its priesthood. *Canticles* and *Ecclesiastes* were fully believed to be Solomon's, and *Esther*, assigned to the Persian period, still the age of inspiration, with its glorious patriotism, its triumph

over heathen foes, and its explanation of the festival of Purim, was also deemed worthy of canonicity. But over *Canticles*, for its sensual tone, *Ecclesiastes*, because of its cynical scepticism, and *Esther*, for its omission of God's name and lack of spirituality, there were very great questionings of heart, and, down to 90 A.D. and even later, the discussion waxed long and furious as to their admission into the Canon.

The supposed antiquity—as gauged in 100 B.C.—of all these Holy Writings contributed greatly to their canonicity. The Spirit of God was held to have been in full operation, inspiring “men of God,” down to the end of the prophetic period, Nehemiah's day. The Spirit's province included not only “The Law and the Prophets,” but other sacred books as well. Not so since that date: “We see not our signs, there is no more any prophet.”

To sum up. The formation of the Canon was a long and gradual process from 444 B.C. to 90 A.D. It really began from the day that the “Book of the Covenant” (c. 800 B.C.) was written, and lasted to 90 A.D. We hear much of the part played in it by Ezra, the “men of the Great Synagogue,” and other learned scribes, but their rôle in this important work can be greatly exaggerated. Long before 444 B.C. the older Books of the Bible had secured for themselves a firm hold in the esteem and reverence of the people. They would, in any case, have won their way into the Canon. These scribes and rabbinic councils simply gave official sanction to what public opinion had already hallowed. No Church dogma ever consecrates anything that has not already passed into practice for a century or two. It was enlightened public religious opinion that formed the Canon, and its value and finality must be judged by the same test. The acclamation of souls, the spiritually-guided intelligence and verdict, not of this or that individual or body of individuals, but of the general body of spiritually-minded men throughout the world, must

be the final court of appeal. Really and truly, the test of the canonicity of these Books lies within themselves and nowhere else. When the question arises: "Are *Canticles*, *Eccles.*, and *Esther*¹ worthy of a place in the Canon?" The one answer is this: "Do they, or do they not, bear clear witness within themselves to their own inspiration as containing a revelation and declaration of the Divine Will?" As the Westminster Confession well puts it: "We may be moved by the testimony of the Church to an high and reverend esteem of the Holy Scripture . . . yet our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth, and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts." With Westcott we believe that the Canon was formed "almost by a divine instinct, a providential inspiration." The acclamation of souls, *vox populi*, in such matters often is *vox Dei*. But we must not press this plea too far, or force it to mean that the inspiration of a Book of the Bible, or the authorship ascribed to it, is correct simply because the Book happens to be in the Canon. The Canon itself is based on human, not divine, judgment and sanction.

¹ The Jewish phrasing of this question is curious and passing strange in our ears: "Do *Canticles*, *Ecclesiastes*, and *Esther* 'defile the hand'?" As we saw (cf. p. 207 *sup.*) in the Priestly Code, "holy" and *taboo* are equivalent. Contact with "holy" things involves purification, and for two reasons. If it is unauthorised contact, it is a "sin" and sin-purification alone will ward off God's wrath; if it is authorised contact, the "holiness" is contagious, and the hand or dress that has touched the "holy" thing is impregnated with "holiness." Anything it touches now becomes "holy," set apart for God's use and not fit any longer for ordinary use. In this sense, contact with "holiness" *defiles the hand*. The Sacred Writings were "holy" things, so "holy" that whoso touched them "defiled" his hand for common purposes till it was "purified." Hence the phrase. It was long felt, then as now, that *Canticles*, *Eccles.*, *Esther*, do not "defile the hand," and that, had they been excluded and *Ecclesiasticus* and *Wisdom* replaced them in the Canon, it would have been a gain. N.T. writers knew the Apocrypha well, *i.e.* books on the border-line of the Canon but not in it, yet read for edification. Jude quotes Enoch, and *Hebrews* quotes Maccabees; St. Paul and St. Peter are familiar with *Wisdom*, St. James with *Ecclesiasticus*; while *no reference* is made in the N.T. to *Canticles*, *Esther*, or *Ecclesiastes*.

CHAPTER XVI

(II.) THE "HOLY WRITINGS" EXAMINED

PSALMS

THE Psalter is the Hymn-Book of the Jewish Church, a collection of hymns gradually compiled and mainly intended for Temple use. Some psalms are earlier than the Exile, a very few may go back to David's day, probably nine-tenths are of the Exile and after. The Second Temple was completed in 516 B.C. and lasted till 70 A.D. As soon as services were rendered possible, a regular liturgy would be required, temple singers and a fixed temple psalmody. But not till about 450 B.C. did Ezra and Nehemiah make provision for full and regular services, by settling definitely the revenues of the priests and singers and other ministers of the Temple, who, till then, had been ill-provided for. Sometime between 516-450 B.C. the first collection of psalms (iii.-xli.)¹ was introduced.

¹ The five divisions (see R.V.) of Psalter = Bk. I., Pss. 1-41; Bk. II. = 42-72; Bk. III. = 73-89; Bk. IV. = 90-106; Bk. V. = 107-150, each book ending with a liturgical Doxology. As Dr. Burney writes me: "3-41 = 'of David,' 42-49 = 'of the sons of Korah,' 50 = 'of Asaph,' 51-72 (say, really 51-65, 68-70, 72) = 'of David,' after which comes the valuable note, 'The prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended.' It looks therefore as if group 3-41 should be immediately followed by 51-72, thus bringing together all the earlier 'of David' Pss., attaching the single 50 'of Asaph' psalm to group 73-83. I think the whole Davidic group 3-41, 51-72 was the earliest collection." Be this as it may, Bks. II. and III., 42-83, apparently once formed a single collection by itself, for it consistently avoids the name Jehovah, substituting Elohim throughout, *e.g.* Ps. 53 = Ps. 14, but every Jehovah ("the Lord") of 14 is changed into Elohim ("God") in 53. Bks. IV.-V. were apparently not in the Temple hymn-book when the musical directions (scattered throughout 1-89) were prefixed to the psalms, for they are lacking in 90-150. The titles to the psalms: "Psalms of David"; "of Asaph," etc., simply mean that the Psalter is made up of collections once known as "The Davidic," "The Korahite," "The Asaphite" collection of psalms. The "sons of Korah," "of Asaph," were families or hereditary guilds of temple-musicians, each apparently with their special hymn-book. The titles of several

The "psalms of Asaph" and the "psalms of the sons of Korah" are two later collections, for these choir-guilds were not distinct till after Nehemiah's day. As time went on, two later supplements were added. Thus the Psalter grew exactly like our own hymn-books. We shall not be far wrong in describing the Psalter as a collection of several smaller groups of psalms, of various dates, compiled between 516-150 B.C.

Of course, the Psalter as it stands is no more David's work than are the Mosaic Books from Moses' hand. But as David was regarded as the founder and organiser of Temple music and singing (1 Chron. xvi. 4; xxv. 3; Ezra iii. 10; Neh. xii. 36, 45 sq.), so also was he held to have completed and arranged the whole Psalter and to have written several of its psalms. A "cunning player on the harp" he undoubtedly was, and his famous elegy on Saul and Jonathan shows he was a poet as well. But very few psalms in the Psalter are now believed to be David's own. Cheyne and Wellhausen insist that "David wrote none of the psalms that have come down to us." Driver will not commit himself: "A *non liquet* must be our verdict; but it is not clear that none of the psalms are of David's composition." Sanday ("The Psalms explained," 1918) writes: "The only certain composition of David is the Lament over Saul and Jonathan; to this may possibly be added psalms 15 and parts of 18, 24, and it may be some others." Dr. Burney: "18 (in the main), 15, and 24 (at any rate the latter half)

Davidic psalms give the occasion and circumstances of the Ps., really gathered from the psalm itself, e.g. Ps. 51 seems to suit David's contrition after his great sin (cf. 72, 127 Solomon). Ps. 110 is called "of David," yet is generally admitted to be Maccabæan; in the Hasmonæan dynasty, "priest and king" were one. Cf. Burney: "I think 110 refers to Simon Maccabæe's appointment as priest and king. The opening letters of verses 1-4 make an acrostic of his name." The title "Song of Ascents" may mean "Pilgrimage Psalms" sung on going up to Jerusalem Feasts; or may refer to the fifteen steps leading from the women's to the men's court. The "Hallelujah" (Praise ye the Lord) Psalms (105-107; 111-118; 135 sq.; 146-150) = for festivals. The psalms vary widely in religious worth and poetic merit; some are genius-creations, others mediocre, though our fine A.V. (and especially the Prayer Book Version) rendering veils the poverty partly.

seem to me the most probable. I suspect, however, that there may be a fair number of Davidic fragments worked in with later psalms." Some extend the list to include 3, 4, 7, 8, 15, 18, 23, 24, 32, and perhaps 101, 110, but with the qualification "*may* be David's." Really, it is not known who wrote any of the psalms and, all said and done, the question is of very secondary importance. They stand or fall on their own intrinsic merits; and on their worth all are agreed. The Psalter was meant to be a Jewish Church hymn-book and is undoubtedly Jewish in tone, yet it has been universally accepted as the Christian's devotional hand-book. "It supplies the model of worship, of prayer, of praise, of penitence and hope, of comfort and thanksgiving." It is to the Psalter that we instinctively turn in order to express and to interpret our inmost heart-thoughts and feelings. The human soul whose experiences are depicted there is but our own soul, true to the life in every detail, and these experiences are clothed in words which strike a responsive chord in our own and in every human heart, and tap a source of comfort which is ever flowing, ever fresh, ever real and satisfying. And if the Psalter can no longer be regarded as the record of one man, David, but as the record of many men covering many centuries, it becomes all the more precious as embodying all the highest aspirations, the purest joys, the noblest sorrows of many generations of Hebrew life.

We have dealt so fully with the theology and ethics of the Psalter in Ch. XIV. that less need be said here under that heading. We shall merely quote one paragraph from Montefiore's *H.L.*, p. 386, in support of what we said there: "Close as is the connection between the psalter and sanctuary . . . the psalmist's religion was wider than that of the priest. . . . It marks the high religious level to which prophet, priest, and sage had educated the national consciousness. . . . He was less a specialist than either priest or sage, and is

thus our best authority for the post-exilic religion." The psalmist's conception of God is sublime. Nowhere, outside Christ and the prophets, are we brought so directly into the Presence of God Himself, a God as inexpressibly lofty and pure as He is near and gracious, full of mercy and lovingkindness, a God who will by no means spare the guilty, yet "like as a father pitieth his own children, even so is the Lord merciful unto them that fear Him, for He knoweth whereof we are made."

Sufferings of the Godly.—This problem is often faced in the psalms. The very first psalm tells us that the righteous prosper, while the wicked come to a bad end. So do Pss. xcii. 11 sq.; cxii.; cxxviii. But it was impossible to shut one's eyes to the fact that this is not a safe rule in actual life. Pss. xxxvii., xlix., lxxiii., xcii. come to the conclusion that the ungodly may flourish, but only for a season, "Suddenly they come to a fearful end." In the psalms, however, the question is never probed to its depths as in Job. Deep-rooted in the Hebrew heart was the conviction that sin and suffering were in exact proportion, measure for measure. God's award on earth must tally exactly with man's deserts. This is plainly expressed in Ps. xviii. 25 sqq.: "With the merciful Thou wilt show Thyself merciful; with an upright man Thou wilt show Thyself upright; with the pure Thou wilt show Thyself pure; and with the froward Thou wilt show Thyself froward." This root-idea pervades the Old Testament and is most pronounced in *Prov.* and *Psalter*. Some psalms realise the educative and disciplinary value of adversity, e.g. "Before I was afflicted I went astray, . . . it is good for me that I have been afflicted, that I might learn Thy statutes." Another psalmist realises that the suffering of the righteous is as nothing compared with the joy and peace of that close fellowship with God which is his, a joy and a peace which the wicked, however prosperous, never knows; *he* lives and dies

like a beast (*e.g.* xlix. 12, 20, lxxiii.). A few psalms, as we shall presently see, rob suffering and misfortune of its sting by looking forward to the day when the righteous dead shall rise to share in the joy of the Messianic kingdom. But, as a rule, trustful optimism is the Psalter's note on this problem of suffering.

Life after Death.—Strong as is the psalmists' faith in God (*e.g.* "I have set the Lord always before me, because He is at my right hand, I shall not be moved"; "The Lord redeemeth the souls of His servants, and none of them that trust in Him shall be desolate"), close as is their walk with God here on earth (*e.g.* "Thou art my portion, O Lord," "Whom have I in heaven but Thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire beside Thee"), yet a blank is found in the creed of by far the majority of these holy men when life beyond the grave is in question. Almost invariably, their hope ends with this life: "Before I go hence and be no more" (xxxix. 13, R.V.); "In death there is no remembrance of Thee, in the grave (= Sheol, R.V.) who shall give Thee thanks?" (vi. 5). God Himself does not remember the dead any more: "Wilt Thou show wonders to the dead? Shall the dead arise and praise Thee? Shall Thy lovingkindness be declared in the grave, or Thy faithfulness in Destruction (= Abaddon, R.V. m.)? Shall Thy wonders be known in the dark?" (lxxxviii. 10 sqq.). It is still, this land beyond the grave, a land of darkness, silence, forgetfulness, a place of mere shadowy, lifeless, listless existence.

But there are brighter gleams in the psalms. As repeatedly stated, from about 300 B.C. the belief began to dawn that Sheol, "the Pit," "the Land of Forgetfulness," "Destruction," "the Place of Silence," was not the final goal of man's life. The belief took a two-fold form: (*a*) on the establishment of the Messianic kingdom, the righteous dead should rise out of their graves to share in it; (*b*) or even—but a later belief—a resurrection to a blessed life of fellowship with

God in heaven would follow immediately after death for the righteous. The former view was by far the more prevalent. In three or four passages in the Psalter this belief in a resurrection seems to find clear expression: "God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave, for He shall receive me" (xlix. 15); "Thou shalt guide me with Thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory" (lxxiii. 24). In these two psalms the resurrection-hope finds clear expression. What shall we say of: "As for me, I will behold Thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with Thy likeness" (xvii. 15); "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt Thou suffer Thy holy one to see corruption. Thou wilt show me the path of life; in Thy Presence is fulness of joy; at Thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore" (xvi. 9-11)?¹ They seem so plainly to refer to a life beyond the grave; yet most scholars see in the former passage not the awakening from the sleep of death, but the awakening every morning to a renewed consciousness of God's immediate Presence (cf. iii. 5, cxxxix. 17, 18); while in the latter passage, Burney and others see in: "Thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol," a reference to a temporal deliverance from death: "Yahwe will not abandon his soul to Sheol, but will rescue him from the danger of physical death to which he is exposed." The present writer still sees in Ps. xvi. 9-11, as well as in Pss. xlix. 15 and lxxiii. 24, clear expression of a resurrection-hope.

Three interpretations of these aspirations to life hereafter have been given: (1) *Mystic*. So close is the psalmist's union with God here (e.g. xvi. 8; lxxiii. 23; cf. xlii. 1, 2; lxiii. 1) that, by a splendid reach of faith, he rises to the conviction that One who has been his portion here will not forsake him hereafter.

¹ Dr. Burney writes me: "I doubt whether in these two Pss. there is really any definite hope expressed of life after death." In his *Outlines of O.T. Theology*, p. 127, he gives reasons as quoted above.

He cannot, will not, believe that "the Pit" ends all for the friend of God. Death cannot snap the union. (2) *Messianic*.—Most scholars see in these passages a reference to the resurrection of the godly to share in the Messianic kingdom on earth. (3) *Enoch translation*. Just as "Enoch was translated that he should not see death," and "he was not, for God took him," so the writers of these psalms may have hoped that they too, even as Enoch and Elijah, might be "taken" to God without tasting death. Strongly in support of this last view is the fact that in the two most definite resurrection-hope passages, xlix. 15, "He shall *receive* me," and lxxiii. 24, "and afterwards *receive* me to glory," the Hebrew reads: "For He will *take* me," "and afterwards *take* me gloriously." The verb in each case is the same as in the passage with regard to Enoch: "and he was not, for God *took* him." Thus the allusion to Enoch in both Pss. seems clear.

Messianic Psalms.—If by Messianic psalm we mean one directly and prophetically pointing to the person of a coming Anointed King who, as God's vicegerent, is to set up God's Kingdom on earth, then the list of Messianic psalms proper is very small. The psalms usually quoted as Messianic are Pss. ii., xxi., xlv., lxxii., and cx., but most of these Pss. as Burney (*Outlines of O.T. Theology*, p. 111) notes, "refer not to a *future* ruler, but to a reigning monarch, who, as Yahwe's anointed, is idealised and in some cases invested with attributes little short of divine. These psalms may be considered Messianic just in so far as they put forward the true ideal of kingship." We must remember that kings, in Israel, are the Lord's "anointed," God's vice-gerents on earth, religious heads of the nation in David's and Solomon's persons, its chief sacrificing priests, anointed with the holy oil reserved for holy persons and things wholly consecrated to God's own service (p. 135 *sup.*). Hence, in the psalms, language is used of kings which clothes the monarch with attributes picturing him as a very

holy person, when all the time the psalmist has an actual reigning king before his eyes; *e.g.* Ps. cx. almost certainly refers to Simon Maccabee (p. 254, n. *sup.*).¹ Personally, we should call Pss. ii. and lxxii. distinctly Messianic. As in the case of Zerubbabel, the Messianic prophecy of Ps. ii. may have been called forth by the victory of a Maccabæan prince which moved the writer to see in him the long promised Messiah; but it has all the notes of a Messianic psalm. Ps. ii. clearly indicates an anointed warrior-king ruling in Zion as God's vice-gerent with *absolutely unlimited sway over the whole world*, exalting the righteous and crushing the wicked. We cannot, of course, press the phrase "son of God," commonly used in the O.T. of angels, judges, theocratic kings, and the theocratic People, as well as of Messiah (cf. of David's "seed," 2 Sam. vii. 14, "I will be his Father, and he shall be My son," a passage to which Ps. lxxxix. 26 sq. directly refers); but the King is clearly superhuman, and in His anger breaks the rebellious stiff-necked nations with a "rod of iron" and makes them His vassals. Of course, as in the "Suffering Servant" (p. 195 *sup.*), it is quite possible that "The Messiah here is the incarnation of Israel's universal rule. He and Israel are almost identical, and it matters little whether we say that Israel *has* or *is* the Messiah" (see Sanday in Hastings' *D. of B.*, iv. 571). In Ps. lxxii., verse 8: "He shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the River unto the ends of the earth," shows that the psalmist speaks of a *future* king with universal sway, who rules with power, justice, and in righteous-

¹ Dr. Burney writes me: "I do not think that 45 and 110, certainly, should be included as Messianic. 45 is certainly a *very ancient* Ps. and has simply as its object the congratulation of the reigning king on his wedding. 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever' is, I think, an incorrect reading. It should probably be: 'Thy throne is God's for ever and ever' (the Heb. says 'is God' instead of 'is God's throne.' The construction is exactly like that of a passage in the Babylonian Creation-epic where the gods congratulate Marduk and say, 'thy command is Anu,' *i.e.* is Anu's). As I have already said, I think Ps. 110 must refer to the appointment of Simon the Maccabee as priest and king. The first four verses which form the oracle make, in their opening letters, an acrostic of his name."

ness (4, 12 sqq.), and eternally: "they shall fear thee as long as the sun and moon endure, throughout all generations." But over against this we have to place verse 17: "His *name* shall endure for ever, his *name* shall be continued as long as the sun," and, here as elsewhere (*e.g.* Jer. xxxiii. 14 sqq. where it is clear that "the Branch or Shoot of Righteousness" of David's line is not one particular king, but a continuous succession of rulers of David's line), it is evidently not a *single* king who thus rules on for ever; it is his *name* or dynasty that has eternal continuance and renown promised to it. Pss. lxxxix. and cxxxii. 17 are far less certainly Messianic. Ps. lxxxix. 3, 4, 19 sqq. clearly points to God's promise to David in 2 Sam. vii. 14 sqq., while verse 27 equally clearly refers to Ex. iv. 22 addressed to Israel; so the psalm evidently has, here again, not an individual king, but a Davidic dynasty in view, and speaks rather of Israel as the Messiah and now heir of the old Davidic promises.

In a truer sense, a great many psalms are Messianic. From the earliest times, Israel looked forward to a Golden Age of peace, joy, prosperity, a Kingdom of Israel befitting Jehovah's Israel, with all God's covenanted promises fulfilled and God Himself its King. "By divers portions and in divers manners," "here a little and there a little," separate contributions to this total picture were contributed in O.T. days. An ideal Figure—Messianic King or Messianic Israel—was created and invested with all the attributes of a Person, Jehovah's representative on earth. The minds of all Israelites were turned towards this Figure and this Kingdom in an attitude of keen expectation. In many Biblical and apocalyptic prophecies the Messianic King forms no part at all of the Messianic Age. Jehovah is to manifest Himself in His glory upon earth without any intermediary. In that day righteousness and purity will blossom on earth, sin will cease, the nations will either be

subdued to Israel or converted to God, the Law and religion of Jehovah will triumph, and Nature herself be transfigured. Now this expectation and picture of "the perfect Israel of God" was never absent from the mind and heart of the religious Israelite, and *any factor in the present that pointed to it he at once idealised*, projecting forward brilliant spiritual hopes and anticipations, prophetic ideals. The ideal Messianic King or Messianic Israel became a centre around which the present ideals, whether of glory or of holiness or even of suffering, could be gathered. Here an actual "anointed" King, there a holy "priest" or a righteous suffering saint, or a victory over enemies, or even smiling Nature, speaks to the psalmist of the perfect time coming, and he idealises it. In this broader sense, psalm upon psalm is truly Messianic as descriptive of the glorious "age to come," and Jewish readers would at once recognise it as such. Thus bit by bit, here a little and there a little, and from different originals, were drawn the lines of that perfect Figure, only realised in our Lord. In Him, the Sun of Righteousness, all their scattered rays are absorbed in the full light of the One bright beam, and the shadows disappear.

"I" Psalms.—This opens a keenly-controverted question with a direct bearing on the Imprecatory psalms of next section. In the "I" psalms, Does the "I" stand (*a*) for the individual speaker, or (*b*) for Israel, the Church and Servant of God, personified?

Of course, all scholars alike agree that in occasional psalms it is undoubtedly the psalmist himself who speaks. As in our Church Hymn-books, so in the Jewish, some hymns were originally personal and for private edification, like Newman's "Lead, kindly light." But many scholars reduce this "individual speaker" element to the barest limits, and (even in Ps. li.) insist that "I" and "me" almost invariably stand for "we" and "us" throughout the Psalter. Their plea is a strong one. They maintain,

and rightly, that, throughout, the Old Testament personifies Israel (*e.g.* "The Suffering Servant"), and they insist that it is so in the Psalter, the " I " standing for Israel = the Jewish Church = the true people of God, personified.

Equally able scholars deny this. They grant that it may be true to some degree, but not nearly to the extent claimed. Their plea is of this nature: It is true that, before the Exile, Israel is constantly personified, and for an obvious reason. Religion then was national, not a personal matter between God and the individual soul; hence the individual sense of right and wrong, of sin and guilt, was not so deeply felt. The community was all in all, the corporate sense very strong, while individual personality was largely merged in the national life. No doubt, even after Jeremiah's and Ezekiel's insistence on personal religion, there was not an immediate recoil to individualism pure and simple. The national instinct was alive and the corporate sense was still there (*e.g.* II. Isaiah's "Suffering Servant"), and rightly encouraged. But post-exilic Hebrew literature proves that, after the Return, individualism grew by leaps and bounds. And such a psalm as li., and most of the " I " psalms, would lose more than half their meaning and force if resolved into a mere expression of national penitence or hope, corporate prayer or praise. The personal note is too pronounced to be thus easily eliminated. Indeed, it is precisely this personal note which gives the Psalter its firm hold on every human heart.

This is a strong plea, and doubly strong when we bear in mind a point already noted. Although the whole Psalter, as it stands, was edited for Temple (and synagogue) service, there is little doubt that many of its hymns were originally the expression of individual experience, afterwards toned down and adapted to congregational use. If the second alternative be not the true solution, then all we can say is

that Hebrew psalmists had an exceptional genius—which died with them—for so wording national hymns as to voice exactly the inmost feelings of each individual heart, all the world over, for all time.

Imprecatory Psalms.—This is where the "I" question mainly comes in. In such psalms as lviii., lxix., cix., cxxxvii., we have Hymns of Hate which cast a black shadow on the lovely picture of the Psalter. These passionate outbursts of resentment against domestic or foreign foes may perhaps not be so shocking, if the "I" is Israel the down-trodden and persecuted community, and not the individual speaker, though our conscience to-day rightly condemns them in either case.¹

Various pleas have been urged in justification of these psalms, *e.g.* : (1) They are but the expression of the Church's righteous wrath against the powers of evil hurting God's cause through the persons of His servants on earth ; or (2) such resentment is only natural on the lips of a people long oppressed, enslaved, and maltreated, and would find its ready echo in Christian Belgium to-day ; or (3) a Christ who called His calumniators "a generation of vipers,"

¹ Pss. cxxxvii. and cix. are generally condemned by all. But many advocate the public singing of the rest, quoting Ps. xcvi. 10 : "*O ye that love the Lord, see that ye hate the thing that is evil,*" alleging that the clearer our realisation of the beauty of holiness, the sharper our recoil from, and condemnation of, all that is base and evil. Forgive *personal* enemies, they say, but express vigorously in word and deed your antipathy to "enemies of Society in the aggregate," even as Christ assailed Scribes and Pharisees who opposed His regeneration of mankind, and assailed them in terms of the strongest invective. These advocates see in *e.g.* Ps. lviii. : "Break their teeth, O God, in their mouths, Smite the jawbones of the lions, O Lord," and "the righteous shall rejoice when he seeth the vengeance : he shall wash his footsteps in the blood of the ungodly," and see rightly, nothing but a *poetical* picture, sketched with a few bold strokes, of the defeat in battle of a criminal nation which has violated every law of God and of civilised humanity, and man's joy that justice has been done ; just as we rejoiced when we had broken the teeth of the German eagle by sending their boats to the bottom or killing their thousands in battle. The Bible, they urge, is no pacifist book, neither should we erase from it passages which paint God's righteous vengeance in terrible colours, just to avoid shocking the susceptibilities of the weak. I have felt in honour bound to put their case as strongly as possible. But (1) Do these men realise Jewish vindictiveness of old under bitter wrongs ? (cf. p. 22 *sup.*). (2) Does Christianity endorse their verdict ? (3) Does natural man's vindictive spirit want prompting, and in God's House ?

and consigned them to the "damnation of hell" (St. Mt. xxiii. 33), would prefer the righteous resentment of these strong Jews to the maudlin softness so common to-day in the presence of evil.

All said and done, the one excuse for such Hebrew Hymns of Hate, which are as wide apart as the poles from Christ's Spirit and Golden Rule of St. Mt. v. 38 sqq., is that such resentment is the ready voice of the natural man's heart under strong provocation, and recent experience proves that it is not for us to cast the first stone. Moreover, as we saw in Ch. II., the Psalms are the impassioned utterances of a Hebrew people full of the fire of passion, the strong love and hate, the pride and scorn of their Arab ancestors. If Hebrew depth of feeling and heart of fire vents itself in half a dozen Hymns of Hate, it also gives us an Amos, Isaiah, and the world's Great Lyric. Once more, 400 B.C. is not 1920 A.D.

CHAPTER XVII

(III.) "HOLY WRITINGS": JOB, ECCLESIASTES, PROVERBS

JOB

JOB is the profoundest creation of Hebrew religious thought, one of the great dramatic poems of the world's literature. Its theme is that sphinx-riddle: "If God is, and is good; why does evil prosper and goodness suffer?"

Even in *Job's* day (probably about 500-400 B.C.), as *Psalms* and *Prov.* show, traditional orthodoxy had its facile answer to this insoluble problem: "Virtue is ever rewarded and badness punished *measure for measure* in this life by a just God. Each man fares exactly as his character and deeds deserve. An apparently good man's woes are proof positive of a goodness only skin-deep"—*e.g.* Ps. xxxvii. 25 sqq.

Yet here is Job, a typically good man at heart, as God Himself¹ and even Satan own (i. 8 sqq.), suddenly grievously afflicted. Therefore, on the current view of Providence, he is a great sinner. His three friends firmly uphold this orthodox view and lay some great sin at his door. *This* Job stoutly denies: "I am innocent; I have ever feared God and eschewed evil," is the clear and unwavering verdict of his conscience, and, as we have seen, endorsed of God. The whole plot of the book hinges on the clear understanding that, not only is Job's outer life morally correct as all the world can see, but that, as Job and

¹ One of the finest strokes of the poet's art is his placing in the reader's hands from the very first this master-key to the whole position, so that the reader knows what God and Satan and Job alone know, and the three friends of Job do *not* know.

Satan and God alone know, his heart is perfect and upright too. We must also bear in mind that Job himself is perfectly certain of two facts: (1) God is, and is good; (2) his own innocence. But how to reconcile a righteous God's justice with a righteous Job's undeserved sufferings, this he does *not* see. In the ground of his heart he feels that there is a solution of this problem; he is trying hard to understand God's righteous rule; he clings to the belief that God is more just than His dealings with him suggest, but he candidly owns that he is floundering in deep waters and utterly in the dark.

Thus *Job* is a religious protest against the shallow traditional interpretation of Providence which has broken down in actual life-experience; a plea for a wider, deeper, truer solution. The old answer will not do, and may even drive a godly man to the denial of God's justice altogether. Job's own experience gives conventional orthodoxy the lie direct; rest in the Church dogma that all suffering is retributive he cannot and will not. He chooses the darkness of doubt rather than give the lie to his convictions and conscience. Indeed, he is very outspoken with God. He frankly spreads out all his doubts before God. He goes further. He openly questions God's justice in a way that shocks his three friends as rank blasphemy.

For Job the old conventional answer has gone clean overboard. But he does not go to the other extreme and say: "I do not believe the old answer; what is more, I do not think there is any answer at all; therefore I shall just cease troubling about it altogether." He will not be dishonest with God or himself by whittling down the new facts till they fit into the old conventional creed, but neither will he lightly deny God or surrender his faith in God's goodness. He stands by his own experience, but he stands also by his trust in God. Heart and head tug hard in opposite directions. The position for Job is

awful.¹ Egypt with its flesh-pots of conventional orthodoxy he has left behind him; the Promised Land of peace and conviction he sees very dimly in sight with the eye of faith, but he cannot win through to it; the wilderness of doubt and uncertainty between the two is an awful place, yet make it his home he must or give the lie to life as he sees it and knows it.²

Does Job succeed in solving the great point at issue, or does he leave it a riddle? Is the whole poem one note of interrogation? Even if it were, its loud protest against the shallow current orthodoxy in itself marks a stage in the history of religious thought vastly in advance of anything that preceded it. The inspired author himself stresses this point. He shows, not only that doubting Job pleads as truly for God as his conventionally orthodox friends, but that he pleads ten times more truly for God. For he shows us God Himself siding, not with the facile advocates of a Tradition which has eyes and will not see, but wholeheartedly with the maligned sufferer who honestly pours out his soul and will not lie: "And the Lord said to Eliphaz, My wrath is kindled against thee and against thy two friends; for ye have not spoken of Me the thing that is right, as My servant Job hath" (xlii. 7).

The protest in itself is of immense value. And is Job's patient endurance in his close walk with God, apart from all outward tokens of His favour, and

¹ "Job is an untamed eagle, dashing himself against the bars of his cage; he rages and flings himself against the moral iniquities of Providence; the Preacher (*Eccles.*) looks out with a lustreless eye on the glorious heavens, where, if he was free, he might soar, and only mourns and moralises" (Cheyne).

² *Job* and *Eccles.* are the most intensely modern of Hebrew creations, they so typically anticipate the fearless honesty and sincerity which is the spirit of our own age. What J. M. Wilson said in his sermon to the British (scientific) Association of the scientific temper of our own day might be said of them. They "feel that truthfulness of mind is of vital importance not only to knowledge, but to character; that to fear investigation even in matters of faith, to conceal difficulties, to slur over inconsistencies, or to overstate convictions, to become, in short, an advocate instead of a truth-seeker, are faults which darken and degrade the soul."

sustained only by the witness of his conscience—is this to count for little in estimating the positive value of *Job*? Unaided, unconsolated, merely “holding fast by truth and his great soul,” Job, with all the odds against him, has won, and helps us to win, through. With all reverence be it said, yet say it we must, there is truer and more heroic faith in a Job who, face to face with such a problem and no light whatever to pierce the gloom of the grave, still clings to God and wins through, than in St. Paul’s: “If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable” (cf. 2 Cor. 4¹⁷; but see Note p. 288).

But the book of Job carries us much further than the protest, or the heroic faith, in the way of a solution. In the earlier chapters Job had spoken to God with fearless frankness, accused God of making Himself both accuser and judge in the case, with no umpire for Job to appeal to as against his Almighty Antagonist in the suit: “He is not a man, as I am, that I should answer Him and we should come together in judgment; neither is there any daysman (= umpire, R.V.) between us that might lay his hand on us both. Let Him take His rod away from me, and let His terror not make me afraid. Then would I speak and not fear Him” (ix. 32 sqq.). Here Job openly arraigns God’s justice, accuses Him of acting in this unequal controversy even as an Oriental despot whose almighty power overrides, without hope of redress, his weak subjects’ claims, even though all the right is on the weaker side. Exactly in the same spirit, when Job’s friends, voicing the view of divine retribution which was the orthodoxy of their day, outspokenly accuse him of being, as his afflictions prove, a great sinner, Job indignantly repudiates their insinuations and their charges. He goes further. He declares point-blank that, if they insist on calling *this* God’s justice, he will say straight in God’s face that He is an almighty tyrant, who unjustly destroys an innocent man, even though God

slay him for it: "Behold, He will slay me; I wait for Him" (Job xiii. 15 R.V.m.).¹

In the supplement to the poem, God Himself takes up Job's challenge. Suddenly God, whom Job had alternately challenged and implored to appear, comes on the scene and answers him out of the whirlwind (xxxviii.-xli.). He shows Job that His Providence all along is right and man's indictment of it wrong. The line of argument is one that ever appealed to Nature-loving² Jews. Nature is called as witness to speak for her Maker. Her evidence clearly proves that, while earthquake and storm may speak only of God's almighty power, yet every star and leaf and bird, summer and winter, rain and sunshine declare God's wisdom and goodness. As Elihu³ points out, in the heavens above as on the earth beneath everything has its season and function, everything moves according to settled rhythm, law, order. So in the moral realm. But both the natural and moral uni-

¹ See p. 229, n. *sup.*, and Driver "*Job*" *ad loc.*, and R.V. As Driver says: "The rendering, 'Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him' expresses a thought which is beautiful in itself, but inconsistent with the context, and with the frame of mind in which Job is here speaking.' Whatever the true rendering, whether it means 'He will slay me, I wait for Him' (*i.e.* for the death-blow), or 'He will slay me; I will not wait (*i.e.* nothing will stop me from vindicating myself before Him)'—the drift is the same, 'Though He slay me, nevertheless I will argue the case and vindicate my ways before Him.'"

² As Montefiore, *H.L.*, 426 (*abridged*) says, Jews ever saw in "Nature, animate and inanimate, the object of God's perpetual care, a witness to His glory and wisdom as its Creator and Sustainer." "Nature was no lifeless product turned out once and for all from the Craftsman's hands." The Jews might grudge other nations a share in their God, but to the God of Israel they ascribed "a very tender feeling towards beasts and birds, mountains and seas, trees and flowers," and without budging one inch from their firm stand on God's Transcendence, they saw God in Nature as clearly as the most pronounced Immanent-ist. Our scientific idea of "Laws of Nature" they certainly had not, but they instinctively felt something akin to it, seeing in Nature's order and rhythm an expression of God's changeless Will and goodness. "Nature 'red in tooth and claw,' 'shrieking against faith in a living God'—these aspects never occurred to the Jews." They saw Nature through the poet's eye, lovingly and not critically.

³ Many consider the Elihu speeches (xxxii.-xxxvi.) later additions. Elihu is not named in the Prologue (ii. 11), and in the Epilogue he is ignored again, though he deserves the same rebuke as the three friends of Job. Again, not a word does Job reply to his provocative speeches; and in xxxviii. 1 sq. God's reply, "Who is this that darkeneth counsel?" etc. is a direct answer to Job's "O that I had One to hear me," etc. of xxxi. 35, just before Elihu's speeches. Clearly the Elihu section is no organic part of *Job*.

verses are far too large and complex for man to be able to gauge the depths of the Wisdom¹ which directs it all. Man knows but one tiny corner of one small field in a vast Universe, and knows even this but imperfectly (xxxviii.). Surely the Creator and Preserver of such a cosmos as we see may safely be trusted to steer it morally right.²

The argument may seem to us inconclusive, more apt to awe and silence man than convince him. Our Hebrew poet, like Tennyson or Wordsworth (p. 15, n. *sup.*), judges otherwise. He represents Job as convinced by what he sees all around him of God's power, goodness, and wisdom, yes, *and* by the awe, wonder, and mystery of it all. God's majestic Wisdom is beyond puny man's ken, His ways inscrutable. If man cannot grasp God's operations in a Nature which stares him in the face, what folly and presumption to pretend to fathom His dealings in Providence! Here Job acquiesces wholeheartedly. So long as the three friends harped on the retributive or punitive aspect of his sufferings, he rebelled and called God's justice injustice; now that he is called upon, in the light of God's beneficent yet mysterious Providence in Nature, to trust Him though He seems to frown, he at once submits and trusts implicitly. Nay, he bows his head in remorse, shame, adoration. At last his heart has learnt to *rest* in God, even though he cannot attain unto Him with his understanding. Rapt in God as seen in His wondrous works, with heart all

¹ *Job* xxviii. on the Wisdom of God (cf. *Prov.* viii.) is a very grand poem. No earthly treasures lie too deep for human industry,—note Job's fine description of ancient mining,—but Wisdom is with God alone. By Wisdom (cf. *Logos*) is meant the Reason originating and pervading Creation. This passage, again, looks like an interpolation; it is out of place just here.

² Behemoth and Leviathan (xl. 15-xli. 34) are the hippopotamus and crocodile. Jastrow (*Heb. and Bab. Tradition*, p. 114 sq., *abridged*) seems right in seeing in xli. 1-8, a reference to the Tiamat monster of the Creation-story which Jehovah alone (cf. Marduk) was able to subdue. "The description of the monster strong of fangs, raising himself up to a great height, to whom iron is as straw, suggests in many ways Tiamat and her brood, with whom Yahweh alone can deal. He catches him as one hooks a fish, uses him as a toy, cf. Leviathan's appeal to the powerful Yahweh who has captured him, as Marduk caught Tiamat,—all this is reminiscent of the Tiamat Story."

along athirst after God and now perfectly attuned to Him, the eyes and ears of Job's soul are now open; he actually hears God's Voice, sees His Face, and is at rest: "I had heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth Thee" (xlii. 5 R.V.). Long before, he had cried in his agony of darkness: "I know that my vindicator¹ liveth and that he shall stand up at the last upon the earth" (xix. 25 R.V.). That prayer is answered now. "In the flesh" Job has seen God face to face (xlii. 5) and God has vindicated him (7) here on earth in his latter day.

Soaring now above the petty material things of earth, Job's soul breathes a purer atmosphere. All his resentment, arguments, doubts, he leaves behind him now. He has seen God face to face, he *knows* God now and is ashamed of his former attitude towards Him: "wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes" (xlii. 6). He calls it all back, bows his head, and adores.

To modern readers the Epilogue (xlii. 10 sqq.), in which "the Lord gave Job twice as much as he had before," seems a sad drop from the sublime to the common-place, a bathos indeed. But *Job* was not written for modern readers. We shall see in the next section that its whole tone and thought prove its author a firm adherent to the common belief that, this life ended, nothing remains but Sheol, the land of forgetfulness and Silence. If the light shed upon this life's changes and chances by the clear vision of a resurrection to eternal life had been vouchsafed to the author, *Job* would be quite a different book. His eyes once open to see this world as only "the vestibule to the world to come" (R. Jacob), all our modern solutions of the problem of suffering would have

¹ *Goel*, i. e. one who vindicates the claims upon him of those who are his, and sees their wrongs righted. "Redeemer" is not only a mistranslation, but misleading to Christian readers because of its association. *Advocate* is the idea here. "The Hebrew of 25b is very difficult, and clearly has undergone some corruption" (Burney). The sense is "God will stand up for me either alive or dead (?)." (Cf. Cheyne: "The text is both corrupt and interpolated.")

instantly flashed upon this creative genius. But from the standpoint of Job's day our present solutions (*e.g.* "made perfect through suffering," or again, "our outward woes do not affect the peace of God within,") were out of court, quite inadequate and unsatisfactory. Under a dispensation in which there was no assurance of a future life, the return of Job's prosperity *in this life* was indispensable to the vindication of Job's character and the justification of Job's arguments in the eyes of contemporary readers. The Epilogue with its: "The Lord gave Job twice as much as he had before," (xlii. 10), not only satisfies poetic justice, it was absolutely a *sine qua non* for the harmonious solution of all the reader's difficulties, even as he needed the Prologue to give him the key to the whole situation at the outset.¹

Life after death in Job.—"As the cloud is consumed and vanisheth away, so he that goeth to Sheol shall come up no more" (R.V. vii. 9); "Before I go whence I shall not return, even to the land of darkness and of the shadow of death; a land of thick darkness, as darkness itself; a land of the shadow of death without any order, and where the light is as darkness" (x. 21 sq.); "Man dieth and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea and the river decayeth and drieth up; so man lieth down and riseth not," etc. (xiv. 10 sqq.); "His sons come to honour and he knoweth it not; are brought low and he perceiveth it not" (21); "For when a few years are come, I shall go the

¹ *Job* is "poetically treated history," a dramatic poem, freely and imaginatively treating facts handed down by tradition and here substantially reproduced. As to the integrity of the book, most scholars question Elihu's speeches, and several also Ch. xxviii., which is certainly inappropriate where it stands. The arguments against the genuineness of other portions of *Job* are mostly far from convincing. Thus Jastrow (cf. Cheyne) writes: "*Job* ended originally with Ch. xxxi., where the closing words: 'Ended are the words of Job,' are still found intact. Chs. xxxii.-xlii. 6 represent further attempts of later writers to discuss the same enthralling theme. . . ." But for these subsequent chs., *Job*, with its scepticism, would never have been canonised (*Heb. and Bab. Trad.*, 233 sq.). In force, diction, style, beauty, xxxii.-xlii. are quite of a piece with the rest of this noble, dramatic poem.

way whence I shall not return" (xvi. 22); "One dieth in his full strength . . . and another dieth in bitterness of soul, . . . they lie down alike in the dust and the worm covereth them" (xxi. 23 sqq.); "I know that Thou wilt bring me to death, and to the house appointed for all living" (xxx. 23).

Not a hint of a resurrection to eternal life in all this¹ in *Job*. Many still see in *Job* xix. 25, "For I know that my Redeemer (= Vindicator = *Goel*) liveth, and that he shall stand up at the last upon the earth, and though after my skin this body be destroyed, yet from my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself and mine eyes shall behold, and not another,"—a clear proof of the author's belief in a resurrection to eternal life. To begin with, as all scholars admit, "this famous passage is hopelessly corrupt through later toning down and touching up"; and, even as it stands, Can such a view of a resurrection be read into the passage in the face of the plain fact that the conception of life after death as set forth in *Job* is one and the same throughout the whole poem, namely, a listless life in Sheol for good and bad alike? As already shown, *Job* xix. 25 clearly means this: "I know that my Vindicator liveth, and that He shall manifest Himself to me at the last here upon earth; and though at my death my body shall be destroyed, yet from my flesh, in my own proper body before I die, shall I see God, I myself." The sequel proves that *Job*'s prophecy, prayer, conviction—call it what you will—of xix. 25 was no delusion. *Job* xxxviii.-xlii. shows us God appearing in Person and speaking to *Job* here on earth, in his lifetime, and xlii. 5 expressly makes *Job* address these words to God: "I had heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear, *but now mine eye seeth Thee.*"

¹ Dr. Burney writes me: "I think *Job* xiv. 13-15 *does* put forward the theory of a future life tentatively as a possible solution, but only to withdraw it again at once as beyond the range of credibility." Cf. *Eccles.* iii. 20, 21, where the Preacher *does* exactly the same thing.

He actually does see his hope (xix. 25) realised in every detail *on this side of the grave*.

Neither Job nor his three friends extend their horizon beyond this world, for all that remains for man after this life is dark Sheol, where the dead lie all huddled together drearily and listlessly. Why should this surprise us? As we have repeatedly seen, we can practically count on the fingers of one hand all the clear revelations of an individual resurrection in the Old Testament, and it is more than probable that not a single one of them dates before 300 B.C. As Delitzsch nobly writes: "This is just the heroic feature in the faith of the Old Testament, that in the midst of the riddles of this life, and face to face with the impenetrable darkness resting on life beyond, it throws itself without reserve into the arms of God." Could we have stood that strain and yet cleaved to God as they did, with no heaven or hell before us? Paul doubts it (1 Cor. xv. 19).

ECCLESIASTES.

Over the inclusion of *Ecclesiastes* in the Bible, in face of its cynicism, the discussion waxed long and furious among the Jews themselves down to 90 A.D. and even after. No wonder. To this day *quot homines tot sententiæ* on this vexed question; in plain English, the ablest scholars have literally boxed the compass in their estimate of *Ecclesiastes*. As to its real interpretation, we can only say in Origen's words on the authorship of *Hebrews*: "God alone knows for certain."

Are we to look upon *Ecclesiastes* as "the work of a brilliant and refined pessimist almost without God in the world," or shall we see in it a "triumph of faith against tremendous odds, placing it on a level with *Job*"? Is its motto "Fear God, and pin not your faith to this world," or "Let us eat and drink for tomorrow we die"? Does it preach "All is well, for

God is at the helm of His world," or "All is the sport of Chance"? Is its last word: "Death is the stepping-stone to life immortal," or "All ends at the grave"? In short, is its creed: "Heaven is in sight, be strong and fear not," or "Life is a hell, and nothing after it, all hope abandon"?

Which set of alternatives are we to choose? It much depends on our answer to the question: Is Eccl. xii. 1, 13 sq., from the pen of the Preacher¹ himself or a later interpolation in the interests of orthodoxy? Here, again, the ablest scholars split into two camps and, unfortunately, the balance of evidence dips in favour of those who reject these beautiful verses as a later addition.

Perhaps the best way of letting the reader judge for himself is to epitomise the Preacher's own chapters one by one. We shall include the whole Epilogue, merely bracketing its disputed verses. Without these, the book is pessimistic and scarcely "godly," while those three verses alter its whole complexion and do make Ecclesiastes "a triumph of faith almost without parallel in the Old Testament."

The Prologue (i. 2-12) gives us the root-idea or theme of this "symphony of pessimism":—

"All is vanity. Life and its toil are a hollow farce and lead nowhere. The fixed and unalterable order of things hems us in a vicious circle from which there is no escape. Everything in Nature and man has to go endlessly round and round in the same groove; of the two, man is the worse off, for conscious man is soon snuffed out, while unconscious 'Earth abideth for ever.' Fruitless is this wearisome eternal round and monotonous, 'there is no new thing under the sun.'"

The Preacher, having stated his brief, now proceeds to prove it from his life-experience:—

¹ The title of *Eccles.* is "The words of *Koheleth*, son of David, King in Jerusalem." *Koheleth* is a fem. participle and means "the one who causes people to assemble" (*i.e.* in holy congregation before God). It *may* (?) mean "the one addressing such assembly." The fem. may stand for Solomon = Wisdom personified; but some words of office are fem. (cf. Arabic "Khalifah").

Ch. i. 12-ii.: "I gave my heart to seek out by wisdom" all it could tell me of man and his lot and found that man's labours, and wisdom itself, lead nowhere but to "vanity and vexation of spirit." Then I tried pleasure. It, too, was all hollow; "I said of laughter, It is mad; and of mirth, What doeth it?" Industry, wealth, fame proved equally Dead Sea fruits. True, "wisdom excelleth folly," for "the wise man's eyes are in his head, but the fool walketh in darkness." But is wisdom worth its heavy price? for it all ends at the grave where wise and fool are both alike. So I hated life, hated all my wearisome toil bringing me nothing but vexed days and restless nights, and, perchance, merely to leave all that I laboured for to a fool! The best thing is to eat, drink, and enjoy such good things as God sets within your reach.¹ Yet even this is vanity.

Ch. iii. All life's events are immutably fixed and our tether is short. We have to be born or die, plant or sow, weep or laugh, love or hate, by the time-table; for puny man is as a puppet in the hands of Almighty God. He fixes the what and the when of everything, big or small, for man to realise his utter dependence on his Maker and fear Him; also for him to realise that man and beast are both alike, out of the dust and back to the dust. Therefore enjoy life while you can, for it is yours only from cradle to grave.

Ch. iv. Life's tears and wrongs prove death better than life; best of all not to be born at all. Life is but knocking one's head against the stone-wall of God's predestined order of things. Labour is barren, and even success a mirage and a snare. In this vale of woe there is some safety in friends and companionship; "two are better than one."

Ch. v. Remember the almighty power of God in His heaven and your own puny weakness as a man here on earth, so if you draw near to God in prayer or otherwise, be very circumspect and let your words be few, or it will be worse for you. Rich and poor alike are in God's iron hand, and men are much more on a level than they seem, for none of us is his own master. Power and riches bring anxiety and have wings. Best eat, drink, and enjoy life; and not think too much.

Ch. vi. God at times gives a man all the good things of life,

¹ N.B.—*Kohleth* was no vulgar sensualist. Riot and excess would repel him as madness. The enjoyment he recommends (and all true Jews) are the simple pleasures of life as ix. 7-10 proves. He here gives the O.T. Hebrew view which looked upon material blessings as the seal of God's favour.

but not the power of enjoying them. There is a fly in most of our ointment, vanity is our common lot and darkness our end ; better not be born. " All the labour of man is for his mouth, and yet the appetite is not filled." Better is contentment with what you have than coveting what you have not, but both are vanity. Man's lot is fated and it is vain to kick against the pricks ; if man had his choice, it would be even worse for him.

Ch. vii. Death is better than birth, mourning than feasting, sorrow than laughter, patience than fretting, wisdom than money. Avoid all extremes ; be not righteous overmuch, or wise overmuch, or wicked overmuch. Wisdom is strength and gossip twined. Woman is more bitter than death ; you may find one good man in a thousand, but not one good woman at all.

Ch. viii. Obey the king and rebel not even when he oppresses, for he is mighty ; he will reap as he has sown in due time. Vice prospers and virtue starves, yet better be good than bad. But eat, drink, and enjoy life, for that boon lasts all one's days. God's ways are past finding out ; even the wisest man, try as he will, can see no purpose in it all.

Ch. ix. All men are in God's inscrutable iron hand ; to all comes the same end, death and the pit where all is blank nothingness. Make the most of this life, for " there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave whither thou goest." " A living dog is better than a dead lion," though even in life merit and success do not go hand in hand ; it is all a matter of luck and influence. Yet despised wisdom is better than successful folly.

Ch. x. Wisdom has eyes, folly is blind ; unhappy the land where " folly is in great dignity and servants ride upon horses," where princes are slothful and gluttonous. Curse not the king or the powerful even in secret, or a " bird shall carry thy voice and tell the matter."

Ch. xi. Be benevolent and you will have friends in time of trouble. Do what work you have to do when you can and as you can ; do not quarrel with your tools or delay action because every little detail is not exactly as you wish. You must run some risks and make your faith-venture, for the laws of Nature are above your ken : " he that observeth the wind shall not sow, and he that regardeth the clouds shall not reap " ; it only paralyses action. Life is sweet, but darkness its one end. " All that cometh is vanity."

Epilogue.—Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth, and walk in

the ways of thine heart and in the sight of thine eyes,—[but know that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment. Remember thy Creator in the days of thy youth]—ere the evil days of old age come, old age with its tottering legs, its toothlessness, dim eyes, deaf ears, loss of taste and desire, and its general break up, old age when “thou shalt say, I have no pleasure in them,” all faculty of pleasure gone. Enjoy life ere it is snuffed out and man returns to the dust whence he came. “Vanity of vanities; all is vanity.”¹ [“Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter. Fear God and keep His commandments, for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil.”]

If only we could add these bracketed verses to the Preacher’s book, what a world of difference it would make! All that goes before would merely give us the cynic’s creed just to pulverise it with one single unanswerable plea, pricking its bubble and exposing it as the plausible but empty thing it is. Setting aside these verses for a moment, let us briefly sum up the Preacher’s (*a*) idea of God, (*b*) idea of death, in the rest of the book.

Conception of God.—Kohелеth’s religion makes God a far-away almighty God. His fiat pre-ordains all that is, and man cannot break this fixed and immutable order of all things, of which he himself forms a part. Of a divine Providence guiding all things to a definite goal, and of any moral principle, the Preacher, after a profound life-long study of things as they actually are, sees not a trace. All is chance and change, in which things go endlessly round and round, but plan, purpose, progress is nowhere to be seen in it all. Fate and Chance seem to rule the world between them. No doubt, God is somehow the cause of everything that happens under the sun, evil or good, and He may have some plan and purpose in it all; but, if so, it is past human comprehension. God is a far-away, almighty God; man but a puppet in His hands. The object of this fixed iron rule is to show that

¹ The recurrence of this refrain here seems to imply “*Finis*,” here the book ends. At any rate, it does imply that the author’s meditations are in the same pessimistic key as when he began. Would “vanity of vanities, all is vanity,” have come in just here, if faith had gloriously triumphed?

God is all in all and man nothing, to strike fear and awe of God in man's soul: "God is in Heaven, thou upon earth, therefore let thy words be few" (v. 1-8). Koheleth does take God into his reckoning: "It shall be well with them that fear God, but it shall not be well with them that fear not God;" the wicked shall not prosper (viii. 12 sq.). The Preacher longs to believe that God has some moral aim in it all, but the hard facts and anomalies of life are too much for him as he looks facts squarely in the face. Existence has no meaning and no worth; pleasure and pain, industry and ease, mirth and sadness, wisdom and folly, all is empty vanity and it all comes to one and the same end, dust thou art and unto dust thou returnest. The best plan is to live while you may, enjoy the good things God sets within your reach, but in moderation and without excess (vii. 16 sq.).

Life after death (see ii. 14 sqq.; vi. 4 sqq.; ix. 5 sqq.; xi. 8). Eccl. ix. 3-10 gives us a most vivid picture of life after death in Sheol where "the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. As well their love, as their hatred and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion for ever in anything that is done under the sun" (cf. Pss. vi. 5; xxxix. 13; lxxxviii. 10-13); so, continues the Preacher, eat, drink and be merry; clothe thyself in white and anoint thy head; live joyfully with thy beloved wife; for that is thy portion;¹ and "whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge nor wisdom, in Sheol whither thou goest." In Eccl. iii. 18-21 ("That the sons of men may see that they themselves are but as beasts. For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other"), he throws cold water on some people's idea² that "the spirit of man goeth

¹ Cf. exactly the same advice given by Siduri-Sabitu to Gilgamesh in the Babylonian epic: "Thou, O Gilgamesh, let thy belly be full; day and night be merry and feast. Clean be thy clothes, anointed be thy head; be washed daily in pure water. Look joyfully on the child that clasps thy hand; be happy with thy wife in thy bosom," the very words are alike.

² Just as *Job* and *Eccl.* both show that the doctrine of the Prophets, e.g. Jer. xxxi. and Ezek. xviii. (=God requites man measure for measure according to his merits in this life) encountered definite opposition from a sceptical spiritual school, prompted, not by mere cynicism, but by a profound study of life as it is,—so Eccl. iii. shows a clear polemic on the part of thinkers against a new view of individual resurrection which differentiated between the fate of man and beast, good men and bad. This polemic, as well as the matter and style of *Eccles.*, its philosophy and its plea for "moderation," "nothing too much" (*μηδὲν ἄγαν*), suggest a third-century date, and Greek influence, for *Eccl.*

upward, and the spirit of the beast goeth downward to the earth" (xxi.)¹: "as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; and man hath no pre-eminence above the beasts. All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again." He would fain believe this new-fangled creed that the fate in store for man's spirit is different from that of the beasts, if there were a particle of evidence for it, but there is not. "There is one event to the righteous and to the wicked; to the good and to the clean, and to the unclean; to him that sacrificeth and to him that sacrificeth not; as is the good, so is the sinner; and he that sweareth, as he that feareth an oath. This is an evil in all that is done under the sun, that there is one event unto all" (ix. 2 sqq.). No one can read *Ecc.* without seeing that Koheleth's whole plea is a protest against the injustice of the grave swallowing up man's spirit, man's character, man's acquisitions, so that he can retain nothing of the experience, character, personality, he has spent life in building. He would fain believe in a life after death, but he cannot; it is a delusion.

As already said, both Job and Ecclesiastes are strangely modern. Both take their stand on life-experience, and refuse to whittle down hard facts till they fit into conventional theories that have broken down in actual experience. Job sees the old answer will not do; he has no other to put in its place, but in his heart of hearts he knows there is one. "Lead, kindly light," is his heart-cry, sure that, to the true seeker, light, God's own light, will come. In this spirit Job wins through. Ecclesiastes also rejects the old answer, but *he* questions whether there is any answer at all. Even in the heart of the arid wilderness Job sees the Promised Land with the eye of faith and means to get there; Ecclesiastes sees nothing but wilderness. He, too, has heard of a Promised Land, but he is sure it is a mirage. For him the wilderness is the be-all and end-all of existence; so, in

¹ This in itself shows that xii. 7, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it," does not mean what it suggests to us. Of course, the Preacher believes that life comes from God, but (as Job 27³ clearly shows: "My breath is in me and the spirit of God is in my nostrils") here it simply means breath (cf. Job 33⁴, 34¹⁴, Ps. 104²⁹).

deadly earnest and not in irony, he frames a practical philosophy of life which may help him and others to make the best of a bad job. Throughout, one feels that his biting epigrams are "a suffering soul's efforts to anæsthetise itself, narcotic drugs to deaden pain." Our whole heart goes out to the Preacher, for his "book of Confessions" is the travail of a soul in its Gethsemane, exceeding sorrowful even unto death. Each word is a heart-groan. Judged by the conventional standard, Koheleth is a light-hearted blasphemer. It is through such agonised souls (cf. Thomas), who have braved the hell of honest doubt, that mankind at times has been led a long stage further in its spiritual life.

And it may be that the whole Epilogue after all is his very own. Whether it is or not, we cannot spare Ecclesiastes. But there has ever been and ever will be a "school of Hillel" affirming that the Preacher "defiles the hand" (see p. 252, n.), and also a "school of Shammai" insisting that it does not. Thank God! Hillel's won the day!

PROVERBS.

After a *Job* and *Eccles.*, Proverbs on the same theme is very tame and uninspiring. In Ch. XV. p. 239, *sup.*, we spoke of one class of the "wise" whose duty it was to teach the people the moral bearings of their creed. They sought to gain the ear of the general public, especially the young, and impress upon them the principles of right conduct. No deep problems, theirs, as in *Job*. They are just moral educators who approach life from a common sense, practical, religious standpoint and set themselves to form men's opinions and guide their actions by moral maxims. Themselves reared in the traditional creed, and seeking to influence the many and not the select few, their ideas and ideals seldom rise much above the level of conventional orthodoxy. They take for

granted that happiness is man's aim in life, enlightened self-interest his ordinary motive, honesty the best policy, religion the foundation of virtue and of well-being. So they impress on their hearers that only he is wise who shapes his life with the fear of God before his eyes, while the self-willed man who leaves God out of his reckoning is a fool blind to his own truest interests. Hence their constant refrain: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom" (Prov. i. 7; ix. 10; xv. 33). *Proverbs* and *Psalms* are full of this teaching. It has its roots deep in the Law and the Prophets, but, for a reason mentioned below, it seldom alludes to either and runs on far broader, almost cosmopolitan lines. These moral educationists take two postulates for granted: "God is," and "God's Law is," or in other words: "There is a God and He rules His world on moral lines, requiring man according to his merits and measure for measure." No average Jew would dream of questioning these simple axioms: all the "teacher" has to do is to drive home these premisses to their logical conclusion, showing that, as experience proves, righteousness pays and is the only true wisdom, while sin comes to grief and is sheer folly.

The tendency to-day is to stress the prudential and utilitarian factor in *Proverbs* and unduly disparage the specifically religious background and atmosphere of its teaching. *Proverbs* lacks the fire and depth of *Job* or the Prophets, but its creed is not thin or colourless. It is no cosmopolitan theism or a mere appeal to the "universal human conscience," but a clear, firm, unquestioning faith in Jehovah, the righteous God of Israel, as the one and only Maker and Ruler of the Universe. We are too apt to forget that the rôle of these "wisdom" teachers was to *apply* to practical life the spiritual teaching already given by others. Side by side with their moral teaching, and paving the way for it, there were going on at the same time two other Ministries of the

Word exclusively religious in character and aim : "The Law shall not perish from the (scribe¹), nor counsel from the wise, nor the Word from the prophet." All over Judah in every city there were recognised teachers from Ezra's day (cf. Ez. viii. 16 ; Neh. viii. 7 ; 2 Chron. xvii. 7 ; xxxv. 3), scribes who taught Israel the statutes of the Law and the religious teaching of the Prophets ; some stressed the statutes, some the teaching. Moreover, the Temple-worship, in which all Jews delighted, kept the ritual side of religion ever before men's eyes, while the synagogue saw to it that due heed was paid both to the Law and the Prophets. If, in *Prov.*, the higher side of spiritual religion seems absent and we find no clear expression of the Love of God, the sense of sin and repentance, the joy of the service of God, the hope of the Messianic Kingdom, it is simply because this bed-rock foundation has already been well and truly laid. The "wise" take it for granted, and would be the first to own that without it their own building would rest on a foundation of sand. The scribe and the prophet deal amply with these vital articles of faith ; the concern of the "wise" is to apply them to individual life by way of moral exhortation and instruction (cf. our Catechism) ; and if, as Christ and the prophets (*e.g.* Mic. vi. 8) insist, religion is a character and a life, then these moral teachers were doing God's work of the Kingdom every whit as truly as their fellow-teachers. Repeat it too often we cannot, it is precisely because we forget the vast variety of ways in which the living spirit of post-exilic Judaism, so full of religious fervour and vitality, found its expression, that we so often label and libel it as a legal yoke throttling spiritual life and ending in stagnation. If we want to judge the Judaism of 500-200 B.C. aright, let us see it steadily and see it whole. An age which could simultaneously and spontaneously pro-

¹ For reasons stated (p. 238, n.), I have adapted this passage to suit my context.

duce its Priestly Code, Job, Eccles., Prov., Chron., Ruth, and wanted them all for its self-expression, was very much alive and no spiritual invalid.

Proverbs falls into two main divisions: (1) A Prologue (i.-ix.) or series of discourses descriptive of wisdom, with one sublime passage on the "Wisdom of God" in viii. 22 sqq., where it practically tallies with the "Word" of St. John; (2) x. 1-xxii. 16, a collection of proverbial couplets on the conduct of life. Over and above these two, there are several minor supplementary collections:¹ xxii. 17-xxiv. 22; xxv.-xxix.; xxx.; xxxi. 1-9; and finally xxxi. 10-31, an anonymous alphabetic poem in praise of the good housewife. The contents of these various sections are very various and hard to classify. The writers seize on whatever touches practical life, counselling men how to judge rightly and prudently every situation—social, political, or economic,—in which they may find themselves, and turn it to their best advantage. Man's character, social virtues, man's private life, his business, his intercourse with inferiors or superiors, what persons to avoid or copy, all come within their ken, and Terence's motto, "*Homo sum, humani nihil a me alienum puto,*" might well be their own. In their word-pictures of wisdom and folly (and, in their eyes, all men are either "wise men" or "fools," two permanent classes as sharply divided as is the Stoic virtuous man from other men), these writers sometimes simply catch the expression of men good or bad, sketching their portrait in a few bold lines; more often they pass a verdict on their actions and thoughts, and urge their hearers to copy or avoid such models. Madam Folly (ix. 13 sqq.); the virtuous wife (xxx. 10 sqq.); the slothful man (xxiv. 30 sqq.); the drunkard

¹ The two main divisions are called "Proverbs of Solomon"; xxii. 17 bids us hear "The words of the wise"; xxiv. 23, "These are also sayings of the wise"; xxv. 1, "These also are proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Hezekiah, King of Judah, copied out"; xxx. 1, "The words of Agur, the son of Jakeh; the oracle"; xxxi. "The words of King Lemuel; the oracle which his mother taught him."

(xxiii. 29 sqq.); the mirror for princes (xxx. 1 sq.), are cases in point.

Prov. x.-xxii. 16 is the oldest portion of the book, probably of the Persian period. Prov. i.-ix. is clearly later and probably of the early Greek period. It seems to show traces of Hellenic influence. Its author treats his topic "more sustainedly, though without logical disposition or connection, in a warm and friendly tone such as an experienced elder might use toward a youth. The style is easy and flowing, and sometimes rises to poetic inspiration." In this Prologue (i.-ix.) we have a set of discourses tracing the development of the "wise man" and the "fool," two of the most striking of all ethical figures in the O.T. They became household words in Israel, so that wisdom was identified with godliness, and wickedness with folly: "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God." Hence, to call a man a fool was the grossest insult (= moral reprobate, *e.g.* Mt. v. 22). These personifications of "wisdom," however, are purely poetical (*e.g.* i. 20; viii. 1 sqq.; ix. 1 sqq.). Not so with the "Wisdom" of viii. 22 sqq.: "I was set up from everlasting, or ever the world was. The Lord possessed me in the beginning of His way, before the first of His works. When there were no depths I was brought forth. . . . Then I was by Him as a master-workman, and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him," etc. The quickening Spirit and creative Word of Gen. i. are here so personified in Wisdom as to convert it almost into an independent Person, though at the same time always one with God Himself.

The teaching of the "wise," we said, has its roots in the Law and the Prophets, though seldom alluding to either. The tone of *Prov.* is distinctly Deuteronomic; Deut. iv. 6-7: "Keep therefore and do the Lord's statutes, for this is your wisdom," is also the motto of Proverbs, and from the Deuteronomic Book of the Law did its writers draw their inspiration.

Thus they have caught its splendid humanitarian spirit, *e.g.* "Rejoice not when thine enemy falleth" (Prov. xxiv. 17); "If he that hateth thee be hungry, give him bread to eat," etc. (xxv. 21 sqq. R.V.). Akin to the highest prophetic teaching are such fine passages as *e.g.* "Despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, for whom the Lord loveth He reproveth even as a father the son in whom he delighteth" (iii. 11), and "Love covereth all transgressions" (x. 12); or "To do justice and judgment is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifice" (xxi. 3). Deuteronomic, too, is the "Fear of the Lord," the wise man's motive for all he does. It is no servile fear, but the feeling of reverent awe in the presence of a Father, a holy God, who knows the innermost secrets of His children's hearts (xxiv. 12), loves them tenderly even when He reproves them (iii. 11), and ever helps those of His children who seek goodness and wisdom to find it.

The problem of the sufferings of the righteous engages the attention of the writers of *Prov.*, but their attitude to it, as in most Pss., is summed up in the conventional verdict: "Happiness is to the righteous (= wise), woe to the wicked (= fools)." In Proverbs virtue is ever rewarded, never is the righteous man forsaken or his seed begging bread; the ungodly always come to grief; while sin is sheer folly ending in loss and disgrace, and worldly prosperity is sure to follow a course of right conduct: "Honour the Lord with thy substance and with the first-fruits of all thine increase, so shall thy barns be filled with plenty and thy fats shall overflow with new wine" (iii. 9-10). This facile optimism pervades Proverbs.

Even as the Psalter was ascribed to David, the poet, musician, and singer, so Proverbs was fathered on Solomon, "who was wiser than all men; and he spake three thousand proverbs, and his songs were a thousand and five" (1 Kgs. iv. 30 sqq.). Proverbial sayings, brief and pithy, condensing in witty or

striking form the wisdom of experience, were common in Israel as elsewhere, especially in the East. But this secular wisdom was not much thought of by spiritually-minded pre-exilic sacred writers. Moreover, Solomon's proverbs would hardly have belonged to the moral or religious sphere ; and ironical, indeed, on his lips would be the sayings in *Prov.* about women. At any rate, the wise saws of Proverbs, as they stand, betray an artificial literary technique and a conception of "wisdom" clearly pointing to the age after the Exile as the date of their composition. Of course, many isolated maxims in Proverbs may go back to high antiquity, while others may contain the substance of very old proverbs, e.g. "iron sharpeneth iron" (xxvii. 17); "bray a fool in a mortar" (xxvii. 22); "a whip for the horse, and a bridle for the ass, and a rod for the fool's back" (xxvi. 3); "the dog is returned to his vomit" (xxvi. 11); "stolen waters are sweet" (ix. 17), etc. In their present form in *Prov.*, however, they are the artificial product of technical *mashal* poetry. If this is true of the couplet and the four-line, six-line, eight-line stanzas, still less can we assign to early proverbial philosophy the long discourses of *Prov.* i.-ix. or the alphabetical eulogy of the virtuous woman.

NOTE TO PAGE 269.

My allusion to Job's superb faith as more true and heroic than St. Paul's in 1 Cor. xv. 19, is open to misinterpretation. Indeed, it is not fair to St. Paul to judge him thus by isolated and somewhat rhetorical passages. His real creed still further developed by his disciple "St. John" is far truer, deeper, more spiritual, and fully abreast of the best Christian thought to-day. His own ripe spiritual experience shows him God's own Spirit so intimately indwelling in the child of God, who does His will from the heart, that the Holy Spirit becomes his spirit, transfigures his whole personality ; eternal life is his here and now, and the spirit of God in him now is a sure pledge of the ideal perfection to be his hereafter (cf. Ps. lxxiii. 23-26). This mystical union with God is so close and real that Paul can only describe it as "I am in Christ and Christ in me." Nothing can disturb or sever the blessedness of this union with God : "Neither death, nor life, . . . nor things present, nor things to come shall be able to separate us from the love of God" (Rom. viii. 38); "The Kingdom of God is not meat, nor drink ; but righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost" (cf. Phil. iv. 4, 11). No question here of future compensation for present ills ; eternal life, with its perfect peace and joy, is ours even here and now.—But this is in a far higher key than the note of 1 Cor. xv. 19, and my words on p. 269 only refer to that *argumentum ad hominem* passage.

CHAPTER XVIII

(IV.) THE HOLY WRITINGS : CANTICLES, RUTH, ESTHER, LAMENTATIONS

CANTICLES

“SONG of songs” (= the best of songs, cf. “Holy of holies”) well expresses the final Hebrew estimate of this dramatic poem : “The whole world is not worth the day on which the Song was given to Israel. For all the Writings (= Hagiographa or ‘Holy Writings’) are holy, but the Song of songs is a Holy of holies” (R. Akiba, *c.* 90 A.D.). But only after hot and long controversy for centuries was this verdict accepted about 90 A.D., when its advocates at last secured the Song’s admission into the Canon on the plea that this exquisite love-poem was a grand spiritual allegory of Jehovah’s love for Israel His spouse.

Allegorical love-poetry, expressive of the love of God for the soul, is not uncommon in mystical circles, and often revels in sensuous imagery. Indeed, so apt and expressive is this conception of Jehovah the husband and Israel His Bride, stressing as it does the solemn covenant between the two, Jehovah’s authority over, and His tender love for, Israel His spouse, and also her heinous sin in her unfaithfulness to Him, that Hosea,—whether as a loan from Canticles, as W. Robertson Smith¹ thinks, or not,—puts

¹ A critical genius, the father of English Bible-criticism at its soundest and soberest. His findings, with a few up-to-date corrections, are mainly ours to-day. Some scholars (*e.g.* Cheyne) openly claim him as Master and avow their heavy debt to him; others seem unaware of the real source of their knowledge and inspiration. The last forty years have only cleared and paved the way this pioneer genius mapped out, so that it may be a public highway.

it in the very forefront of his teaching; so does Ps. xlv.; cf. Jer. iii. 14; xxxi. 32; Is. liv. 5. This apt idea was taken up by the New Testament, Christ now becoming the Bridegroom (Mt. ix. 15; Jo. iii. 29), the Church His Beloved Bride (2 Cor. xi. 2; Eph. v. 23-32), even as the mediæval Church saw in the bride the Virgin Mary. In the Christian Church the allegorical interpretation of the Song, as a prophetic picture of Christ's love for His Beloved (Church or soul) and the Beloved's longing for loving union with Him, was so deep-rooted that Theodore of Mopsuestia was anathematised in 553 A.D. for literally interpreting the Song of earthly wedded love. From the Reformation onward, however, the literal interpretation began slowly to gain ground, and very few scholars interpret Canticles otherwise to-day. As Herder (1778) well puts it: "It is the beautiful picture of innocent and tender love, and is not true love itself holy? Let the Song of songs speak for itself in this light, and it will need no apology to justify its morality, no allegorising to commend it as pure, lovely, and worthy of a place in the Holy Book." Herder's fine and true instinct also anticipated a view now again coming to the front with many scholars (*e.g.* Budde). For Herder it was a Song of songs in the literal sense, that is, not *one* Song, but a chaplet of several bridal songs, "separate voices accordant only in the breath of love," strung together into an organic whole by one dramatic hand.

In its present form, what is the Song of songs? Avowedly, it is a love-song, or rather a bridal song, and its theme is the love of man and woman, expressed in passionate words and sensuous imagery. But is it a lyric drama, one organic whole with one central idea or ideal pervading the whole play through all its progressive stages? or is it merely a collection or anthology of wedding-songs artistically strung together? An Eastern wedding-festival to this day lasts a week, and the proceedings preparatory to the marriage ceremony itself take five days. Daily, some

part of the ceremonial is done to the accompaniment of singing and music. For instance, in one of the earlier scenes, the bridegroom dresses himself up as a pilgrim, leaves the bridal house accompanied by the married women of the party singing in chorus and preceded by instruments of music. His future father-in-law meets him, asks why he is going away, begs him to return, tells him he has a young virgin daughter, and that, if he wishes, he will give her to him in wedlock. So it is at every stage of the proceedings, over and above the endless wedding-ceremonies, there are processions through the streets, and choral songs either explanatory of each ceremony or in fulsome praise of the bride or bridegroom. Some of these songs are fine examples of popular poetry and occasionally are little gems of art. Scholars to-day are largely inclined to look upon the Song of songs as an anthology of these bridal-week songs, as we shall presently see.

Since Ewald's day the general view, till quite recently, has been that the Song is the glorification of true love which remains steadfast under the most trying ordeal. The heroine is a lovely maiden of Shunem. There is direct allusion here to Abishag, the Shunammite (1 Kgs. i. 1-3), "a young virgin, whom the king's servants sought for their lord, king David old and stricken in years, and the damsel was very fair, and she cherished the king, but the king knew her not." This lovely maiden Solomon, now king, wants for his harem.¹ From the outset Solomon fully believes that she is also in love with him. He

¹ Abishag is still young and very lovely and pure when David dies. Solomon's elder brother wants her, and Solomon kills him for it. The reason was really political. But popular folk-lore, ever fanciful, romantic, and dramatic, gives just so much of a story as it wants and leaves the rest. Adonijah's murder by Solomon is an act of jealousy; Solomon is himself in love with her and wants her for his harem. The Shunammite's heart, however, is given to another. Even as on the former occasion, when forced against her will by the king's servants to "lie in his bosom," she had saved her honour and "he knew her not," so now with Solomon. We thus have every incident here ready to hand for inventive folk-lore to develop the whole drama of the Song.

does not know—as the readers know—that the maiden's heart is already wholly given to a shepherd to whom she is betrothed. So the king does not realise that the passionate words of love on her lips are meant, not for him, but for another. As usual in the East, on one of the days of the wedding-week the king, as bridegroom, proceeds with his friends to the home of the bride and addresses her in impassioned words. She replies¹ with equal warmth, but her heart is speaking to *her* beloved; she longs for him by day, she seeks him in her dreams by night. Solomon, when the wedding ceremonial reaches its climax, bends all his suasive powers and charms to win her love, only to discover that her pure heart is another's and never can be his. He is large-hearted enough not to force his suit upon her. Armed only with her own virtue and her affection for her beloved, she comes out of the terrific ordeal more than conqueror in all eyes (viii. 8-10). In the last act we see her walking with her lover upon their native hills. The moral of the piece is well given in viii. 5-7: "Who is this that cometh up from the wilderness, leaning upon her beloved? . . . Set me as a seal upon thine heart, as a seal upon thine arm; for love is strong as death. . . . Many waters cannot quench love, neither can the floods drown it. If a man would give all the substance of his house for love, he would utterly be contemned" (R.V.).

This interpretation flows most naturally from the Song, and, without any dislocation or break, the actions and songs, as they come in the text, mark perfectly the progressive stages of the marriage proceedings. It is quite probable that actual wedding-songs are worked up and embodied in the Song, but, even as with the folk-lore embodied in *Gen.*,

¹ Both bridegroom and bride occasionally lead the singing and dancing; e.g., in the so-called sword-dance of the bride, she seeks to display her charms, while the bridegroom sings the praises of her physical beauty, men and women taking up the chorus in turn. Similarly the eulogy of the physical charms of the bridegroom comes from the lips of the bride.

the poem is the creation of one author, and a dramatic unity. We must not press its accuracy to historical fact; as Chapter III. proves, Hebrew literature cares far more for truth of idea. It is simply a beautiful romance with a moral purpose, and 1 Kgs. i., ii., gave folk-lore and our dramatic poet all the suggestions they wanted.

To-day it is the fashion to sneer at this version of the Song as a triumph of pure love over lust, and to label it "Victorian literary criticism." "The enigma of the Song," writes Budde, "is now definitely solved. The new interpretation of it cuts away the roots of the 'moral drama' idea of it, and now wins its natural sense for the Song of songs." And what is this "new interpretation"? In 1873, Wetzstein, Prussian consul at Damascus, published an article on marriage customs and wedding-songs in Syria. In it, and in a later publication, he described the proceedings and ceremonial during the seven days' marriage-festival, or "king's week"; for the Syrian peasant bridegroom during his bridal-week is literally, in song and salutation, viewed as a king or royal personage in the eyes of his fellows, and the bride is his queen. Throughout the week the royal pair are escorted by villagers in processions with songs and dances in their honour. For the time being they *are* village king and queen. Hence in Hebrew song, says Budde, "as the bridegroom is compared with king Solomon in his glory, and would not (just then) exchange his fortune with Solomon, so for the beauty of the bride no less a woman could be named than the fairest, the maiden of Shunem who was admittedly 'the fairest virgin to be found in the whole land' and also a queen." Here Budde finds "the solution of the problem of our book." It is just a collection of wedding-songs descriptive of the physical charms and wedding-attire of the young pair. The "sixty mighty men" are the companions of the bridegroom. The "daughters of Jerusalem" are village maidens

taking part in the celebrations. The festive occasion of the songs, and their relation to successive stages of the festivities, naturally impart movement and action and a dramatic quality to the whole work. A cunning hand has artistically strung the various independent songs together with some skill, but, really and truly, the Song is no dramatic unity, the creation of one poet; it is simply a collection or anthology of wedding-songs of various origin and date.

Such are the two views of the nature of the Song; the reader must choose between them. The trend to-day is to give the Song of songs a very late date. The text and the distinctly late Hebrew words (see Cheyne), some of the Greek period, undoubtedly prove the presence of late elements in its present composition. Probably the Song was long orally handed down, and did not assume its present written form till comparatively late. Such popular poetry modernises itself from generation to generation; hence the original wording has suffered. The freshness and power of this lyric drama, its Northern dialect, heroine, and scenery, its Northern protest against the corruption of a monarchical Southern court, its mention of Tirzah (vi. 4) destroyed in 900 B.C.—this last touch may be due to poetic imagination—all tend to place the *original* Song in the good period of Hebrew literature (8th century),¹ the hey-day of poetry and song on all themes of national life, *e.g.* war, love, vintage. These popular songs lived on in the memories of the people, but (like much else in secular literature, *e.g.* popular proverbs) were often without interest to the sacred writers of Israel. Hence only a very few of the purely secular songs survive in our Bible, *e.g.* this Song of songs, also the Song of the Well (Numb. xxi. 17 sq.), and the Vintage Song, “Destroy it not, for a blessing is in

¹ I am bound to add that this early date of the Song is very unpopular to-day. The ablest scholars all but unanimously date it 400–300 B.C.

it" (Is. lxxv. 8). Only the mistaken allegorical theory providentially saved the Song of songs from oblivion.

RUTH.

Ruth is a graceful prose-idyll. Full of human interest, rich in colour and imagination, this pleasing dramatic picture of early days has all the freshness, simplicity, sweet poetic fragrance of the living portraits of Genesis. Its place on the line is side by side with those other matchless Hebrew creations, the loves of Jacob and Rachel, the story of Joseph, the nature-pictures of Canticles. The author of *Ruth* takes such evident delight in the pathetic and romantic details of his sweet idyllic picture, enters so heartily and sympathetically into the story he has to tell, tells it with such power, that the story thrills us from start to finish. Through his eyes we see the charms of the simple life in the innocent pastoral days of old. To us as to him Naomi, Ruth, Boaz, the very harvesters, are simple, kindly, God-fearing folk, and we yearn for the love, simplicity and gentle manners of those good olden days. The touching scene in which Naomi bids her widowed daughters-in-law go back, each to her mother's home; Ruth's "entreat me not to leave thee, for whither thou goest I will go; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God"; Naomi's return to Bethlehem, and the people's: "Is this Naomi?" with her reply: "call me not Naomi (= 'pleasant'), call me Mara (= 'bitter'), for the Lord hath dealt very bitterly with me"; the picture of the gleaners in the field of Boaz, and his kindness and courtesy; the chaste and delicate handling of the scene in which Ruth comes to Boaz by night and claims his protection; the quaint scene at the city gate where a nearer kinsman waives his prior claim to his brother Elimelech's (Ruth's father-in-law) field and Ruth's hand with it, and, in the presence of ten elders, passes on his rights to Boaz by removing

his shoe and giving it to Boaz ; the people's blessing on Boaz and Ruth and their union ; the women's blessing on Naomi, who takes their first-born child "and laid it in her bosom, and became nurse unto it," "and the child's name they called Obed ; he is the father of Jesse, the father of David,"—all this is told with an unaffected simplicity and fineness of touch modelled upon the best period of Hebrew literature.

Scholars ask : "What was the author's aim and object in *Ruth* ? Was it written for David's pedigree ? or to throw light on the marriage-law ? or as a political pamphlet against Ezra's new social and marriage reforms ?" Probably for none of these. Doubtless the author was a lover of the simple life¹ and meant his old-world story to be an example for his own age ; and he may have wished to protest against the narrow particularism of his day ; but first and foremost he loved his idyll for its own sake, and such a gem wants no moral to adorn its tale. Clearly written long after the event,—probably a tale of folklore long treasured before it was cast into literary form—it is an idyll pure and simple and a gem of the first water. Its "entreat me not to leave thee, for whither thou goest I will go, and where thou lodgest I will lodge ; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God ; where thou diest will I die and there will I be buried ; the Lord do so to me and more also,

¹ Cf. the whole prophetic teaching, ever exalting the simple life above the materialism of a complex civilisation, e.g. Abel the shepherd is good, Cain the father of the builder of cities (Gen. 4¹⁷) bad ; the Patriarchs are shepherds, and the Codes love agriculture and look askance at commerce, which the prophets label "Canaanite" ; Deut. 17¹⁴⁻²⁰ frowns on kingship (cf. I Sam. 8⁷⁻¹⁸) ; the prophets all denounce civilisation's wealth, large estates, fine houses, luxury, and want swords turned into ploughshares and each man living contentedly under his vine and fig-tree ; the disastrous consequences of exchanging the simple life for the grandeur of kingdoms and royal courts, higher culture and militarism, are shown by pointing to David and Bathsheba's sin, or Solomon's harem sapping his loyalty to God ; Jeremiah praises the austere Rechabites who neither drink wine, nor live in houses, but in tents, and remain nomad shepherds (Jer. 35), and the prophets ever point to the simple wilderness days as the ideal period when Israel lived closest to God. "This austere Hebrew ethic may have diminished the pure *joie de vivre*, but fostered the sense of life's seriousness, the basic condition of firm attachment to ideals."

if aught but death part thee and me," in itself hallows
Ruth.

ESTHER.

"In passing to *Esther* from the other books of the Bible we fall as it were from heaven to earth," writes Ewald. God's name occurs not once in it,—a fact without parallel in the Old Testament—while the king of Persia is named 187 times in it. The nearest approach to a religious topic is the mention of fasting (iv. 16; ix. 31), but there is no allusion to prayer, and, in the Jews' celebration of their rescue and their annual commemoration of it, Esth. ix. 17 sqq. tells us much and repeatedly of "feasting and gladness," but not a word of thanksgiving to God. In all other Books of the Bible deliverance is ascribed to God, in *Esther* all is done by man; indeed all reference to God seems studiously avoided, e.g. Mordecai warns Esther that, if she fails her people in their hour of need, "then shall relief and deliverance arise to the Jews from another place" (iv. 14). *Esther's* moral tone also leaves much to seek; not Esther, but Vashti, is the most respectable character in the book; and narrow particularism, craft, and vindictiveness are pronounced throughout its pages. From the religious and moral standpoint, Luther's description of *James* applies far more aptly to *Esther*: "a right strawy book!" The Jews themselves had the gravest scruples as to the right of *Esther* to a place in the Canon, even after 90 A.D., and the early Christian Church shared these scruples. In popular Jewish esteem, however, *Esther* stood very high by reason of its intense patriotism; for its flattering glorification of the Jews at the expense of their foes, the wicked heathen, 75,000 of whom they then slew (ix. 16); also for its fine portrait of their Joan of Arc, and its Feast of Purim to commemorate their great deliverance (ix. 26). We can well understand how Esther's

devotion to her oppressed fellow-countrymen, her readiness to lay down her life for them—"I will go in unto the king, and if I perish, I perish"—and her dutiful bearing, even as queen, towards her foster-father, would endear this national heroine to the Jews and win her a place beside Deborah in the nation's gratitude.

The story of Esther is told with dramatic power, and the plot most artistically developed. Act I.—The first act opens with a gorgeous banquet at the Persian court ; the king, "merry with wine," orders queen Vashti to be brought in "to show her beauty, for she was fair to look on." She pays no heed to this degrading command and is deposed to make room for a more compliant successor. A decree promptly goes forth that the fairest young virgins be all brought to the king, so that the maiden most pleasing to him may be queen in Vashti's stead. The choice falls on a beautiful young Jewess, an orphan, Esther, whom her cousin Mordecai had adopted. At Mordecai's suggestion she keeps her Jewish origin secret. Act II.—Haman is Grand Vizier, and so great his power that all bow and cringe before him as to a king ; but Mordecai the Jew "bowed not, nor did him reverence." Haman discovers that he is a Jew, and induces the sensual arbitrary king to decree the wholesale slaughter of all Jews in his realm. Mordecai charges Esther to plead with the king for her race ; she tells him that even for her to come into the king's presence, uncalled, is death, but "I will go in unto the king, and if I perish, I perish." Act III.—The captivating Jewess comes in to the king, becomingly dressed, finds favour in the sensual monarch's sight, and he promptly promises to grant her request, be it what it may, before she opens her lips. Cleverly, she simply begs the king to dine with her in her rooms and bring Haman too. At dinner, the king again offers to grant Esther whatever she wishes, but she artfully still postpones her request till the morrow, when the king and Haman

are to dine with her again. Haman, meanwhile, elated at these signal marks of queenly favour, builds a gallows for Mordecai. The night before the second dinner-party, the king, unable to sleep, has the records of his reign read to him. There he finds that a certain Mordecai once saved his life and nothing has been done for him. In the morning he asks Haman, his Grand Vizier: "What shall be done unto the man whom the king delighteth to honour?" Thinking this meant himself, he replies: "Let him ride in the king's apparel and on the king's horse through the city-streets, with a prince at the bridle to proclaim that he is the object of the king's special honour." "Do that for Mordecai, Haman, and hold his bridle yourself," orders the king. Act IV.—Scene, the queen's apartments; the king, Esther and Haman at dinner. "What is thy petition, queen Esther?" again asks the king. To his surprise—he has no inkling that she is a Jewess—she answers: "If it please the king, let my life be given at my petition, and my people at my request. For we are sold, I and my people, to be destroyed, and to be slain." Indignant at this plot against his queen, the king asks: "Who is he, and where is he, that durst presume in his heart to do so?" Pointing to him the queen replies: "This wicked Haman." The scene now becomes very dramatic: the king is so angry that he walks out of the room into the garden to recover; Haman goes down on his knees to the queen who spurns him; the king re-enters the room to find Haman now "upon the bed whereon Esther was," which makes the king ten times more furious; the officials naturally all turn against Haman and tell the king of the tall gallows Haman has at home for Mordecai, and instantly comes the royal order: "Hang him thereon." This done, the king is pacified. Act V.—Esther tells the king that Mordecai is her kinsman and foster-father, and the king at once invests him with the royal ring and makes him Grand Vizier in Haman's stead. By

Persian law, the original royal order to massacre the Jews cannot be repealed, but, by a masterly stroke of policy, Mordecai gets the king to issue a decree authorising the Jews to muster their forces, fully armed, and fall on their would-be assailants. Thus the Jews massacre 75,000 of the wicked heathen, instead of being massacred by them. Esther and Mordecai order the Jews to keep annually the Feast of Purim in commemoration of this joyful end to their troubles.

How far is all this true to fact? No doubt, to all doubters of its veracity *Esther* itself professes to give two irrefutable proofs of its historicity: (1) Its statements are all recorded in the Persian Chronicles and can be verified there (x. 2; vi. 1; ii. 23); (2) The Feast of Purim was instituted expressly to commemorate these very events and their glorious issue (ix. 26 sqq.). So it was that ever after, at the Feast of Purim, *Esther* was annually read in the synagogue with much accompanying outward expression of feeling, as telling passages moved the hearers to love or hate, pride or scorn, rage or grief. In spite of the local colouring and the lifelike representation of Persian manners and customs, especially in connection with the palace at Susa and the vain, capricious, sensual character of Xerxes, the story bears on the face of it the features of a historical romance.¹ But the reader cannot fail to be forcibly struck by the dramatic power and vividness of *Esther*, even though its religious, moral, and historic worth can hardly be said to be great. In date, it is probably of about 300 B.C., if not later.

¹ In *Mordecai* and *Esther*, fictitious names, many scholars see adaptations of the Babylonian deities' names Marduk and Ishtar, the kindly spring sun-god and the goddess of fruitful vegetation who triumph over the winter storms, the plotters of havoc and destruction. Be this as it may, this association of Mordecai and Esther with Marduk and Ishtar certainly never entered the Jewish author's head in this story.

LAMENTATIONS.

Lamentations, five elegies or dirges on the woes of Judah and Jerusalem at the time of Zion's siege and fall (588-586 B.C.), and after. *Lam.* i.-iv. are alphabetical acrostics; all five poems clearly show the literary artist's hand. They are not spontaneous outbursts of grief, but elaborate elegies in which every note of pity and terror is brought out with conscious art to stir up the feelings of the hearers. The scenes of woe are interwoven with confessions of sin, calls to repentance, and prayers for a return of God's favour. Each elegy is a whole in itself, independent, and there is no traceable progress in the thought from first to last.

Lam. i.-iv., alphabetic acrostics, each contains 22 three-clause verses, and each verse begins with its proper letter of the alphabet. In *Lam.* iii., the proper letter not only occurs at the beginning of each verse but at the beginning of each of its clauses, *i.e.* it is thrice repeated in each verse. *Lam.* v. also has 22 verses, but it is neither alphabetic nor in elegiac metre.

Lam. i.—Zion's solitude and desolation. Imprecation on foes.

Zion, our queen, sits now solitary, widowed, tributary, weeping, with none to comfort her, "her lovers (= old allies) and friends have dealt treacherously with her," "Judah is in captivity among the heathen." No more solemn assemblies, streets and gates are desolate, priests sigh, princes are laid low. Jerusalem so great and pleasant is now mocked of her foes. "She hath grievously sinned, therefore she is removed and become an unclean thing." The heathen have entered into her sanctuary, her people sigh and seek bread. "Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by? See if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow"; for my sins, the Lord in His anger hath delivered me to the enemy, trodden me in the winepress, made me faint and desolate. "Zion spreadeth forth her hands and there is none to comfort her. . . . The Lord is righteous, for I have rebelled against

His commandment." "Behold, O Lord, . . . I have grievously rebelled ; abroad the sword bereaveth, at home there is as death." "My enemies are glad that Thou hast done it. . . . Let all their wickedness come before Thee, and do unto them as Thou hast done unto me for all my transgressions."

Lam. ii.—Zion's destruction and woes. Call to repentance.

"The Lord hath cast down from heaven unto the earth the beauty of Israel," "He hath bent His bow like an enemy, with His right hand as an adversary He hath slain all that were pleasant to the eye, He hath poured out His fury like fire." Her palaces, His strongholds, His Tabernacle, His solemn assembly and sabbath, His altar, His priest and king, He hath swallowed up, abhorred, despised in His anger. "He hath made the rampart and wall to lament, they languish together ; her gates are sunk, her bars broken, her king and princes are among the heathen, and the Law is not ; the elders keep silence in dust and sack-cloth, the maidens hang down their heads, mine eyes fail with tears, children swoon in the streets for hunger." Our sins and false prophets are to blame for it all. "All they that pass by clap their hands, hiss and wag their heads, saying, 'Is this the city that men called the perfection of beauty, the joy of the whole earth? We have swallowed her up ; certainly this is the day we looked for, we have found, we have seen it.'" The Lord hath fulfilled His word and done what He foretold of old ; He hath thrown thee down and exalted the horn of thine adversaries. "Arise, pour out thine heart like water before the face of the Lord. Behold, O Lord, to whom Thou hast done thus!" "Shall the women eat their fruit, their children ; the priest and prophet be slain in the sanctuary? Young and old lie in the streets, maidens and youths are fallen by the sword!"

Lam. iii.—An "I" elegy. Desolation, Contrition, Hope and Trust. Curse on foes.

"I am he that hath seen affliction by the rod of His wrath ; He hath led me in darkness and not in light ; He hath broken my bones and made me old and my chain heavy, He shutteth out my prayer ; He was to me as a bear and a lion ; He hath bent His bow and set me as a mark for the arrow. He hath filled me with bitterness and sated me with wormwood."

The penitent "I" sees a righteous but compassionate God, and from his depth of woe hears a voice :
"Fear not."

"It is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed, because His compassions fail not. They are new every morning ; great is Thy faithfulness. The Lord is my portion, saith my soul ; therefore will I hope in Him." It is good for me that I have been in trouble ; my soul, wait patiently upon God. "For the Lord will not cast off for ever. For though He cause grief, yet will He have compassion according to the multitude of His mercies. For He doth not afflict willingly (= from His heart), nor grieve the children of men." The Lord does not crush the prisoners, nor turn aside the right, but loveth righteousness. "Why doth man complain when his sins are punished ? Let us search and try our ways, and turn again to the Lord. We have transgressed, we have rebelled. Thou hast covered Thyself with a cloud that our prayer should not pass through, Thou hast made us as the offscouring and refuse in the midst of the peoples. Mine eye poureth down, till the Lord look down and behold from heaven." "I called upon the Lord from the lowest dungeon, Thou heardest my voice ; Thou drewest near and saidst, Fear not." "Thou wilt render unto my foes a recompense, Thou wilt give them hardness of heart, Thy curse upon them ; pursue them in anger and destroy them."

Lam. iv.—Lurid picture of Zion's woes. Sinful priests and prophets. Curse on Edom ; comfort for Zion.

"How is the gold become dim !" The sanctuary-stones lie about the streets, Zion's precious sons are as earthen pitchers, the sucking child's tongue is parched for thirst, the children lack bread, they that were in scarlet embrace the dunghills, Zion's sin is greater than Sodom ; her Nazarites were purer than snow, their visage is blacker than a coal, their skin cleaveth to their bones ; those slain by the sword are better than those slain with hunger ; women have sodden their children. The Lord hath accomplished His fury. Neither kings nor men "believed that the enemy should enter into the gates of Jerusalem. It is because of the sins of her prophets and the iniquities of her priests ; they have wandered as blind men in the streets, and polluted themselves with blood."

"Our eyes as yet failed in looking for our vain help; in our watching we have watched for a nation that could not save"; our foes pursued, laid wait for, harried us mercilessly on every side, "the breath of our nostrils, the anointed of the Lord (= our king) was taken in their pits; of whom we said, Under his shadow we shall live among the nations." "Rejoice and be glad, Edom (at our fall); the cup shall pass through unto thee also, thou shalt be drunken and naked." "Zion, the punishment of thine iniquity is ended, He will no more carry thee away into captivity. Edom, He will visit thine iniquity; He will discover thy sins."

Lam. v.—Alien oppression. (Unlike other Lamentations, v. begins with prayer and ends on the wrath of God.)

"Remember, O Lord, what is come upon us, Behold, and see our reproach." (Woes of foreign oppression.) Aliens have our lands and homes, sell us our water and wood. "Our fathers have sinned and are not; and we have borne their iniquities"; "servants have ruled over us"; they starved us, ravished our wives and maidens, hanged our princes, insulted our elders, sweated our young men and children, turned our joy into tears; foxes walked on Zion's holy mountain. "Thou, O Lord, abidest for ever, Thy throne is from generation to generation. Wherefore dost Thou forget us for ever, and forsake us so long time? Turn Thou us unto Thee, O Lord, and we shall be turned; Renew our days as of old. But Thou hast utterly rejected us. Thou art very wroth against us."

Tradition uniformly ascribes *Lamentations* to Jeremiah. The Septuagint actually introduces the first chapter with the words: "And it came to pass that after Israel was carried into Captivity, and Jerusalem was laid waste, Jeremiah sat weeping,¹ and made this lamentation over Jerusalem and said."² Even some who question Jeremiah's authorship as a whole, attribute parts to him. Hence the placing of *Lam.* immediately after *Jer.* in our Bible;³ even as

¹ It is largely owing to the ascription of *Lam.* to Jeremiah that he is known as the weeping prophet.

² Cf. 2 Chron. xxxv. 25.

³ In the Hebrew Bible, *Lam.* stands among the "Holy Writings," and "Ah how!", its opening word, is its title. In the Septuagint, it stands after *Jer.*, and its title is *Θρήνοι* (= "Dirges," "elegies"), exactly as the Talmud,

Ruth follows *Judges* in the Greek Bible and ours, because the story of *Ruth* is laid in the time of the *Judges*. Much of *Lam.* was certainly composed before 516 B.C., the date of the completion of the Second Temple. *Lam.* ii. and iv. are the best, and probably oldest. *Lam.* iii. is deeply religious, but artistically weakest, and latest in date. *Lam.* v. shows dramatic power, but seems left in the rough by its composer. *Lam.* i. is a beautiful, but rather monotonous elegy. *Lam.* ii. and iv. may certainly be Jeremiah's; but, generally speaking, the whole book, like much in *Ezekiel*, shows the literary artist's hand overmuch, and was apparently written in the study towards the end of the Captivity. *Lamentations*, in later days, was publicly read by the Jews on the 9th of Ab, the anniversary of the destruction of the Temple, as part of the ritual of that great day of mourning.¹

and Jewish writers generally, call it "elegies." Hence the *Lamentationes*, *Lamenta* of Jerome and the Latin Church. (See W. Robertson Smith, *Enc. Brit.* (9th editn.), xiv. 240.)

¹ The only portions of the Hagiographa publicly read in the Jewish Church are *Canticles* (at the Passover), *Ruth* (at the Feast of Weeks), *Lam.* (as above), *Eccles.* (at Feast of Tabernacles), *Esther* (at Feast of Purim). These five books together form the five Megillôth ("rolls") or small books written on separate rolls for liturgical use at the five Jewish festivals mentioned. "Chron., Prov., Job, Dan., Neh., Ezra, are not read now, and have never been read, in Jewish public worship" (Woods, *O.T. Canon*, Hastings' *D. of B.*, iii. 604).

CHAPTER XIX

MESSIANIC HOPE—DANIEL AND APOCALYPSES

WE speak of the Future Hope and associate it with Life after Death, Judgment, Eternity, Heaven, and Hell; for us it has mainly to do with the individual. To say that belief in individual immortality is not found in the Old Testament would be untrue. It certainly is from about 300 B.C. onward, *e.g.* Pss. xvi. 9-11, xlix. 15, lxxiii. 24; Is. xxv. 8, xxvi. 19; Dan. xii. 1-2. But, in itself, the belief in a purely individual immortality never appealed to any but a very few isolated thinkers in O.T. days. Even when they did arrive at a belief in a resurrection, it was all but exclusively a national, not an individual, resurrection. Israelites looked forward to a blessed future only *as members of a Holy People*, as citizens of an Israel of God or righteous Kingdom which should embrace all good Hebrews, alive or dead, for the good dead should rise to share in its blessings. In a word, our eschatology is that of the individual and its scene heaven; O.T. eschatology is that of Israel as a nation and its stage of action is God's Kingdom here on earth.

A clear idea of the Future Hope of Israel, *as given in the O.T. and as pictured by O.T. writers and readers*, is not easy to place before the modern reader, and for two reasons: (1) The O.T. reveals its picture of it bit by bit, here a little and there a little; only in apocalypses outside the Bible do we get these separate ideas combined into a clear organic whole hardly distinguishable from the New Testament picture.

(2) But the modern reader's chief snare is that he will read N.T. views into O.T. passages, and give a Christian meaning which is not there to O.T. Messianic ideals and aspirations. For instance, we can easily read a Christological meaning into the "Suffering Servant," the Immanuel Prophecy, the Messianic King; but, for the original writers or readers, was it there at all? Of course, we can plead that God saw further than Isaiah, Micah, or Jeremiah, and made these prophets say more and better than they knew. This may be; but here our one aim is to see what these O.T. Israelites *themselves* thought of the Messianic Kingdom or of Life after Death. And for this we must clear our minds of all Christian ideas on these subjects, or we shall see the O.T. picture in quite a wrong perspective and defeat our own ends.

From first to last, Israel's Hope clusters round "The Day of the Lord" which is to usher in Israel's great prosperity and blessedness. "The Day" plays a vital part in it all, and we must begin with that. "The Day" is *not* the blessed future itself, only the divine act of judgment inaugurating it, or the Day of God's divine interposition. The words of Amos (760-750 B.C.): "You that desire the day of the Lord," (v. 18) prove that the phrase was already quite familiar and on all lips. It dates much further back in Israel's history.¹

With Israel, as with their Arab kinsmen, "the Day" had originally the definite signification of "the day of battle"² (cf. Is. ix. 4, "the day of Midian"). So in the popular mind the "Day of the Lord" was

¹ For reasons given in Ch. III., we do not quote in the text so-called earliest promises of a Future Hope as made *e.g.* to Adam (Gen. 3¹²) or to Abraham (Gen. 12³), or Noah or Jacob. But the Song of Deborah, which shows us Jehovah actually leading Israel in battle against His and their enemies (Judg. v.); 2 Sam. vii. with God's express covenant with David; and Ex. xx. 22-xxiii. 33, the Book of the Covenant (800 B.C.), with its promises of prosperity to Israel if true to its Jehovah,—all help to explain Amos' "you that desire the day of the Lord."

² Cheyne, *Enc. Bib.* 1348; Robertson Smith, *Prophets*, 2, 397.

to be the day when Jehovah, at the head of Israel's hosts, would personally deliver them from their foes, wreak dire judgment on His and His Israel's enemies, usher in a Golden Era of everlasting material prosperity for His Chosen People, and Himself take up His abode in their midst. This idea of an Israelite Kingdom of God naturally flowed from the identification of Jehovah with His Israel. Ever since His Sinai Covenant with Israel, He is *their* God, they are *His* people. Jehovah's and Israel's fortunes stand or fall together. Hence Deborah curses Meroz "Because they came not *to the help of the Lord*" (Judg. v.).

Universally, up to 800 B.C., "The Day of the Lord" was viewed as a crushing day of Israel's judgment on Israel's enemies. On that day Jehovah would vindicate His own and His Israel's honour by crushing their foes and setting up His glorious Kingdom. On the people's lips "the Day" had a material and national meaning pure and simple. From Amos onward, prophet after prophet challenges this comfortable Hope of Israel, and tries to substitute one based on moral grounds. They adopt the phrase, but give it a moral note which converts it into a day, not of God's blessing, but of His wrath on a sinful Israel. They frankly tell Israel: You think yourselves God's Israel to whom all His covenanted promises are made. You are *not* it. The real Israel of God and the actual Israel are poles apart; till you become the true Israel, the promises are not for you, only God's wrathful judgment *on you!*

Yet the prophets believe in an *Israelite* Kingdom of God every whit as much as the people themselves. Jehovah has pledged Himself to it, and, in spite of Israel's badness, the prophet's implicit faith in Jehovah and His Covenant-promises does not waver for one instant. True, a sinful Israel must be purified of its dross as if by fire, but from its ashes will rise a new Israel, meet to be citizens of the Kingdom of God. This Hebrew Kingdom of God must be, will

be. Indeed, they all see it very near at hand; but of the exact time of its coming knows no man, only God. This, however, they do know: the Day of the Lord must first come, a Day of terrible visitation *on Israel itself*, sifting its wheat from the chaff. Yet with all their emphasis on it as a *Day of Judgment*, they know it is but a purifying judgment. Its cleansing work done, at once the Golden Age will dawn on a righteous Israel. Unlike the present evil age, the Golden Era will be an age free from all ills and foes within and without. God will bestow upon His People such glory, peace, and well-being as David's and Solomon's glorious reigns never knew; the Jews' fondest dreams will be more than realised. This "redemption of Israel" is to be God's own act at His appointed time. God Himself will suddenly and miraculously intervene, manifest Himself visibly, vindicate His own and His Israel's honour; He will be Israel's King, they His People in direct communion with Him; to Him, and to His Israel, shall every nation bow the knee.

In some Messianic prophecies God is spoken of as raising some chosen human agent as His "anointed" (= Messiah) for the express purpose of delivering His Israel. At times he is a sublime Davidic king. David's reign, the hey-day of Israel's glory, was ever idealised by later generations, but 2 Sam. vii. gives us a deeper reason for this expectation of a Davidic Messiah. In God's own name, Nathan the Prophet had covenanted with David that his house, his kingdom, his throne should be established for ever, and that Israel's immortality as a nation should be as sure as that of David's own line (2 Sam. vii. 8-17).¹ Hence

¹ N.B. The phrases: "I will be his father, and he shall be My son"; "thy throne and thy kingdom shall be established for ever"; "I have cut off all thine enemies out of thy sight, and have made thee a great name"; "I will appoint a place for My people Israel and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more."—These promises of God are the key to two-thirds of the so-called Messianic expectations.

we often hear of the coming Deliverer as a righteous Branch or Sprout of David's line, a Davidic King, the Lord's "anointed," very gracious, full of the strength and Spirit of the Lord, and abundant blessings flow from the righteous rule of this ideal King. Some prophets, however, have no Davidic king, but some other Deliverer whom God has anointed and upon whom He has poured His Spirit, *e.g.* Zerubbabel, Cyrus. Others, again, have no human Deliverer at all; God Himself is Israel's Redeemer, the new Israel's King, and Jerusalem His Holy City and abode. As to the fate of the nations, Second Isaiah and the author of Is. xix. are universalists, and show us God loving the nations for their own sake and lovingly drawing them to Himself; the majority of Bible-writers, however, are particularists; they reserve all the glory of the Kingdom for the Jews and make the nations their vassals.

The rich growth of these Messianic prophecies is natural. Once given: (1) God's Covenanted promises to Israel at Sinai; (2) His Covenant with David; (3) David and his glorious kingdom as seen through the eyes of later oppressed Jews; (4) Israel's practical monopoly of Jehovah as *their* God,—and we can readily understand Israel's Hope, as well as the bright colours in which a glowing Hebrew imagination would paint its picture of the Golden Age and its Messianic King. It is a sketch rich in Oriental poetry, imagery, hyperbole, but wondrously grand and inspiring.

Such are the broad general outlines. We shall now trace the gradual evolution of the Messianic ideal in the prophets, taking them one by one, but dividing them into three groups: (*a*) pre-exilic, (*b*) exilic, (*c*) post-exilic, and for this reason. Roughly speaking, *before the Exile*, the Day of the Lord is a day of judgment on a sinful Israel itself; *during the Exile*, "the Day" finds Israel chastened and purified, so its judgment is on their foes; *after the Exile*, Israel

is constantly sinning again and always under foreign yoke, so "the Day" is at times a judgment on Israel itself, more often on their Gentile oppressors.

(A) *Pre-exilic prophets.*

Amos (c. 760-750 B.C.) tells Israel: You expect "the Day of the Lord" to be a day of triumph over your foes. Not so. It is going to be a terrible day of judgment, but *upon you*. "You only have I known, O Israel, therefore I will punish you for all your sins." Amos has no reference to a better future (Am. ix. 8*b*-15, a Messianic prediction of the restoration of David's kingdom, with nations subject to it, and the prosperity of the Golden Age, is admittedly a post-exilic addition to counteract the ill-omened close ix. 1-8*a*; 8*b* not only flatly contradicts 8*a* but 9*b* as well).

Hosea (c. 750-737 B.C.) also sees a day of judgment on Israel's harlotries. But Jehovah is Israel's Husband and still loves His faithless Bride, tenderly watching over her, so that even "the valley of trouble shall be a door of hope"; "In that day I will betroth thee unto Me in righteousness, and in judgment, and in lovingkindness, and in mercies." The old relations of full Husband and Bride will be restored, and the Golden Age will come. Hosea is the first prophet to declare the Messianic ideal of godliness and happiness. *If* Hos. iii. 5 is his (?), a Davidic King is promised: "Afterward shall Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king." This is the first reference to a Messianic ruler.

Micah (724 B.C.- ?).—Corruption and oppression cry to God for vengeance. "Hear this, ye heads and rulers of Israel that abhor judgment and pervert all equity. . . . Zion shall be plowed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountain of the house as the high places of the forest" (iii. 9 sqq.). Yet immediately follows a picture of the Golden Age, with the Temple rebuilt and glorious, Jerusalem the world's religious centre to which all nations flock; and the Law of God universally obeyed ushers in an age of universal peace and happiness. True, Assyria is already at the gate, "thou shalt go even to Babylon," but a glorious restoration is promised, and "thou shalt beat in pieces many people" (iv.). Mic. v. 2 sqq., like Hosea, foresees an anointed King of David's line, born at David's birthplace, Bethlehem. The strength and spirit of the Lord will be in him, and "he shall be great unto the ends of the earth"; Assyria will

be humbled, and the Golden Age will come (cf. vii. 7 sqq. But the majority of scholars are puzzled as to how much of all this (chs. iv.-v. and vii. 7 sqq.) is really Micah's).

Isaiah (740-700 B.C.) = Is. 1-xxxix. (but xiii. 1-xiv. 23, against Babylon, is exilic; xxi. 1-10; xxiv.-xxvii., is certainly post-exilic and quite late; xxxiv.-xxxv. against Edom, is exilic; xii. is also probably exilic; xxxvi.-xxxix. is noteworthy as = 2 Kgs. xviii.-xx.). "The Day" is the dread Day of the Lord, first on Israel, then, after a respite, on Judah, to purge God's people of their cross. In the "remnant," or small band of faithful souls, Isaiah sees the "holy seed" out of which is to spring God's new Israel. The famous passages Is. vii. 14; ix. 1-6; xi. 1-9 all point to an ideal Davidic Prince as the Lord's anointed King ruling, in the strength and Spirit of the Lord, in righteousness over a righteous and thrice-blessed Israel. This forms what is called the "Immanuel Prophecy." Syria and Israel are threatening Ahaz, who is greatly afraid. Isaiah bids Ahaz, Davidic king of Judah, not be afraid, but trust implicitly God's promise (2 Sam. vii.) of an everlasting throne to David; he assures him that, though his house may be humbled awhile, yet God's words: "I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever. I will be his Father, he shall be My son, My mercy shall not depart from him. . . . My people shall dwell in a place of their own and move no more, neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime" (2 Sam. vii.), must be fulfilled. Out of the root of Jesse a new glorious Shoot will spring, a sublime Immanuel or Davidic King will arise. "The maiden" ¹

¹ "Virgin" (Heb. 'almāh), "a colourless term = any young woman of marriageable age, without in itself stating whether single or married" (Burney, *Outlines of O.T. Theology*, p. 103), e.g. in Joel i. 8 = young married woman. "The maiden," here the article may = (a) a young woman well known at the time, e.g. the wife of king Ahaz, or of Isaiah himself; (b) generic (as often in Heb.), i.e. marriageable maidens as a class, as in R.V. and A.V.; (c) one long since marked out in history to play a definite rôle, e.g. the mother of the Messiah; or even Israel, the Bride of Jehovah (Hos. ii.), cf. "The Virgin of Israel" (Jer. 14¹⁷, 18¹³, 31²¹, Lam. 1¹³), and then "the maiden" = the regenerate Israel. Cheyne, Robertson Smith, Kuenen, favour the generic meaning (b); Ewald, and most English scholars, advocate (c), as in the text above. But, as Bleek and Prof. A. B. Davidson warn us, it does not follow that Isaiah himself, in Is. vii. 14, had Christ's Virgin-Birth in view. "Historical interpreters have to distinguish between the things which N.T. writers affirm and corroborate by O.T. passages, and the proofs or corroborations (e.g. Mt. i. 22 sq.) which they adduce. . . . It was more the actual life of Christ that suggested to N.T. writers the application to Him of O.T. passages, than the prevalent or authentic interpretation of the passages. They saw in His life the full religious meaning of the passages, and the question of their original sense or application did not occur to them." (Cf. pp. 198, 307 *sup.*; esp. 317 *inf.*)

(Heb. has "the" = she who is famous as mother of that famous son; "maiden" = any young woman of marriageable age, single or married) shall conceive and bear a son, Immanuel, an ideal Davidic King, so full of the strength and Spirit of the Lord, which God pours into His chosen agents, that he is literally Immanuel (= "God is with us"). In him, as His representative, God will manifest Himself, and fully realised will be His promise to David: "I will be his Father, he shall be My son," as also that other promise, "his throne shall be for ever." Thus Immanuel, "God is with us," will be as the *everlasting Father* in his fatherhood of the people under his care, and as the *God-mighty One* as against his people's foes; and even as David was a king righteous and just, who established an empire and a reign of peace, so Immanuel will be a *Wonder of a Counsellor*—that is, a wondrously righteous administrator of affairs in his kingdom, and a *Prince of Peace* ushering in a period of peace and prosperity after war and trouble. In Is. xi. 1-9 (probably post-exilic), this "Shoot out of the stem of Jesse, and Branch out of his roots," extraordinarily endowed with the Spirit of the Lord, and righteous in his sway, is further developed; and in a highly poetical passage we see all Nature, and the wild animals, sharing in this paradise of Messianic peace and bliss. Isaiah xi. 10 also gives us the first sketch of religious universalism, for the God of Israel extends His gracious care and love even to the nations: "a root of Jesse shall stand as an ensign of the peoples, unto him shall the nations seek, and his resting-place shall be glorious" (cf. the splendidly universal Is. xix. 19 sqq., but it is almost certainly post-exilic).

Habakkuk (608 B.C.), *Nahum* (605-600 B.C.).—We are on the eve of the Captivity and Israel is already suffering keenly at the hands of the oppressor. Hence *Hab.* and *Nahum* no longer stress Israel's sins, and the Day of Judgment is to strike the Gentiles. This is the first note in this key.

Jeremiah (626-586 B.C.).—*Before* the Captivity the Day, in Jeremiah, is one of sword, famine, pestilence, and irrevocable doom on Israel, but a new Israel is to arise from its ashes; the end of tribulation will be good "when God will."

(B) *During the Exile*

Jeremiah now comforts. God will after 70 years restore Israel and Judah to their land in peace and prosperity. True shepherds will feed God's flock, a succession of kings of David's line ushered

in by a "righteous Branch of David's stem," an ideal Davidic King who "shall execute judgment and justice on the earth and be called '*the Lord is our Righteousness.*'" The name "Jehovah (the Lord) is our Righteousness" of this king embodies a *Theocratic* ideal even more emphasised than "God is with us," Immanuel's name. In Jer. xxx. 9: "Israel shall serve the Lord their God, and David their king, whom I will raise up unto them," this ideal king is simply called David. In this Messianic age, God makes a new Covenant with Israel and writes His Law, not in a Law-book as of old, but in each man's heart, so that they may all spontaneously know Him, from the least of them to the greatest (xxxii. 31 sq.).

Ezekiel (593-573 B.C.) is at first stern. The Day is one of judgment and doom on Jerusalem and on Judah. But after 586, he comforts. God will restore *both* Israel and Judah to their land and "I the Lord will be their God, and My servant David a prince among them" (xxxiv. 24). In xxxvii. 24 sq. David is more than a prince: "My servant David shall be king over them and rule over them for ever." Israel and Judah are again to be one kingdom. The New Covenant of Jeremiah is developed in Ezek. xxxvii. 26. It is to be a "Covenant of peace," an "everlasting Covenant," and Jehovah tells Israel: "A new heart also will I give you and a new spirit will I put within you. . . . I will put My spirit within you and cause you to walk in My statutes, keep them, and do them" (xi.). "My tabernacle shall be with them; yea, I will be their God, and they shall be My people" (xxxvii. 27). "The heathen shall know that I am the Lord, when I shall be sanctified in you before their eyes" (xxxvi. 23). Ezekiel is an out and out particularist. The nations are God's and Israel's wicked foes and shall be destroyed; the Assyrians are to be set in the uttermost parts of the pit.

Second Isaiah (c. 540 B.C.).—The Day of the Lord is now a very good day for Israel, whose righteous few, the "Suffering Servant," have atoned for, and borne, all her sins and those of others. Cyrus, God's servant and "anointed," whom God hath raised up in righteousness and called by name, is to be the Deliverer. Israel is to be gathered in from all quarters. Jerusalem is to be gloriously rebuilt, and God will pour His Spirit abundantly upon His People, and graciously bless them with every blessing beyond anything He ever promised to David. All nations will gladly look up to Israel, and she will draw them to worship her God and King. All barriers separating the nations from

a share in the Kingdom are broken down. Henceforth, God's salvation has for its object the whole world of nations. The fact that Second Isaiah has no Messianic King, also his absolute universalism, mark him off from Jeremiah and Ezekiel. (For fuller details of this paragraph see p. 192 sqq., *sup.*)

(C) *After the Exile.*

Haggai and Zechariah (c. 520 B.C.).—The exiles are now in their own land, but the promised Golden Age is not theirs. Foreign yoke, foes within and without, no Temple, a desolate land—such is their lot. Haggai and Zechariah declare God is angry because His Temple is not rebuilt. This done, but not before, the Golden Age will dawn. Haggai predicts Israel's foes will be brought low, for "God will shake all nations and the desirable things (not "desire," for the Heb. is a collective noun with a plur. verb), of all nations shall come" to ornament the Temple and fill it with glory (ii. 6-9). Both Zechariah (see p. 200, *sup.*) and Haggai (ii. 20-23) mark out Zerubbabel as Messianic King, though Zech. vi. adds that Joshua, the high-priest, "shall be a priest upon his throne (= at Zerubbabel's right hand) and the counsel of peace shall be between them both." Zech. viii. 20-23, makes the nations voluntarily come "to seek the Lord of hosts in Jerusalem, and to entreat the favour of the Lord . . . ten men shall take hold, out of all the languages of the nations, of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you." (Zech. ix.-xiv. are not Zechariah's. Zech. ix. 9-10: "Shout, O daughter of Jerusalem; behold thy King cometh unto thee; he is just, and having salvation (Heb. "saved," *i.e.* by Jehovah); lowly, and riding upon an ass, even upon a colt the foal of an ass," *i.e.* after conquering his enemies, he is now mounted upon the animal ridden in times of peace, indicating that he is ushering in a reign of universal peace: "he shall speak peace unto the heathen, and his dominion shall be from sea to sea, and from the River to the ends of the earth" (cf. Ps. ii. 8)).

Malachi (460-450 B.C.).—The Day is again "a great and dreadful day" of judgment on a morally and religiously lax Judah, and upon its priests who are careless in Temple-worship. The Gentile nations put Israel to shame in the honour they pay to God and in their pure offerings: "For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same My Name is great among the Gentiles ;

and in every place incense is offered unto My Name, and a pure offering" (i. 11). Israel must purge herself of her dross, then Jehovah will come suddenly to His Temple, and Judah will again be "pleasant unto the Lord," "and all the nations shall call you happy; for you shall be a delightsome land" (iii. 12). "Unto you that fear My Name shall the sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings" (iv. 2). But "I will send you Elijah the prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord come" (iv. 5).

Trito-Isaiah (post-exilic, the work of a number of different writers = Is. lvi. to the end, called Trito-Isaiah for convenience, and not to denote a single author). Jehovah is wroth with Israel's sins, but a great future is in store for her: "Behold, the Lord hath proclaimed unto the end of the earth, Say ye to the daughter of Zion, behold, thy salvation cometh"; "and they shall call them the Holy People, The redeemed of the Lord; and thou shalt be called, Sought out, A city not forsaken" (Is. lxii. 11-12). In the Messianic Kingdom (no king in it) there are to be new heavens and a new earth (lxv. 17); Jerusalem is to be thrice-blessed. Men shall live to a patriarchal age (lxv. 20), and there will be such perfect peace that even the brute creation will share in the prevailing harmony. The hostile nations will be judged, and such as escape will flock to Jerusalem and its Temple to worship God.

Joel (400 B.C.?).—The Day is one of judgment on the nations, which are gathered together to be judged and destroyed. It does not hurt penitent Israel, but justifies her in the sight of all nations; plenty and many blessings are to be her lot.

Psalms (see Ch. XVII. *sup.* "Messianic Psalms").—*Note*.—In the *Psalms*, as in all hymns everywhere, we have the faith and hopes (mainly eschatological) to which men cling, voiced in prayer, praise, and thanksgiving. When the *Psalms* speak of judgment (i. 5; vii. 6 sqq.; xxxv. 23, etc.); of the meek inheriting the earth (*e.g.* xxxvii. 11); of the day at hand for the wicked (*e.g.* xxxvii. 13); of seeing God's face in righteousness (*e.g.* xvii. 15); of the upright speedily to have dominion over the unrighteous; of a transfigured earth; of the subjection of the nations to the King, and so forth, they refer to the Future Hope—Pss. (*e.g.*) ii., lxxii., are directly Messianic.

Summary.—From this survey we can see how fluid and undefined is still the conception of the Future Hope of Israel in the prophets (760-c. 300 B.C.). There

is a great variety of idea, with a certain amount of formal agreement, but over and over again, even in the same writer, the statements are hard to reconcile and all but contradictory. The fixed points seem to be these: (1) On the "Day of the Lord" God interposes suddenly, miraculously, and manifests Himself in judgment; (2) the judgment is followed by the perfect kingdom of God; (3) the Kingdom is always for Israel, but sometimes the nations share in it; where they do not, they are either destroyed or subjected; (4) God dwells in Israel's midst and the people are in full and direct communion with Him;¹ (5) it is an everlasting Kingdom; (6) it is on earth; (7) it is a *national* Future Hope, almost exclusively, hardly *individual* till 300 B.C. The prophets are thinking far more of the Israel that shall be than of individual Israelites.

As yet we have no fixed doctrine of a personal Messiah, only the material, the separate ideas or conceptions which will eventually be combined and meet at last in a single complete Portraiture. In a historical study of the Messianic Hope, we must be careful not to attribute greater distinctness or scope to the Messianic expectation at any period, *e.g.* in Hosea, Isaiah, or Jeremiah, than had been attained. They are so many steps, so many separate contributions to the total conception of Messiah that we know so well now, but they must be treated as separate while they are so. This does not in any way detract from the divine value of the final Picture. From that final standpoint, it matters not at all that the lines of the Messiah, which all meet at last in a single Portrait, are drawn from a series of different originals. We could have no more conclusive proof that all the course of the world and all the threads of history are in one guiding Hand, the Hand of Him

¹ With the prophets, this coming of the Lord to dwell amidst His people is something personal and objective to a degree which we can hardly realise, especially in *Ezekiel*.

who rules His world on moral lines and makes all things work together for the redemption of man.

What we want to know here is: "What did Messiah mean to an Isaiah or Jeremiah? What person had *he* in his mind's eye in the passages quoted above? What was the Messianic Hope of O.T. days, as pictured by O.T. writers and readers, and as actually given in such O.T. passages as, *e.g.* Amos (?) ix. 8-15; Hos. (?) iii. 5; Mic. v. 2; Is. vii., ix., xi.; Jer. xxiii. 5-6, xxx. 9; Ezek. xvii. 22-24, xxxiv. 23 sqq., xxxvii. 22-28; Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12, ix. 9, sqq.; Pss. ii., lxxii., etc.? We shall see that the prophets were not reading into their prophecies what we read into them. As has been well said, "O.T. Messianic was, so to speak, unconscious. The writers had not the future King distinctly in their minds. They were speaking of other persons, or they were uttering presentiments, or what seemed to them religious necessities, or projecting forward brilliant spiritual hopes and anticipations" (Prof. A. B. Davidson).

We shall see this for ourselves all the better and clearer if we recapitulate what we have already said in this chapter. Very old, very strong, very deep-rooted was Israel's conviction from the very earliest days that Jehovah had entered into a Covenant relationship with His Israel. This Covenant, *in Israel's eyes*, linked Jehovah's fortunes with their own, and assured the continuance of their race and its prosperity for ever. Such a Covenant, they held, did not depend upon the goodness or badness of any particular generation of God's chosen People. Failure, shortcoming, apostasy on their part would involve dire divine punishment, and the wicked generations or portions of Israel might for the time being forfeit all the privileges of the Covenant blessings. But it was an "everlasting Covenant" made with Israel *as a whole*, and even if nine-tenths of Israel fell away, God never would be without a "remnant," a "holy seed," in His Israel, for whom His eternal Covenant

would still stand sure in the nation's darkest days. This "holy seed," the true Israel, represents the nation, is indestructible, and out of it is to spring the new Israel of God in God's own good time. Happen what may, the eternity and final Golden Age of Israel as a nation is assured. Jehovah cannot prove Himself untrue to the oath which He swore to Abraham, to the solemn Covenant into which He entered with Israel under Moses.

We have also seen that God entered into a solemn covenant with David: "thy throne and thy kingdom shall be established for ever"; "I will be his Father, and he shall be My son"; "I have cut off all thine enemies out of thy sight and made thee a great name." Simultaneously, Jehovah renewed His covenanted promises to Israel: "I will appoint a place for My people Israel and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own and move no more, neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime."

We can readily understand how capable of indefinite idealisation were these two ideas, these two covenanted promises: (1) the indestructibility of Israel as a nation; (2) the eternity of David's line on Israel's throne.—Hence, in the darkest hours of adversity, exile, or oppression, prophets and people alike were confident that Israel, purged of her dross, would come out of it all to enter upon the heritage of a glorious future, when all her foes would be crushed and Israel's Golden Age (material and spiritual) be inaugurated on earth as the Kingdom of God. So, too, of God's promise to David: "thy throne and thy kingdom shall be established for ever." Even as David had subjected the nations, established a mighty empire, been a man after God's own heart, just and righteous in his rule, and a prince of peace in his latter years, so would God again visit and bless his house and make it even more glorious. Israel and Judah would again, in God's own time, be one; Israel's

empire would be restored with tenfold more power and glory than in Solomon's palmy days, and the nation would never be without a ruler of David's line sitting on his throne, ruling in righteousness, full of the strength and Spirit of the Lord.

Even before Amos' day, the minds of men were turned towards these glorious promises in an attitude of tense expectation. Amos, Isaiah, Micah, and the earlier prophets all refer to this Messianic Era as something keenly expected. In the prophetic visions of this Golden Age, the spiritual idea embodied is ever the same, but the actual picture presented varies in each succeeding age, because the prophet has to make use of the materials lying to hand in his own day, and these are constantly changing. To take a concrete instance; when First Isaiah comes on the scene as prophet in 740, Israel and Judah are still independent kingdoms, though Assyria begins to look threatening; and a Davidic king sits on Judah's throne. In Second Isaiah's day (540) Israel and the ten tribes have ceased to exist, Judah has been fifty years in Captivity, but her hopes are greatly raised by Cyrus, who is about to crush her oppressor, Babylon. With such different materials at hand out of which to rear their Messianic fabric, is it any wonder if their two visions differ in form, though the spiritual ideal they embody is the same in both cases?

What is this ideal? A righteous Israel with their Jehovah dwelling in His People's midst; "God with us," "God is there." How can a sinful Israel thus become fit for God's actual presence in their midst? There is only one way; only one Saviour to work this radical change is even thinkable, God Himself. He, and no other, can work this miracle; and in many Messianic prophecies Jehovah, and no other, is the immediate Saviour, Redeemer, Deliverer of Israel. But, as history reveals, Jehovah often works through great personages, judges, kings, priests, prophets

men whom He "anoints" and fills with His own Spirit for this very purpose. Even then, Jehovah Himself is still the one Saviour; it is His Spirit in His mediator or representative, the God in and through the man, that does the saving work. In these men, God's "Anointed" (= Christ), His Messiahs full of His Spirit and strength, we have Immanuel, "God with us." Hence in the prophetic Messianic pictures, (1) at times, Jehovah is the one and only Saviour and King; (2) at times, he is manifested mediately, *e.g.* in and through a Davidic king. Take our concrete instance of a moment ago by way of illustration. In 735, Ahaz, Davidic king of Judah, is trembling before a Syria-Israel coalition threatening to annihilate him and his kingdom. Isaiah, full of unbounded faith in God's covenanted promises to David, bids Ahaz cast away his groundless fears; David's house may share the people's humiliations, but David's "throne is established for ever." And straightway, on the strength of his faith, an inspired Isaiah sees the Messianic Age here with its Davidic Prince of Peace, the God-Mighty One, the Wonderful Counsellor, Immanuel, "God is with us." In 540, during the Exile, Second Isaiah, with equally unbounded faith in God's covenanted promises to Israel *the nation*, sees God's mediator or deliverer in Cyrus, "Mine anointed, My shepherd, Mine elect, whom I have called by name." He, too, in the strength of his great faith, sees in his vision the Messianic Age here, but there is no king in it but Jehovah Himself, "God with us" in His own Person.

So it is throughout. The actual historical situation at the time being always suggests the *form* of the Picture to the prophet. The fundamental conceptions embodied in it,—God dwelling in the midst of a righteous Israel, a glorious Israelite Kingdom of righteousness, peace, and prosperity,—never vary; but the setting of the Picture constantly varies, because each prophet sees this Golden Era flow out of the

conditions of his own day, and constructs the "new Israel" out of the materials lying before him, *e.g.* the actual state of things he sees in the Israel of his day, the attitude to it of the nations, and so on. And almost invariably, the prophets take a foreshortened view of the appearance of the Messianic age and its Messiah. Each prophet expects the ideal Israel *at once* on the removal of the sins of his own age, which alone stand in the way of the immediate coming of God's Kingdom. Thus Isaiah regards the Assyrian invasion as the last of Israel's troubles; Jeremiah expects the "redemption of Israel" within 70 years years of 586 B.C.; Haggai and Zechariah as soon as the Temple is rebuilt.

As to the personality of Messiah,—where Jehovah Himself is not Saviour, Redeemer, Deliverer of Israel,—there again the greatest variety comes in. He may be some actual, prominent, historical person alive at the time; or an idealised Davidic King still to come; or he may be no special individual at all, but *e.g.* the "house of David," or even Israel itself. For instance, if Amos ix. 11 sqq. and Hos. iii. 5 are authentic, it is rather the renewed glory of the house of David, and the reunion of all the tribes under it, than the coming of one Messiah, to which they refer. Similarly Jer. xvii. 25, xxii. 4, xxxiii. 15-17 dwell not so much on one pre-eminent King, as on the succession of kings of David's line ushered in by "a Righteous Branch of David's Stem." On the other hand, in Mic. iv., v. and Is. vii., ix., xi., attention is focussed on a single idealised King of David's line, whose relationship with God is so close that it exactly tallies with God's promise to David: "I will be to him a Father, and he shall be My son." From this time forward there is a special Messianic Hope, the expectation of an extraordinary King of David's line. One would have thought that this Figure would henceforth monopolise the field. Far from it; for long periods at a time He is not so much as hinted at. In Second

Isaiah, there is no king but God in the Messianic Age; the "Suffering Servant" is God's Redeemer from sin, and Cyrus His deliverer from material bondage. In Haggai, a mediocre Davidic Zerubbabel is Messiah; in Zechariah, either Zerubbabel or Joshua the priest.

Enough has been said to show how various, fluid, figurative are the O.T. Messianic prophecies and ideals up to 300 B.C. To interpret them aright, we must throw ourselves back into the prophets' own day, the condition of things then, their environment, their mind. If we fail to do this, and see in their ideals ideas and truths such as we ourselves associate with Messiah to-day, we are good Christians, but bad interpreters of O.T. prophets and their message. The following pages will help us to see how, in the apocalypses of the two centuries before Christ, these separate prophetic ideals were gradually combined together into a more or less compact organic whole to express the personality of Him who is the complete and perfect Ideal.

DANIEL AND APOCALYPSES.

The prophets foretold a coming judgment on Israel, but also a glorious Kingdom of God as soon as the judgment had done its purifying work. Grand and inspiring was this ideal of God dwelling in the midst of His righteous Israel, with its trumpet-call: "Be ye holy, for I am Holy"; but there was a weak side to it. As we said a moment ago, the prophets invariably foreshorten the view of the coming of this Kingdom of God, speak of it as at hand, almost within their own generation. Thus they lay themselves open to discredit, and the people to disappointment, if their anticipations of the future are not literally fulfilled. In all conscience, said the people, Israel has had its judgments in plenty, but where is this Golden Age? Promised as at hand since 750 B.C., it was not theirs yet in 1 A.D.! Yet this did not altogether discredit

prophecy in men's eyes, and for this reason. Long since, Jer. xviii. 7 sqq. had forewarned Israel that God's promises and threats entirely depended for their fulfilment on the behaviour of the people addressed: "At what time I speak concerning a nation to build and plant it, if it do evil in My sight, I will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them,"—so of threats. This moral character of prophecy was well understood by the spiritual-minded in Israel (cf. Jer. xxvi. 17). They knew that if the Kingdom was not here, the blame lay at their own door. No doubt, God's promises of a glorious Israelite Kingdom were sure; but man's bad conduct could retard, never invalidate, it; Israel's Kingdom and Golden Age were certainties.

After the Captivity Israel's material conditions, instead of getting better, grew worse and worse, as a brief historical sketch may show. Up to 332 B.C. Israel was under Persian yoke, then it passed under Greek rule: at first as subject to the Egyptian Ptolemies, but about 200 B.C. Syria wrested it from Egypt, a bad exchange for Israel as the sequel proved. Taxes were doubled and their new masters tried to Hellenise Palestine, though Judæa, and especially Jerusalem, offered a stubborn resistance to Greek influence. At last arose a Syrian king determined to Europeanise even Jerusalem, and break down a Jewish exclusiveness which barred his pet scheme of a compact Syrian kingdom "one people in religion, law, and custom." Some Jews had compliantly Hellenised; he decreed that all Jews should adopt the Greek language and religion. Sabbath-observance, circumcision, abstinence from pork, even the possession of a Bible, were forbidden on pain of death. Antiochus Epiphanes (c. 160 B.C.) had overshot the mark. From the first, riots had broken out here and there. A day came when the Jews no longer raised riots, they rebelled as one man. No sooner had Antiochus Epiphanes set up the "abomination of desolation" in the Temple—a pagan

altar to Zeus¹ in the Holy of holies, and pigs sacrificed upon it!—than a fiery spirit of religious patriotism blazed up and Judæa, under the heroic Maccabees, achieved her independence. A grateful nation made the Maccabees “leaders, high-priests, and governors” (cf. the “King-priest” of Ps. cx.), and the Hasmonæan dynasty ruled from about 160–60 B.C. They abused their high privilege, aped the splendour of their royal neighbours, copied Greek manners, estranged the “pious” by their worldly ways and, as a family, were soon torn by feuds from within their own household. Civil war broke out. Both sides appealed to Rome; a Herodian usurper, Rome’s nominee and vassal, was put upon the throne and cast his whole influence on the side of Hellenism. Judæa, shortly after, was made a dependency of Syria, placed under a procurator or lieutenant-governor, and, of course, the Jews had to pay tribute to Rome.

Thus after the Captivity, except for a brief period, Israel is politically annihilated as a nation. All hope of a glorious Israelite Kingdom of God seemed daily to grow less and less. The yoke of foreign oppression rested heavily on the land; Israel seemed under God’s ban. Had God cancelled His everlasting Covenant with Israel? The mere thought was blasphemy! But what did God’s silence and the present dark cloud mean? The present was a blank; Israel’s former glory was but a memory of a far-away past, written in a book; prophets had ceased and no direct revelation came from God: “We see not our signs, there is no more any prophet; neither is there any among us that knoweth how long;” “hath God forgotten to be gracious?”

Now that prophets are gone, visionary apocalyptic writers step into their place, “revealers of hidden

¹ It is not improbable that the words translated “abomination of desolation” are a contemptuous distortion of the name of the heathen god, Baal Shamaim, Baal of heaven, = Zeus; *Shōmēm*, “desolate,” being just a punning variation of *Shāmāim* = “heaven.” (See Hastings’ *D. of B.* i. 12.)

things" (= apocalypse)¹ who comfort pious souls in days of dark trouble. These apocalyptists expect, as we shall soon see, not a regenerated Jerusalem and an actual king of David's line, but, as a rule, a new heaven and a new earth, a new Jerusalem coming down from heaven, and a superhuman Deliverer. Practically for the first time, we now get clear and unmistakable pictures of a Messiah and a Messianic Kingdom in our sense of the word, though some still make Jehovah the only Saviour. There are a few instances of this new outlook in the Psalter, but *Daniel* is the real O.T. and classical type of all apocalypses.

The apocalyptist is akin to, yet distinct from, the prophet. The prophet has his eyes fixed on his own generation and trusts to the spoken word; the apocalyptist turns his back on the hopeless present and writes of things beyond man's ken in the future. Yet, really, the apocalyptist builds on the prophet's foundation. In God's Word (= the Prophets) he finds a number of unfulfilled promises. They are God's own and must be fulfilled to the letter. By turning what was poetry into prose, what was literal (*e.g.* Jeremiah's seventy years) into figure of speech, and figure of speech into literal fact; by subtle rearranging or harmonising of this passage with that—he is easily able to use this vast mass of promises, fulfilled and unfulfilled, in such a way as to map out the future according to his wishes, and even arrive at precise dates.²

¹ II, Esdras (technically called 4 Ezra, date 81-96 A.D.) in ch. xiv. 44 sqq., tells us he is told to write, under angelic prompting, 94 Books, of which 24 (= O.T.) are to be published "that the worthy and unworthy may read therein," "but the 70 last keep thou, to deliver them to the wise only. For in them is the spring of understanding, the fountain of wisdom, and the stream of knowledge." The point of this passage is to explain why these 70 very old books (= Apocrypha) had not previously been known. Cf. the strict orders to Daniel (xii. 4, 9; ix. 24) to "shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end."

² Apocalyptists stress chronology. The "How" and the "When" was all in all to them. "They spent much ingenuity in arranging history into a fixed and symmetrical system of chronology which governed rather than expressed its course" (Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, *Beginnings of Christianity*, p. 131).

In other ways apocalyptists and prophets differ, *e.g.* (1) Prophets are essentially religious reformers, and only secondarily predictors; their call is to repentance. In apocalypses prediction is everything; their call is to patience and hope. (2) Prophets still look upon this world as God's world, assured that on this earth will God's goodness be manifested. Apocalypses view the present world as all but past praying for, and all their interest lies in a supra-mundane hereafter on a transfigured earth or up in heaven. (3) The prophets mean men to trust in God, but also work out their own salvation; their inspiring Messianic ideals are incentives to that rightness of character and action which alone can speed the Kingdom's coming. The apocalyptists cannot thus wait for the coming of the Kingdom through the working of moral forces in line with God's own divine interposition.¹ This mode of procedure is too slow. They see the Golden Age at hand bursting on an astonished earth. (4) The apocalyptic Messiah is still often a Davidic King, but altogether unique and idealised beyond anything in the prophets; he is a superhuman being kept in store in heaven till the moment of his manifestation, and then coming on the clouds of heaven. (5) Prophets speak in their own names; apocalypses always claim to be the work of some great figure in the past, *e.g.* Moses, Enoch, Daniel, the Twelve Patriarchs.² (6) The prophets make God "near," and expect an objective and personal coming of the Lord, at all events in His Temple. Apocalypses transcendentalise God more and more, place a wide gulf between heaven and earth. (7) Prophets are figurative and poetical in their language,

¹ "The Apocalyptists are determinists, viewing history as the working out of a predestined plan; nothing can change it. The Prophets view God's purposes as at least in part conditional on men's conduct" (*ibid.* p. 128, cf. Jer. 18⁷).

² A writer in *e.g.* 160 B.C. puts into the mouth of these great men, dead hundreds or thousands of years, predictions of what has happened in the interval. On the strength of these true predictions *after the events*, the reader is now ready to believe other predictions *before the events*.

but ever explicit ; apocalypstists are cryptic and speak in riddles. By means of images, symbols, mystic numbers, animal-figures, and so forth, they three-quarters conceal what they profess to reveal. (8) Prophetic eschatology is a national, rather than individual, resurrection ; apocalyptic eschatology is largely that of the individual, which now at last comes to the fore as with us to-day.

Daniel is the typical O.T. apocalypse, but by no means the first or only one. Ezekiel, because of his visions (*e.g.* i., x., xl.), has been called the Father of apocalypse.

Ezekiel.—God appears (ch. i.) seated on a heavenly chariot-throne, supported and drawn by four creatures (called "Cherubs" in ch. x.), each with four wings and four faces,—man, lion, ox, eagle,—the whole surrounded by a rainbow brightness. The time of Israel's deliverance is to be preceded by an attack of the nations on Jerusalem, a struggle with Gog and Magog (xxxviii. sq.). All Israel (ten tribes included) are restored to their land in peace, and God dwells in their midst in His Temple.

Isaiah xxiv.—xxvii. (*c.* 350—332 B.C.) is another and a far more developed apocalypse ; we shall often meet its eschatological outline in later apocalypses. Its day of judgment is a catastrophic and dread day ; "the earth is clean dissolved and reels to and fro like a drunkard" (xxiv. 19 sq.), the moon and the sun are darkened (23), "the host of the high ones that are on high (= rebellious angels) and the kings of the earth" are judged, and both principalities and powers and sinful men are then shut up in prison in the pit,—an intermediate state,—to await their final judgment (21 sq.). Then "the great trumpet shall be blown," and the righteous scattered Jews shall be gathered together from all lands (xxvii. 13). "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise ("Thy dead shall live ; my dead bodies shall arise" (R.V.)). Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust ; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead" (xxvi. 19) ; "He will swallow up death in victory, and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces" (xxv. 8). The Kingdom of God is set up, the Golden Age is here, God dwells among His people. There is no Messianic King ; God alone is King.

Isaiah xxxiv.—xxxv.—Is. xxxiv. is a dark, rancorous picture

of a terrific and supernatural judgment on the nations, focussed especially against Edom.¹ Not only are they "utterly destroyed" till their carcasses stink and the "mountains are melted with their blood," but "all the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll; and all their host shall fall down" like falling leaves. Edom's very land is turned into an uninhabitable waste, "and the streams thereof shall be turned into pitch and the dust into brimstone, and the land become burning pitch." "It shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up for ever." Dragons, owls, and wild beasts alone shall live there. Is. xxxv. is the companion prophecy and makes up for the horrors of xxxiv. It speaks of the exiles' return to the Holy Land and the glorification of that land: "The ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs, and everlasting joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." The Messianic Age has dawned.

Zech. ix.-xiv. (c. 300-200 B.C.) is a very mixed and composite apocalypse, the work of many hands. *Zech. xii.-xiv.* is the oldest portion, and contains two different pictures of the final onset of the heathen on Jerusalem. In xii. the heathen are all gathered together against Jerusalem, but God mightily sides with the countryfolk of Judah and gives them (so that Jerusalem may not think too much of herself in her pride) the victory over the heathen, then they rescue the capital. God sets up His Kingdom, pours His Spirit upon His people. In that day the feeblest shall be as David, "and the house of David shall be as God, as the Angel of the Lord before them." In *Zech. xiv.* Jerusalem is taken by the heathen, sacked, and half its people go into Captivity. Jehovah, as Jerusalem's Saviour, comes down to the Mount of Olives, treads on it so that it cleaves in twain, and through the great valley thus formed the other half of the people flee into safety. "In that day, the light shall not be clear nor dark," "and living waters shall go out from Jerusalem," eastward and westward even to the sea. "And the Lord shall be King over all the earth; in that day there shall be one Lord, and His Name one." God smites Jerusalem's foes so that "their flesh consumes away while they stand upon their feet." The rest of

¹ Edom is viewed as the arch-enemy, because in the life and death struggle of 587-6 B.C., Judah's kinsmen and neighbours backed Babylon, and were the chief gainers by the Fall of Jerusalem and Judah (cf. *Lamentations*, p. 303, *sup.*), occupying permanently part of Judah. This the Jews never forgot.

the nations bring their gold and silver abundantly unto Jerusalem and "go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of Hosts, and to keep the Feast of Tabernacles." If the heathen come not up to worship they shall have no rain, or plagues will smite them. All Jerusalem and Judah in that day will be so holy that even down to the horse-bells, bowls, and pots shall be "Holiness unto the Lord" (xiv. 20 sq.).

Daniel, however, is the first extant apocalypse on a large and complete scale. The book was composed (c. 168-165 B.C.) during the terrible religious persecutions under Antiochus Epiphanes, already described, when life was made a hell on earth for true Jews. The "abomination of desolation" was in the Holy of holies, circumcised children and their mothers were hurled headlong from the walls, any Jew refusing to eat pork was put to death, Bibles were burnt wholesale. Like all apocalypses, *Daniel* is a "Tract for hard times." Its aim was to foster endurance and loyalty to the faith in the face of this fiery ordeal. Hence the stories as to "unclean meats" (i.), the "fiery furnace" (iii.), the "lions' den" (vi.), to show how God stands by those who obey His Law and not the decrees of men or evil kings. The stories of the humbling of proud Nebuchadnezzar (iv.), and the fall of Belshazzar (v.), as well as later visions, are to comfort oppressed Jews with the assurance of their present tyrant's impending fall.¹

According to *Daniel*, this evil age is soon to end by the judgment of the Day of the Lord on the wicked nations, and a bright era dawn. Under the fantastic and varied imagery of an image with head of gold, breast and arms of silver, belly and thighs of brass, legs of iron, and feet part iron and part clay (Dan. ii.)—or, as in chs. vii., viii., under the symbols of four monstrous beasts, a lion, a bear (or ram), a leopard,

¹ *Dan.* (cf. *Ezra*, p. 202, n., *sup.*) is bilingual. Dan. i.-ii., 4^a is in Hebrew; ii. 4^b-vii. (inclusive) is in Aramaic; rest = Heb. Aramaic in ii. 4^b sqq. is appropriate: "Then spake the Chaldeans to the king in Aramaic" (R.V. m.), but this motive soon ceases, yet Aramaic is used to the end of vii.

a he-goat with ten horns¹—we have four succeeding empires in a descending or deteriorating scale. The Golden Head (= lion) is the Babylonian Empire; the silver breast (= bear, or ram) is the Median; the brazen belly and thighs (= leopard) is the Persian; the iron legs and iron and clay feet (= ten-horned he-goat) is Alexander's Empire and the kingdoms into which it was broken up, often allied but essentially disunited. The "little horn" of vii. 8, 20, 24 sqq., "before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots, and having eyes like the eyes of a man," . . . "and he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws" (25), is Antiochus Epiphanes, as Dan viii. still more clearly proves. The empires of Babylon, Media, and Persia have already fallen, and the fall of Grecia with its "little horn" is soon to follow. In Dan. ii., "a stone cut out without hands" smites the image upon its iron and clay feet, and the iron, clay, brass, silver, gold, all collapse into dust and are whirled away by the wind, while "the stone that smote the image becomes a great mountain and fills the whole earth" (ii. 35)—that is, "in the days of these (Grecian) kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever" (44). In the case of the "little horn," Dan. viii. sees him also "broken without hand," though God's people are delivered into his power for three and a half years (xii. 7), then the power of the "king of fierce countenance," who

¹ "Are these beasts, etc., merely figures of speech, or realities in the writers' minds? Believing that events on earth corresponded to events in Heaven, did they think that there were supra-mundane creatures whose activities and conflicts in Heaven affected the nations corresponding to them on earth? In support of the latter view is the effect on the destiny of Israel of the struggle in Heaven between its angel Michael and the 'Angel of Persia' in Dan. x. 13 sqq." (Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, *Beginnings of Christianity*, p. 369).

“destroys many and stands up against the Prince of princes,” shall be utterly destroyed.

The Kingdom of God is at hand, but catastrophic days must first come. It has to be preceded by this “abomination of desolation”; sin, oppression, tyranny, anti-God, must do their worst for a short season, but only to be crushed very soon by the Most High. Daniel already sees the Ancient of Days on His throne, judgment set and the books opened, and “One like the Son of Man¹ coming with the clouds of heaven, to whom is given dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all peoples, nations and languages should serve Him; His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed” (vii. 13 sqq.); “And many that sleep in the dust of the earth (lit. “the land of dust” = Sheol, see p. 90 *sup.*) shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.”

On *Daniel's* model all following apocalyptic writers shaped their predictions; roughly speaking, they take this form:—

The present evil age is ending and the new glorious age all but here. The Day of the Lord is at hand and will come suddenly when evil is at its height and anti-God triumphing; for the Day is always preceded by an epoch of unparalleled wickedness, like

¹ “*Son of Man*” has commonly been interpreted of the Messianic King. But to-day it is mostly viewed as a personification of Israel, for two main reasons: (1) Like the four beasts (lion, bear, leopard, he-goat), he is not an individual but represents a kingdom of the world, viz. Israel. (2) vii. 27 is decisive for this view; there the Kingdom is given to “the people of the saints of the Most High; his (= the people’s) is an everlasting Kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him.” “Coming with the clouds of heaven,” said of the Son of Man, is an evident contrast to the heathen kingdoms, “rising out of the sea”—that is, of earthly origin.—See Driver’s admirable article “Son of Man,” in Hastings’ *D. of B.* iv. 579–589, proving “Son of Man” = (a) poetical synonym of “man”; (b) in *Ezek.* to mark man’s insignificance in the presence of God’s majesty; (c) in *Dan.* vii. “one like unto a son of man” = a personification of Israel in human form (in heavenly places); (d) in Enoch’s “Similitudes” (see *inf.*) “Son of Man” = an august superhuman being enthroned beside the Almighty; (e) in N.T. “Son of Man” = the ideal type or representative of the human race. Most scholars (p. 586) question its application as a title of the Messiah in the Gospels, e.g. Westcott.

Daniel's "abomination of desolation," and there is great tribulation. Then God (or Messiah, if there is one; often a superhuman Being kept in store in heaven for the fateful day) acts, overthrows the world-kingdom and crushes all foes, angelic or human. Next comes the Judgment, and the righteous Israel (cf. Dan. vii. 27) is given an everlasting kingdom with dominion over the nations, and God dwells with His people. The righteous dead arise to share in the Kingdom; and often the wicked dead, too, to be judged and cast into the pit. As Dr. Burney also reminds me: "Notice that Dan xii. 2 interprets the last verse of Isaiah as referring to the future punishment of the wicked. Out of this there was developed the conception of a penal Gehenna."

These are the general lines of pre-Christian apocalypses, but they vary in details, *e.g.*:—

The Judgment sometimes comes before, sometimes after the Kingdom, and at times there are two judgments. The judgment may be also on Israel only; at times it is universal and (cf. Is. xxiv.) even fallen angels are judged.

The Kingdom is either (1) on a transfigured earth, (2) in a new Jerusalem brought down from heaven, or (3) in heaven itself. It is at times everlasting, at times only a millennium of prosperity, peace, and righteousness. It may be material, or spiritual,¹ in character. Its members live for ever, or else to a patriarchal age. Its inheritors are only Israelites, or they are all righteous men. When heaven is the scene of the Kingdom, the righteous are "as the angels."

The Resurrection is (1) of the righteous only; (2) of many of both sorts; (3) of all men. It is (1) of the body; (2) of the spirit only.

Sheol is (1) an intermediate place of moral retribution for good and bad; (2) a prison for wicked men and angels (cf. Is. xxiv.); (3) divided into compartments for saints, bad men, bad angels; (4) Hell.

Messiah.—As in the O.T., there is often no Messiah. If he comes in, he may be (1) a man; (2) superhuman; and he may be

¹ We are too apt to stress the narrow, exclusive, material side of the Jewish idea of the Kingdom of God, and to forget that, in the spirit of a Second Isaiah and an Ethiopic Enoch (see *inf.*), very many Jews hoped and prayed for a universal and purely spiritual Kingdom in which God's will should be done, as in heaven, so on earth. Simeon's "*Nunc Dimittis*" was the aspiration of a large number of enlightened pious Jews long before his day.

a warrior Messiah, or highly spiritual. Thus in the *Ethiopic Enoch* 37-70 ("The Similitudes") he is more than a mere man or mere angel, and almost God. He is called "the Christ" (= Messiah = "Anointed"), "the Righteous One," "the Elect One," "the Son of Man"; He is revered; prayed to, created before Creation, preserved in heaven till the time of His showing, God-like, destined to be a Light to the Gentiles and the hope of those who are troubled at heart; yet He is a little below God. The date of this apocalypse is 94-64 B.C.

The Gentiles.—(1) Usually they are destroyed or subjected by Israel; or (2) they are ignored; or (3) they share in the Kingdom; or (4) God has mercy on them, but gives them no honour or glory.¹

Perhaps the most important new factor is the emphasis laid in all apocalypses, from Is. xxv. 8; xxvi. 19; Dan. xii. 2, onward, on individual resurrection. Here, at long last, do we find in apocalyptic vision the solution of the problem which has so long deeply exercised Old Testament saints. At length the righteousness of God is vindicated in the eyes of men. The righteous may go to the wall in this life, while the wicked prosper; but on the Resurrection-day all earth's wrongs will be righted at the Judgment-seat of God, by God, or His Messiah, who is to be the Judge of men and angels; and each man will reap as he has sown.

Moreover, this resurrection doctrine—stimulated as it may have been by Parsism—is the genuine product of Jewish inspiration, for all its factors are indigenous to Jewish thought. As already stated, along three lines of thought this belief in man's life after death was bound to arise sooner or later:—(1) Israel's undying conviction of a coming Hebrew Kingdom of God was bound to lead to the resurrection of righteous departed Jews to share in its blessings, exactly as Is. xxvi. 1-19 puts it. (2) Along

¹ Patriotism is apt to make good haters even to-day, far more of old. Cf. even Plato congratulating the Athenians on the fact that they surpassed all other Greeks in their hatred of the foreign nature.

another and totally different line of thought, Jeremiah's and Ezekiel's revelation of the infinite value of the individual soul in God's eyes must also lead to the same goal. Since religion is a personal matter between each man and his God, wherein every man receives measure for measure according to his character and deeds, *then*, seeing that the righteous man's wrongs are often not righted here, God must right them elsewhere. Hence the doctrine of retribution was of necessity carried into the world beyond the grave, so that a personal blessed existence after this life—whether as a member of the Messianic Kingdom, or in heavenly glory—eventually and of necessity became part and parcel of Hebrew thought. (3) Pss. xvi. 8-11 and lxxiii. 23-26: "I have set the Lord always before me; because He is at my right hand I shall not be moved; therefore my heart is glad, my flesh also shall rest in hope, for Thou wilt not leave my soul in Sheol. Thou wilt show me the path of life; in Thy presence is fulness of joy." "Nevertheless I am continually with Thee; Thou hast holden me by my right hand. Thou shalt guide me with Thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory"; both these psalms show how vividly men felt that not even death itself could snap the bond of intimate communion between the faithful saint and his God. In their heart of hearts they knew that nothing could separate them from the care, love, Presence of God, and that for them Sheol would stretch out his arms in vain. As truly as St. Paul were they persuaded that "neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God." This conviction, again, was in itself bound to lead to the belief in individual immortality.

But to the very end, as Is. xxvi. 19 and Dan. xii. 2 prove, the strong Old Testament corporate sense

makes national and individual resurrection go hand in hand. The righteous man has his personal claims, which must be satisfied as well as Israel's claims, but they can both be met simultaneously. Hence Is. xxvi. and Dan. xii. recompense the righteous man, not with a solitary immortality in heaven or elsewhere, but with a blessed resurrection-life shared with his brethren in the Kingdom of God. And, all said and done, this corporate sense is grand. One "our" is worth many a "my."

Is. xxv. and xxvi. and Dan. xii. are probably among the last, Dan. xii. may be actually the last, words of the Old Testament. Could anything be more apt or beautiful than their grand triumphant closing note: "Thy dead men shall live. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust." "The Lord God will swallow up death in victory, and He will wipe away tears from off all faces"?

INDEX ¹

(Pages of special reference value are given in Clarendon type.)

- ABISHAG, 291**
Abomination of desolation, 324
 "Abraham tribes," 34 n., 72, 74 sq.
 Abyss, watery, 65, 78 n., 82
 Adam, derivation of, 65 n.
 Adonai, 102 n.
 Adultery, 99, 139
 Ahab, 74, 143
 Ahaz, 74, 143 sq., 165 sq., 312, 321
 Ahimelech, 131
 Ahriman, 243
 Akkad, 71
 Amos, 38, Ch. X., 150 n., 154 sq., 311
 Amurru, 71, 72
 Ancestor-worship, 59
Angel of the Lord, 117, 127
 Angelology, 242
 Animal-worship, 59
 Animism, 58
Anointed, Lord's, 61, 135 sq., 195, 259, 321
 Antiochus Epiphanes, 324
 Anu, 78
 Aphek, 115
 Apocalypses, 241 sq., 325 sqq.
 Apocrypha, 242 n., 252 n., 326 n.
 Apsu, 82
 Aramæans, 71 n., 72
 Aramæan migrations, 34 n., 72
 Ark, 100 sq., 117, 209
 Asherah, 111, 151, 167
 Ashtart, 79, 111
 Assyria, 74, 77, 142 sqq., 165 sq., 168
 Astruc, 41
 Atonement (of sanctuary), 190 (e)
 — (Day of), 62, 209, 213
 Azazel, 57, 243
- Babylonian Law, 86
 — life after death, 89
 — loans to Israel, 90, 247, Ch. VI.
 — magic and omens, 88 sq.
 — prayers and psalms, 84 sq.
 — religion, 77 sqq.
 — stories of Creation and Flood, 81 sqq.
 Ban, 99
 Barak, 16 sq.
Before God, to come, 81, 107, 130, 138, 191 n.
 Bel, 78
 Benhadad, 74, 143
 Bible, canon of, 211, 249 sq.
 — chronology, 36 n., 110 n., 144 n.
 — chronological order of Bks., 37 sqq.
 — difficulties, Chs. I.-IV.
 — folk-lore in, 56 sq., 67, 76 n., 90
 — literary forgeries, 39
 — poetry and imagery, Ch. II.
 — truth, 27 sqq.
 — unity, 33 sq.
 Blood taboo, 58 sq.
"Books of Moses," 36 sq., 41 sqq.
"Book of the Law," 167, 177, 203
 Brazen Serpent, 129, 151
 Budde, on Canticles, 293
 Burney, 34 n., 36 n., 37 n., 38 n., 45 n., 49, 55 n., 72, 73 n., 77 n., 95 n., 98 n., 102 n., 105 n., 111 n., 117 n., 134 n., 138 n., 144 n., 166 n., 192 n., 199 n., 253 n., 254, 258 sq., 272 n., 333
- C, 45, 138**
 Canaanites, 35 (c), 71, 73 n., 113, 170 n.
 Canaanite migration, 71
 Canon of Bible, 211, 249 sq.
 Canticles, 20, 39, 250, 289 sqq.
 Captivity, 35 (g), 181 sqq.
 Caravan-routes, 74, 136
- BAAL, 102 n., 111 sq., 118 n., 177**
 Babylon, 75 n., 76 sq., 168, 195, 247
 Babylonia, Ch. VI., 34 (a)
 Babylonian chronology, 75 n., 144 n.
 — history, 75 sqq.

¹ This book is a review—religious, social, doctrinal, literary—of the O.T., not a history. Such historical sections as it contains are there to enable the reader to recover the original background and atmosphere. Thus reference to the text will reveal much on e.g. Ezra and Nehemiah, but next to nothing of the biography of Solomon or David, Elijah or Elisha.

- Carchemish, 168
 Carlyle, T., 32
 Carpenter, Estlin, 57 n.
 Centralised worship, 35 (*f*), 37 (iii.),
 42 sq., 106, 125, 171 sq.
 Cheyne, 91 n., 104, 254, 268, 273 n.,
 289 n., 294
 Christ's attitude to—
 the Bible, 5 sqq.
 the Law, 7 sq., 218 n.
 the Prophets, 6 sq.
 Chronicles, 39, 126 sq.
 Chronological order of Bible Bks.,
 37 sqq.
 Chronology, 36 n., 75 n., 110 n.,
 144 n.
 Circumcision, 57, 62, 100 n.², 183,
 212
 "Clean," 59, 80 n., 207
 Commandments, Ten, 7, 40 sq., 46,
 104 sqq.
 Conscience, early, 66
 Corpses taboo, 58 sq., 206
 Covenant, Bk. of, 45, 133, 251
 —, Sinai, 35 (*b*), 102 sq.
 Creation, 65, 82 sq.
 Culture and morals, 98, 113 sq., 137
 sq., 145, 231
 Custom, tribal, 66, 87, 99, 138
 Cyrus, 77, 195, 199

 D, 37 sq., 47, 53 sq.
 Daniel, 39, 242 n., 250, 330 sqq.
 David, 123 n., 127 n., 128 sq., 130,
 136, 254, 259, 291, 319 sq.
 Davidic King, the, 260 sq., **Ch. XIX.**,
 311, 313, 319, 322
Day of the Lord, 244 sq., **Ch. XIX.**,
passim, e.g. 307
 Death, 58, 65
 —, life after, 89 sq., 158, 161, 180,
 257 sqq., 280, 334
 Deborah's Song, 16 sqq., 37, 117
 Decalogue, 7, 40 sq., 46, 104 sq.
Defiles the hand, 207 n., 252 n.
 Delitzsch, 275
 Deliverer, 112, 310 sq., 320, 326
 Deluge Stories, 81, 91 n.
 "Descent into Hell," 89
 Deutero-Isaiah, 38 (D), 192 sqq.
 Deuteronomy, 37, 47, 167, 169 sqq.,
 176
 De Wette, 42
 Disease, origin of, 60, 65
 Divination, 64, 89, 107, 129 n.
 Driver, 18, 37, 47 n., 54, 55, 105 n.,
 113, 254, 270 n., 332 n.
 Duplicates in O.T., 19, 44, 48 sq.,
 111, 115 n.

 E, 37 sqq., 48, 50 sqq., 98 n.,
 110
 E², 48 n.
 Ea, 78
 Early man's creed, Ch. V.
 Ecclesiastes, 39, 241, 275 sqq.
 — Conception of God, 279 sqq.
 — Epitome of, 276 sqq.
 — life after death, 280 sq.
 Edom, 34 n., 73 n., 95, 144 n.,
 303, 329
 Education, Israel's divine, 9 sq.
 Egypt, Israel in, 34 n., 95
 El, 101 n.
 "Election" of Israel, 195 sq., 197
 Elihu, 270 n.
 Elijah, 9, 124 sq., 130, 133, 245
 Elisha, 124, 130, 133
 Elohim, 102 n.
 El Shaddai, 102 n.
 Elyon, 102 n.
 Enlil, 78
 Ephod, 105, 118, 128 sq.
 Eschatology, 244, 247, Ch. XIX.
 Esther (Bk.), 20, 39, 242 n., 250,
 297 sqq.
 Ewald, 291, 297
 Ezekiel, 38 (D), 186 sqq., 314, 328
 Ezra, 202 sqq., 239, 251, 253, 296
 Ezra and Nehemiah (Bks.), 39,
 202 n., 250

 FAMILY LIFE, 139
 Festivals, 45, 80, 119, 145, 190 (*e*),
 204
 Fetish, 61
Fill the hand, 130 n.
 "Fire, pass through," 166 n.
 Folk-lore in O.T., 57, 67, 76 n., 90
 Forgeries, literary, 39
 Frazer, 57 n.
 Funeral customs, 59 n.

 GENEALOGIES, 126, 127 n.
 Gentiles, 149 n., 195 sq., 334
 Gifts to deity, 63
 Gilgamesh, 90, 91 n., 280 n.
Glory of Jehovah, 128, 188, 190 (*b*),
 194, 205
 God-marks, 62
 God's Name = taboo, 62, 102 n.
 God-possession, 13 n., 64, 147
 God, titles of, 101 n.
 Goethe, 13
 Golden Calf, 129 n.
 Graf, 42
 Greek period, 324

- H, 47 n., 54
 Habakkuk, 38 (c)
 Habiru, 34 n., 73
 Hagar, 48
 Haggai, 38, 200, 315
 Hagiographa, Chs. XV. sqq.
 Haman, 298 sq.
 Hammurabi, 71, 73 n., 76, 86
Hand, fill the, 130 n.
 Handmaid tribes, 34 n., 105 n.
 Harran, 34 n., 73 sq.
 Hasmonæan dynasty, 325
 Hazael, 143
 Hebrew traits, 19 sqq., 29, 196 n.
 — literature, Chs. II., III., IV.
 Heifer, red, 57
 Henotheism, 35 (b), 78, 79, 101 sq., 128
 Herder, 290
 Hexateuch, 38 n., 41 sqq.
 — sources, 47 sqq.
 Hezekiah, 35 (f), 43, 129, 144, 166 sq.
 Hilkiyah, 167
 History, old and new, 25, 28 sqq.
 —, pragmatic, Ch. III., 109, 124 n., 125, 126 n.
 "Holy" (= taboo), 61, 100, 188, 189 sqq., 205 sqq., 207, 215, 252 n.
 Holiness, Law of, 47 n., 188
 "Holy Writings," Ch. XV.
 Hommel, 76, 144 n.
 Hosea, 38 (C), Ch. X., 150 n., 170 n., 289, 311
 Hoshea, 143
 Hymns (Babn.), 84 sq.
 — of Hate, 4, 22, 264 sqq.
 Hyperbole, 22
- IDEALS, 23 n., 26 sq.
 Images, 105 sq., 129, 151, 194
 — of Jehovah, 101, 105 n., 129, 151, 170
 Immanuel, 312, 321
 Incantations, 63, 88
 Inspiration, 9 sq., 12 sq., 22, 65, 147 sq.
 Inter marriages, 113, 201 sq.
 Isaac (tribe), 34 n.
 Isaiah, Ch. X., 37 (c), 144, 150 n., 165 sq., 312
 —, Second, 38D, 192 sqq., 314
 —, Third, 38 n., 316, 327
 Ishtar, 79, 85, 89
 Israel, stages in hist. of, 34 sqq.
 Israel (Kingdom), 143, 164
- JE, 53
 JED, 54
 Jacob (tribe), 34 n.
 Jael, 16 sq.
 Jashar, 19
 Jastrow, 34 n., 38 n., 41 n., 70, 71 n., 72, 80 n., 81 n., 82 n., 87, 150 n., 271 n., 273 n.
 Jehovah, 102 n.
 —, conception of, 35 (b), 44, 51, 99, 116, 127 sq., 146, 148, 169 sqq., 177, 183 sq., 188, 193 sqq., Ch. XIV., 222 sqq., 230, 279 sq.
 —, henotheism, 102 sqq., 128
 —, images, 101, 105 n., 106, 129, 151, 170
 —, storm-god, 16, 100
 —, Sabaoth, 117
 —, Suffering Servant of, 195 sqq.
 —, war-god, 117
 Jehu, 143
 Jephthah, 98, 101, 114
 Jeremiah, 159 sq., 175 sqq., 304, 313
 Jeroboam's bulls, 129 n.
 Job (Bk.), 20, 39, 250, 266 sq.
 — on Life after death, 273 sqq.
 Jonah, 242 n.
 Joseph-tribes, 34 n., 95, 105 n., 111 n.
 Josiah, 35 (f), 167
 Judah (kingdom), 144, 164 sqq., 175
 Judaism, many-sided, 185, 218 n., 233 sqq., 237 n.
 Judges, 38 (B) and (C), Ch. VIII.
 Judgment Day, Ch. XIX.
 Judgments of existence, 25 sqq.
 — of value, 26 sqq.
- KARDUNIASH, 75 n.
 Karkar, 74, 143
 King, 116, 135 sq., 259
 Kingdom of God, Ch. XIX., 308, 319 sq., 332, 333
 Kings (Bk.), 38 (B) and (C), 124 sq.
 King's *Schweich Lect.*, 18 n., 23 n., 72, 76 n., 84, 91 n.
 Kuenen, 42, 115 n., 153
- LABAN, 34 n., 52 n., 61 n.
 Lamentations (Bk.), 20, 38 (C), 250, 301 sqq.
 Law-Codes, 45 sq., 86 sq., 167, 203, 204 n.
 Law-courts, 138
 Legalism, 171 n., Ch. XIV.
 Leo the Isaurian, 129
- J, 37 sqq., 48, 50 sqq., 110

- Levi, tribe, 108 n.
 Levites, 43, 107 sqq., 108 n., 167, 171 n., 190 (C), 209 n.
 Levitical purity, 59, 80 n., 190, 207
 Life after death, 89 sq., 158, 161 sqq., 180, 257 sqq., 273 sqq., 280 sq., 334
 Lilit, 243
 Longevity, patriarchal, 83
Lord's Anointed, 61, 135 sq., 195, 259, 321
 Lots, 89, 107, 129 n.
- MACCABEES**, 260, 325
 Machir, 17
 Magic, 63, 68, 88
 Mahanaim, 48
 Malachi, 38, 245, 315
 Manasseh (king), 74, 78, 166
 Marduk, 79, 82, 83 n., 85
 Medicine-man, 63 sqq.
 Megiddo, 16, 168, 175
 Melech, 102 n.
 Messiah, 259 sq., 261 sq., 317, 320, 326, 333
 Messianic prophecy, 153 n., 161, 198, 200, 259, Ch. XIX.
 — psalms, 259 sqq.
 Micah, 38 (C), 311
 Mineptah, 95
 Miracle, 23, 66
 Moab, 34 n., 73 n., 95, 144 n.
 Monotheism, 35 (b), 149, 169, 193
 Montefiore, 5 n., 40 n., 104, 128, 130 n., 187 n., 214 n., 255, 270 n.
 Moon-worship, 79, 80 n., 102 n.
 Mordecai, 298 sq.
 Moses, Ch. VII., 35 (b)
 Mosaic Books, 36, 41 sqq.
 — Covenant, 35, 102 sq.
 — Law, 7 sq., 40, 104 sqq.
- NAAMAN**, 128
 Naioth, 134 n.
Name of God, 117
 Names taboo, 62, 102 n., 117
 Nathan, 133
 Nature-imagery, 20, 270 n.
 — worship, 20, 60, 67 sqq., 78, 99 sq., 111
 Nebuchadrezzar, 77, 168
 Nehemiah, 202 sqq., 251, 253
 — (Bk.), 39, 202 n., 250
 Nehushtan, 129, 151
 Nineveh, 168
 Nizir, Mount, 82, 91 n.
- OMENS, 63, 89
 Omri, 126 n., 133
 Oracles, 89, 106 sq., 128 sq., and 129 n. (*See* "Before God.")
 Ormuzd, 243
- P, 37 sq., 47, 54 sq., 204 sqq., 212 sq., Ch. XIV.
 Particularism, Hebrew, 66, 149 n., 170 n., 172, 188, 193 n., 225, 297, 310, 313 sqq., 329, 334
 Passover, 212 n., 213
 Paterson, W. P., 40
 Patriarchal biographies, 31, 34 n.
 — longevity, 83
 Paul, St., and the Law, 214 sqq., 218 n.
 Pekah, 143
 Pentateuch, 38 n., 41 sqq.
 Persian religion, 12 n., 162 n., 243, 244, 246 sq.
 Personal religion, 179, 186, 224 sqq., 240
 Pinches, 71 n.
 Plato's myths, 28 n.
 Poetry and prose, 14 sqq.
 Polygamy, 87 n., 139
 "Possession" (spirit), 64
 Pragmatic history, Ch. III., 109 sq., 124 n., 125, 126 n.
 Prayers and psalms (Babn.), 84 sq.
 Priests, 63, 80, 88, 106 sq., 119, 129 sqq., 152 n., 167, 173, 199 n., 207
 Priestly Code, 37 sqq., 46 sq., 54 sq., 185, 204 sqq., 212 sqq., Ch. XIV.
 Progressive revelation, 9 sq., 34 sq.
 Prophets, 6, 22, 30, 35 (e), Ch. X., 132 sqq., 147 sqq., 152 n., 175, 188, 207, 251, 311 sqq.
 Prophets, false, 134 n., 135, 181
 —, schools of, 115, 134 n.
 —, terminology, 147 n.
 "Prophets, The" (Bks.), 249
 Proverbs (Bk.), 20, 38 (D), 241, 250, 282 sqq.
 Psalms (Bk.), 20, 39, 221 sqq., 250, Ch. XVI., 316
 —, Davidic, 254 sq.
 —, "I," 262 sqq.
 —, Imprecatory, 264 sq.
 —, Messianic, 259 sqq.
 — on Life after death, 257 sqq.
 — on sufferings of the good, 256
 Purim, Feast of, 297, 300
- "QUEEN OF HEAVEN," 85
 Quincey, De, 15

- RABBINISM**, 214 n., 232 n.
 Rahab, 82
 Rameses II., 95
 Rebekah (tribe), 34 n.
 Red Sea, 96
 Religion, making of, 68 sq.
 Resurrection, 162, 180, 245, 257 sq.,
 273 sqq., 280 sq., 333, 334
 Retaliation, 66, 87, 138
 Return, The, 199 sqq., 238
 Revelation, progressive, 9 sq., 34 sq.
 Rezin, 143
 Robertson Smith, W., 132, 289 n.
 Romances, religious, 242
 Ruskin, 23
 Ruth (Bk.), 38 (C), 242, 250, 295
 Ryle, 47 n., 54
- SABAOTH**, Jehovah, 117
 Sabbath, 80, 106, 130 n., 152 sq.,
 183, 206, 212
 Sacrifice, 43, 63, 69, 80, 106, 130,
 152, 155, 171, 173, 177, 228
Salvation is of the Jews, 29, 196 n.
 Samaritans, 200
 Samson, 114
 Samuel, 115 sq., 117 n., 133
 — (Bk.), 38 (B) and (C), 123 sq.
 Sanday, 22 n., 254, 259
 Sargon (c. 3000 B.C.), 71 sq., 76 n.
 — (720-707 B.C.), 144
 Satan, 243, 247
 Saul's election, 115 n., 116
Schweich Lect. (King), 18 n., 23 n.,
 72, 76 n., 84, 91 n.
 Scott, Sir W., 1
 Scribal writings, 239
 Scribes, 81, 125, 185, 239, 284
 Seer, 65, 132, 147
 Semites, 18, 71
 Sennecharib, 144 n.
 Shalmaneser III., 143
 Shamash, 79, 82, 83 n., 84, 85
 Shebna, 144
 Sheol, 59, 89, 158, 161, 162 n., 257,
 273 sqq., 280 sq., 333
 Sheshbazzar, 199
 Shiloh, 119, 130
 Shinar, 75 n.
 Sinai Covenant, 35 (*l*), 102 sq.
 Sisera, 16
 Socrates, 10 n., 148 n., 162 n.
 Solomon, 127 n., 130, 142, 259, 287,
 291 sq.
 "Son of God," 260
Son of Man, 332
 Song of Deborah, 16 sqq., 37, 117
 — of Solomon, 20, 39, 250 sq., 289
 sqq.
- Song of Triumph (Red Sea), 96
 Spells, 63, 88
 Spirits, 59 sqq., 80, 88
 Stages of Heb. evolution, 34 sq.
 Stanley, 11, 98
 Stones, holy, 61, 67
 Suffering = sin, 131 n., 179, 256, 266
 sqq., 287
 "Suffering Servant," 195 sqq.
 Sumer, 71, 76, 77 n.
 Synagogue, 173, 184, 211, 220
 Syria, 74, 165 sq.
- TABOO**, 59, 61, 68, 100, 189, 207
 Tammuz, 69 n., 78, 114 n.
 Tehom, 65, 78 n., 82, 83 n.
 Tell-el-Amarna tablets, 72, 73
 Temple, 119, 126, 130 sq., 155, 178,
 190, 200 sq., 209 (A), 210, 226
 Ten Commandments, 7, 40, 46, 104 sq.
 Teraphim, 107, 128 sq., 138 n.
 Theodore of Mopsuestia, 290
 Tiamat, 82, 83 n., 271 n.
 Tiglath Pileser, 74, 143 sq.
 Titles of God, 101 n.
 Tophet, 171 n.
 Torah, 107, 130, 191, 233, 239 n.
 Totemism, 59 n.
 Trade, 136 sq.
 Travelling, 140
 Trito-Isaiah, 38 and 38 n., 316, 327
 Truth of fact, 25 sq.
 — of idea, 26 sqq.
- "UNCLEAN," 59, 189, 206 sq.
 Universalism, 149, 192, 195 sq., 245,
 310, 313, 314
 Ur, 34 n., 73 sq.
 Urim and Thummim, 107, 129 n.
 Utnapishtim, 81, 91 n.
 Uzzah, 100
- VASHTI**, 297
 Vendetta, 66
- WATTS**, 14 sq.
 Wellhausen, 47 n., 172 n., 254
 Westminster Confession, 252
 Wette, De, 42
 Wilson, J. M., 268 n.
 "Wisdom Literature," 239 sqq.
 Wisdom of God, 248, 271 n., 286
 "Wise, the," 239, 246, 282 sqq.
 Worship, 130 n., 145 sq., 155, 184, 211
- ZACHARIAH**, 200, 315, 329
 Zedekiah, 168
 Zerubbabel, 199 sqq., 323
 Ziusudu, 83, 91 n.

PRINTED BY
WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED,
LONDON AND BECCLES, ENGLAND.

Bib. Lit.

C.

167941

Author Cohn, John R.

Title The Bible and modern thought.

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File"
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

unely S. M.

