

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE IV.

THE HISTORY OF RESEARCH CONCERNING THE STRUCTURE OF THE O. T. HISTORICAL BOOKS.

BY PROF. ARCHIBALD DUFF, M.A., LL.D., AIREDALE COLLEGE, ENGLAND.

No. II.

THE intense interest now widely felt in Hebrew religious history is to theologians a profoundly important phenomenon.¹ That importance seems, indeed, to multiply itself while we reflect upon it. It is really only one of the superficial facts of the case that a great body of Christian churches, so cultured in pulpit and pew as are the many units of the Free church of Scotland, have for the last four years spent a large share of the time which they usually devote to internal ecclesiastical conference in discussing that Hebrew history. They have been almost equally divided on the question whether one of the ablest and most devout Old Testament scholars of the day should be condemned as a heretic because he has taught that the traditional views of the origin of the Old Testament are seriously incorrect. The scholar has been authoritatively freed from the charge of heresy; yet the church which acquitted him has forbidden him to teach any longer in her theological schools. His supporters within the Free Church have nevertheless met in public assembly, and presented to him important books and manuscripts, amounting in value to one thousand pounds sterling, as means wherewith he may still continue his Old Testament researches. These friends have also announced that they have collected and invested a fund which shall yield to the

¹ In America as well as in Europe, publications on the subject are rapidly appearing. A valuable work from the pen of Prof. R. P. Stebbins, D D., of Newton, has just come to hand as this ms. goes to the printer. Let us here invite attention to the work, which shall be noticed hereafter, although only a brief reference to it could be made in the following pages. (See L 1, b. *infra*.)

expelled professor an annual salary quite equal to that which he received while holding the chair in the Free church theological school.

Thus these members of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland have chosen to be taught concerning the Old Testament by a man whom the vote of the assembled church forbids to teach in her theological classes. They remain within that church. Indeed, they are unquestionably devoted Christian men, many of them honored ministers, elders, professors of theology in the Free church. These men are so impressed with the value to their Christian life of the work done by Dr. W. R. Smith that they have set apart of their private means some thirty to forty thousand dollars (\$30,000 to \$40,000) to enable that gentleman to go on teaching themselves and the public his views concerning the Old Testament. Within six months of the silencing vote these gentlemen have made all necessary financial arrangements, and have established the silenced teacher as endowed investigator and public lecturer. The fact that they have gently pushed aside their own cherished ecclesiastical system, doing in contradiction to it the religious work which they cannot do through it, is perhaps a proof of the healthy Christian life in these men. They outgrow and overgrow the system when it cramps them.

These are exciting facts, yet they are only secondary phenomena; and they excite only a secondary interest, when we learn that a great number of the more scholarly, thoughtful, and devout students of the Old Testament within the churches are declaring that philological, historical, and theological research, inductively pursued, tends to support a theory of downward development as the explanation of Hebrew history. The significance of this opinion becomes greater still when we learn also that the expectation of finding amongst the Hebrews a political, literary, and religious history essentially analogous to all other history, has attracted men to study the Old Testament with an enthusiasm and to an extent that would but lately have seemed incredible.

On the one hand, the conviction is growing among theologians that a truly scientific theology must rest upon and largely consist of a history of religion. And this conviction draws additional strength from the results of advancing biblical scholarship; for the story of the people among whom our Lord came appears ever more ready to fit itself to the regular theory of history — a theory of development at once natural and divine; natural because divine, and because natural therefore all the more divine. On the other hand, we find one half of the great brotherhood of Christian men moved with an interest that seems to well out from their very central heart; listening as if they now heard that for which their spiritual nature hungered, when they are told that a thread of unexpected, but lifelike order is unravelling itself from the Hebrew documents, and that large parts of the Old Testament which have been hitherto mysterious, unattractive, almost unread and useless, are proving themselves to be accurately fitting links in a simple human history.

There is a theological method which may be called the method of scientific theology; and it is commanding the service of all true scholars. It grows out of the thirst of active souls for knowledge of all facts of history or providence, and it is based on the belief that harmony is discoverable between the order of these facts and the laws of the investigating mind. This method claims to be receiving unexpected confirmation from sacred history. Moreover, the satisfaction felt by a large part of the Christian public on learning what this method does and how it is confirmed is itself, in the strict sense, partial confirmation of the correctness of the method. For there are scarcely any thoughtful men who hold that the method and the satisfaction above described are antagonistic to Christianity. Such would hardly be possible among Protestants, who claim that their religion pervades the atmosphere of the schools and society of Protestant lands. Indeed, they would make a much bolder claim, and affirm that the Christianity of the Reformation has given birth to our society and our schools, has made

our scholars and our free public religious sentiment at once possible and real. Christianity is the life-blood of the scholarship of to-day, and that scholarship is the expression of Christianity, full of light and light-giving, ever spreading, ever more clear and perfect. The historical evidence of this proposition is as unanswerable as it is full of interest. In the present course of Articles we have to exhibit a part of the history of that scholarship, — a fragment only, yet one which concerns opinion as to the mode of the origin of Christianity. Let us approach the work in the spirit of men to whom the knowledge of God's modes of revelation will be itself a divine revelation, something truly welcomed although it be strange and unexpected. It is ever well to read the story of God's providence, whatever that providence may have been.

The results of investigation by many of the foremost students of the Old Testament during the past fifty years have seemed to favor a hypothesis very different from the traditional popular theory of Hebrew history. In a former Article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* (Oct. 1880, pp. 739-751) an exposition was begun of the classical treatise on the new hypothesis — a treatise published by Professor K. H. Graf of Meissen in 1866, and entitled, "Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments." In the former Article above mentioned it was proposed to present in successive Articles a full exposition of Graf's treatise; next to trace carefully the course of investigation by various scholars which culminated in Graf's work; then, finally, to describe the later history of the hypothesis, its modifications, and its rapid advance in the estimation of Hebraists.

Before continuing the exposition proper, it may be of service to sketch in briefest outline the causes and rise of the hypothesis. The Reformation in Germany set men free to think, and commanded them to study as men had seldom studied or thought before. But the most scholarly fruits of the Reformation could not be reaped at once nor early. Men had to fight with sword and pen. What they built

was the fortress, then homes on silenced battle-fields, warehouses, council-chambers, universities. What they wrote was protests, charters, declarations, exhortations, devout sermons, hymns-militant, or poetry that was feeble save where here and there a mountain song or a hymn of real faith burst forth. Each word served its generation; but students were ever yearning after a more graceful, truer speech, that they might think therewith more truly. Lessing arose and spoke, teaching the soul to utter itself and to listen to its own music. Then Kant summoned men to come and reason together. It was God's grace that spoke through these two men, as it was his providence that created them. The queen science awoke ere long; and in pulpit and lecture-hall the eloquent, yet profound Schleiermacher poured forth his consciousness of the love of God, and sought to unravel the story of religious feeling in man and among men. A mysterious, devout thinker next appeared, declaring that in and through our own reason we may find God in ourselves, God in all history. Hegel's theory was grand and true, but a theory that needed demonstration and true illustration from the actual reading of all history's minutest details. When, then, Vatke (1835) professed to apply that theory to the Hebrew religion, and said, "Leviticus must have followed Isaiah, for sacerdotalism always follows faith," the answer was at once, "A fair theory; but theory cannot stand upon itself. We question the truth of the theory, for all men believe that Leviticus preceded Isaiah. Let us study the books, the actual records, and test both the old belief and the new theory by these." Ewald plunged deep into the ocean of Semitic language and history, wandered long in the depths, throwing up strange disturbances, troubling the waters and all who would follow him. He paid little attention to Vatke's hypothesis, but was himself too often an inventor of *a priori* theories. When a generation had come and gone it was found, now twenty years ago, that in the opinion of the majority of Old Testament scholars the Pentateuch was constructed out of several distinct documentary

elements, just as Semitic books of narrative are usually constructed. It was believed that there were three chief elements: first, a so-called Elohist or priestly and somewhat philosophic document, dating from the early days of the kingdoms; secondly, a so-called Jehovistic or more popular document, which dated from the middle period of the kings, and whose narrative is interwoven with the Elohist record; thirdly, the Deuteronomic document, dating from the reign of Josiah, a generation before the fall of the kingdom of Judah.

In 1866 Graf's treatise set forth the results of a minute comparison of the Levitical and the Deuteronomic regulations, and contended that the priestly system of the Book of Leviticus must have arisen later than the Book of Deuteronomy. Graf held that this Levitical system must be separated from the Elohist portion of the Pentateuch, of which it had been thus far counted an essential part. Therefore it seemed now to be necessary to suppose four chief elements: first, the Elohist; second, the Jehovistic; third, the Deuteronomic; and fourth, a Levitical document, dating from the exile or later. The investigators were still a step behind their ultimate general result. Soon after Graf had published his essay he found reason for believing, with many others, that the Elohist element and the Levitical may not be separated, but are essentially one, as they had formerly been regarded; but that, instead of forming together the earliest element, they are the latest — the date of the whole element being proved to be post-exilic by the post-Deuteronomic and post-exilic character of the Levitical system. Thus the whole Elohist element with its reflections, its philosophic cast, its pragmatic narrative, its calculations, its systematized and materialized ritualistic religion came to be regarded as a product of the sacerdotal age which followed the Exile. It was the expression of the faith and the strivings of the half-disheartened freedmen after the generations of slavery in Babylonia. They came out of prison, almost shrinking from the sunlight, to look upon ruined homes and think of mocked hopes. Yet their fresh freedom and their forced struggle

quickened reflection, as well as anxiety. They pored over the past, and sought to prove their ancient birthright; they searched what they must do to be saved, and elaborated out of the simple ways and the grand faiths of the past a cumbersome ceremonial. This is the view now held, with various minor differences (unavoidable here as in all historical reconstructions), by the advanced body of Old Testament scholars. Of these Professor Kuenen of Leyden and Rev. Dr. W. Robertson Smith now of Edinburgh, are representatives whose writings are in part well known to English readers, and whose great learning, philosophic grasp, and clearness in exposition, together with noble devotion to Christianity, have won admiration.

We cannot but advance reverently in expounding the new doctrine; for it concerns sacred ground. It proposes to set aside as mistaken a series of opinions which our thoughtful doctrinal systems as well as our more popular esteem have linked closely with the most sacred religious facts. Certainly, if the new doctrine be true, then interest in it will grow with the years, and fear of it will vanish. A complete exposition of the arguments in the case will then be counted indispensable for the ordinary student. Let us take a suggestion hence. *The new doctrine is as yet only a hypothesis;* but the investigation which has given it life is a historical fact, and its main features are already many years old. Let us, therefore, endeavor to look upon an exposition of the past investigation as simply a statement of historical fact, a description of past events which circled closely about life's sacred centre, and may seriously affect us. Let us welcome any full exposition, any report, which gives unsparingly what is new and what is so momentous. Investigation need not excite unkind passion. It would be well that students should no longer labor merely for the arguments real or formal to support this side or that of an antithesis. The days of such controversy are numbered; for only he appreciates either side of an antithesis who can truly frame the proposition which shall express at once the true import of both

sides. He is unscholarly who treats the truth as something essentially different from what mind and life must be. We live by the inseparable influences of opposite factors, and truth is the accurate record of all these varied influences. We may well cease to regard ourselves as each the champion or the lord of some bit of truth. The truth was scarcely made for that or for us. Truth is the transcript of God's thoughts. We are made that we may trace these thoughts; for by the knowledge of them we live. Has any scholar uttered with true scholarly pleasure any proposition respecting the Old Testament, then assuredly the final proposition, that shall declare all Old Testament truth, shall be found to manifest the positive influence of that minor contribution. Our business, then, is not to controvert, but to search, to expound, to record, to construct.

The former Article in these pages described especially Graf's statements respecting the relation of the Deuteronomic doctrine of festivals to the system of festivals ordained in the laws of Leviticus and the allied records. We proceed now to Graf's account of the "Priestly Orders" which appear in the two systems. The proposition which sums up the results of the comparison is, that while the festival regulations, as expounded in our former Article, appeared to Graf to be post-exilic, the regulations of Leviticus concerning the priesthood, its members, their qualifications, income, place of service, and duties are to him even more plainly post-exilic. The Deuteronomic system which was established as the national cultus by Josiah's government has a priesthood which is very simple and rudimentary as compared with the priesthood of Leviticus. In Deuteronomy all Levites are priests, the rank of all being that of poor dependents of the households all over the land. In Leviticus, on the other hand, only the sons of Aaron are priests, and all other Levites are degraded to the rank of servants of the priests. In Deuteronomy every priest must indeed be a Levite, but any Levite may fill the priestly office if he will. Quite otherwise is it in Leviticus. Let us examine Graf's details.

I. We turn first to his report on the characteristics of the Deuteronomic priesthood. He states :

1. In the language of Deuteronomy, which was of course the language of the reformation under Josiah, the term Levite is synonymous with priest. Not some Levites are priests, but all Levites are priests. Not some particular family of Levites has priestly rank, but all Levites have equal priestly rank.

a. The *usus loquendi* in Deuteronomy is to say either *הַכֹּהֲנִים הַלְוִיִּים*, "the priests the Levites," the words being unquestionably in apposition (xvii. 9, 18; xviii. 1; xxiv. 8; xxvii. 9); or to say *הַכֹּהֲנִים בְּנֵי לֵוִי*, "the priests, the sons of Levi" (xxi. 5; xxxi. 9); or to say *הַלְוִיִּים*, "the Levites," where the context indicates that priests are signified (see xxxi. 25, 26, where Levites handle the contents of the ark).

b. The writer of Deuteronomy even expressly explains that by the expression "the priests the Levites" he means the whole tribe of Levi (xviii. 1). We may be permitted a momentary digression from the description to observe that Dr. Stebbins's contention, on pages 66, 67, 68 of his recent work above named, wherein Dr. Stebbins traverses that particular of Graf's theory which the present page expounds, is being abandoned by advocates of the traditional theory. A highly honored leader in the United Presbyterian church of Scotland, and a strong advocate of the traditional theory, in recent lectures in Aberdeen on the subject, accepts the doctrine that in Deuteronomy all Levites had priestly functions. But he explains this as the result of Moses' discovery, during the forty years of practical experience in the wilderness, that the priestly work was too great for the Aaronic family, and required the whole of the tribe of Levi for its performance. To discuss so new a theory is of course beyond our sphere.

c. The Deuteronomist says that the Levites live scattered about the country; not, therefore, always exercising their priestly functions, since Jerusalem is the only true sanctuary, in the Deuteronomist's opinion. But any Levite may come, if he wish with all his heart to come, from his village home

to Jerusalem, there to act as priest, and to receive a share of the priestly income (xviii. 5-8).

d. The characteristics of the priestly office of the Levites are: *a.* To stand before Jahweh, God of Israel, to minister before him (לְפָנָיו); to bless in his name; to utter commands and other words in his name; and to carry the ark. It is of great importance to observe here that the offering of the sacrifices was apparently the duty of the ordinary Israelite himself. This function of offering is not clearly a priestly function in Deuteronomy (x. 8; xviii. 5, 7; xxi. 5; xxvii. 14; xxxi. 9, 25; cf. 1 Kings viii. 11, where the priests' work is לְפָנָיו; Ezek. xl. 46; xlv. 15). *β.* They have no possessions as means for their support, save certain parts of the sacrifices, "the fires of Jahweh" (אֵשׁ יְהוָה), also certain periodical gifts. These possessions are summarized in the words, "Jahweh is their possession" (Deut. x. 9; xii. 12; xiv. 27, 29; xviii. 1, 2). *γ.* Jahweh is said to have chosen the tribe of Levi for this service (Deut. x. 8; xviii. 5; xxi. 5). In their office they are supported by solemn divine sanctions. *δ.* The song of Moses specially extols the priestly office as belonging to all the members of the tribe without distinction (xxxiii. 8-11). *e.* In addition, the Levites were the higher local judges, to whom the local elders appealed for decisions in difficult cases. The supreme court of appeal consisted of the Levites and the elders at the time in office in Jerusalem, where this court must sit (Deut. xvi. 18; xvii. 8-13, especially vs. 9; xviii. 7; xxi. 5, 19; xxvi. 3). The Levites were the fountain of instruction (הוֹרָא).

e. Graf further compares with this the *usus loquendi* of the Book of Joshua (viii. 33; xviii. 7); of men of Josiah's time, e.g. of Jeremiah, who speaks of הַכֹּהֲנִים הַלְוִיִּים, and speaks of their office as being לְפָנָיו. Compare the language of Deuteronomy with Jer. xxxiii. 18, 21, 22. Compare also Ezekiel, as quoted above (*d. a.*); and Isaiah, writing for the exile (lxvi. 21), "I take of them for priests for Levites" (לְכֹהֲנֵי לְוִיִּים). The words are taken to be in apposition.

2. He says that Deuteronomy speaks of no high-priest

higher in rank than all other priests. We do not read in Deuteronomy of a high-priest standing beside Moses to aid in giving commands; but we do read that the priests, the Levites stood beside him, exhorting the people (Deut. xxvii. 9). Aaron is barely mentioned in Deuteronomy — once in connection with the golden calf, as one with whom Jahweh was especially angry, in two other passages Aaron's death is mentioned (Deut. ix. 20; x. 6; xxxii. 50). Aaron seems almost slighted by the writer in comparison with the prominence given to Joshua throughout the prelude and the conclusion of the book. It is remarkable that Jeremiah also speaks of the priests, i.e. the Levites, as in a sense co-ordinate in importance with David's house (Jer. xxxiii. 17, 18); but he says nothing of Aaron's house, and nothing of any high-priest. He does not appear to know them, unless Pashchur (Jer. xx. 1) was high-priest, although Jeremiah does not call him such.

II. Let us hear, secondly, Graf's account of the priesthood required by the Book of Leviticus.

1. In Leviticus Aaron is high-priest. References in proof of this are unnecessary. It is, however, an important coincidence that the Book of Ezra (vii. 5) regards Aaron as the first of a long line of high-priests. Aaron is there אֲרֹנְיָהוּ רֹאשׁ הַכֹּהֲנִים, "the priest, the head." The portion of Ezra quoted is most likely a part of the Book of Chronicles, and therefore dates from about 300 B.C. A comparison of Neh. x. 38; xii. 47, etc., and of the many passages alluding to the priesthood in the Books of Haggai and Zechariah, in the Old Testament Apocrypha, in the New Testament, and in Josephus, will show that soon after the Exile a graduated system of priesthood like the system of Leviticus was a settled institution, and continued to be so until the fall of Jerusalem.

2. The priests of the Book of Leviticus and related passages are the sons of Aaron only. No other Levites are priests. Not only may no other Hebrew of the other tribes dare to perform priestly duties; but any Levite who is not of Aaron's family, and yet ventures to touch priestly work, or even to claim a right to do priestly offices, is visited with

the utmost displeasure and punishment. Korah the Levite, the cousin of Aaron, is said to have suffered a terrible death, and his whole family, his wife, his children, and his possessions perished with him, because he was not of the seed of Aaron, and yet came near to offer incense. Dathan and Abiram, who were Reubenites, suffered likewise for the same offence; but Korah's offence is visited with much more condemnation than is theirs (Num. xvi., especially vs. 8-11, 16, 32, 40, 49). Further evidence is unnecessary that in Leviticus and the related sections of the Pentateuch, as distinguished from Deuteronomy, the Aaronic family alone out of the tribe of Levi hold the priestly office, and no other Levite dare take that office on pain of death (Num. iii. 10; xvii. 5 [Heb.]; xviii. 7).

Considering for the moment Leviticus and related sections as *sub judice*, and not certainly pre-exilic, Graf claims that no clearly pre-exilic book attributes the priesthood thus exclusively to the sons of Aaron. The Books of Judges, Samuel, Kings, Deuteronomy, and the prophets¹ from Amos (800 B.C.) to Habakkuk (600 B.C.) do not make this distinct separation of Aaronites to the priesthood, and may be said to know nothing of the exclusive separation. Thus the *usus loquendi* of Leviticus and the customs and the times which it represents seem to be quite different from those of all the clearly pre-exilic writers. Even Ezekiel makes no such distinction between Aaronic and non-Aaronic Levites. He does distinguish the priests of the Jerusalem sanctuary from the rest of the Levites; but those Jerusalem priests thus distinguished he calls sons of Zadok, never sons of Aaron; and he gives a reason for the distinction (Ezek. xl. 46; xliii. 19; xliv. 15; xlviii. 11; cf. 1 Kings ii. 35). Even the Book of Chronicles mentions this very distinction made by Ezekiel and by the Book of Kings between Zadokite priestly Levites and all other Levites,

¹ i.e. Amos, 800; Hosea, 770; Isaiah, 750; Micah, 730; Zephaniah, 630; Nahum, 630; Jeremiah, 620; Habakkuk, 600; the dates being given approximately.

although it is not quite consistent with the line of distinction which the chronicler usually draws, i.e. the line separating Aaronic priests from non-Aaronic Levites (cf. 1 Chron. xxix. 22; 2 Chron. xxxi. 10 with 1 Chron. xxiii., etc.).

3. The duties of these Aaronic priests of the Book of Leviticus, says Graf, are duties which were assigned by the Deuteronomist to the whole tribe of Levi (see above, on Deuteronomic priests, 1, *d*), with, of course, the added duties which a more elaborate and more purely sacerdotal system entailed. We need not repeat all the well-known details, but may describe them summarily, as the care of all the more sacred things, from the holy of holies down to the burnt-offering. They also pronounced Jahweh's blessing upon the people. These functions were to be Aaronic forever. לְכֹהֲנָיִם לְעֹלָם לְעֹלָם לְעֹלָם לְעֹלָם (Ex. xxix. 9; xl. 15; Num. vi. 23 ff.). Contrast with these words the allusion of Josh. xviii. 7 to the Deuteronomic system. The same word (קָהֵן) is used to signify the office of the Levites as a tribe.

4. The duties of those Levites who were not sons of Aaron are, in the legislation of Leviticus, Graf says, as follows: They should stand between the priests and the people (Num. viii. 11 f.; xviii. 2 f. Observe the etymology given here for the word לֵוִי); they shall serve Aaron (Num. iii. 6); they are fully given to Aaron and his sons (Num. iii. 9), for they are given to Jahweh, and he has given them to Aaron (Num. viii. 16, 19; xviii. 6); but they may not touch the holy vessels, for that is the prerogative of priests only (Num. xviii. 3; iv. 15, 20).

III. Having thus considered the apparent difference between the priesthood of Deuteronomy and that of Leviticus, let us turn, thirdly, to Graf's examination of the general history of priesthood as it appears in the various historical books. He clearly holds that any book will be naturally colored by the influence of the system in use at the time when the book was composed. Thus the Chronicles — a work dating from the time of Alexander or later — may be expected to exhibit intimate knowledge of the system of

that age, and great reverence for it, on the writer's part. He will surely regard it as a divinely chosen system. So also the Book of Kings, dating perhaps, in the main, from the time of Jeremiah and the beginning of the Exile, will reflect traces of the system observed in Jeremiah's time, and will regard it as the highest standard of religious observance. On examination of the history we find that according to Graf :

1. There was no distinction made between Aaronic priests and other Levites in the narrative as given by those writers who are pre-exilic, or not distinctly post-exilic. If this system of Leviticus had been in use in the days of the writers of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, they would have mentioned it in their narrative. They could not have avoided mentioning it, if they had known that it had existed in the time of David and onwards, or if they had had any knowledge of it at all. If this system, with its peculiar distinction, so important in the eyes of those who actually knew it and observed it, had been in existence in the times of the writers of the Kings, these writers could not have ignored it. But they do ignore it. It may not be objected that the distinction may have existed, because the chronicler believed that it had so existed, and writes as if it had. The chronicler's high regard for the system is to Graf the very evidence that the writer of Kings would not have ignored it had he known it. The chronicler saw the system in existence, and held it as most sacred, so much so that he supposed it must have been the divinely ordained system, and the system sacredly observed by all good men in the past. He was a child of the system, close to it, never dreamed of questioning its sacredness or ancient origin. The argument from the silence of Kings would scarcely arise for him; much rather would he naturally interpret the silence as simply requiring supplementary positive interpretation. To the chronicler the Aaronic system was well known, and with reason was felt to be a divinely important factor in the life of his times. He could not think of the past as without it, so important was it. In like manner, when the writer of Kings is viewed in the light

of the chronicler's mode of thought it is held that the writer of Kings would have recorded the existence of so important a factor as the Aaronic system, if that factor had existed.

Of course, the chronicler's belief became the current belief of his time, and of the following generations who worshipped according to the Aaronic system. It was therefore the popular belief in New Testament times, and has continued to be the popular and traditional theory down to our own day. But this theory seems to lessen the value of the Book of Kings, and the faithfulness of the writer of Kings, while it does not really add to the value and faithfulness of the Chronicles.

According to the traditional theory, the course of history in Israel must have run thus: First, a period in the wilderness, when the Aaronic distinction was made and regarded as extremely sacred, and this lasted for about forty years; following this, a period wherein the distinction does not seem to have appeared at all, in practice, in language, or in recollection, and this lasted from about the entrance into Canaan until the Captivity, say for seven hundred years; finally, there followed the post-exilic period, when the distinction was revived, to endure with various fortunes, say for five hundred years. Graf gives a still more detailed statements of his grounds for believing that the distinction was unknown in the second period mentioned above. It may be presented as follows:

a. The Pentateuch gives only a very uncertain account of the period in the wilderness. Even Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers assign various positions to Aaron. At times he appears as priest, accompanying Moses as Eleazar accompanies Joshua, or as Abiah journeys with Saul, or Abiathar with David, namely, as a sort of priestly officer on the military commander's staff. In other passages Aaron is set much behind Joshua. See Ex. xxiv. 13 ff., where Joshua ascends with Moses into the mount of God to receive the law, while Aaron stays below with the people. See also

Ex. xxxiii. 11, where Joshua, Moses' קָשֶׁתָּהּ (cf. the use of קָשֶׁתָּהּ above concerning priests), stands in the tent of covenanting where Jahweh's cloudy pillar talks with Moses. Joshua remains in that tent while Moses is absent for a time. Again, Aaron makes the calf. He rebels, with Miriam, against Moses. Before the interview with Pharaoh he is simply called the Levite (Ex. iv. 14); after his journey, and at his death, he is called the priest (Num. xxvi. 64; xxxiii. 38).

b. A few remarkable allusions in Exodus to the position of the priests deserve special notice. In xxiv. 5 "young men of the children of Israel," נְעָרֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, were sent by Moses to offer burnt-offerings, and to sacrifice peace-offerings (i.e. to cause the former to ascend, in the pillar of smoke — to burn them, — and to slaughter the latter for the festal meal). Moses himself performed the befitting ceremony with the blood, sprinkling it upon the altar and the people. Now, in Ex. xix. 22, 24, Graf points out that priests, as well as people, are warned not to break the barriers which kept them off Mount Sinai. Why did not these priests offer the sacrifices which Moses sent youths to offer? Why must priests be withheld, like ordinary men, from nearer approach to God's seat, although Joshua was taken up to the mountain top? Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and seventy elders also went up, according to xxiv. 1, but not nigh unto God's presence, like Moses, and apparently also Joshua (vs. 13, 14). And finally, what were the origin, rank, and duties of these priests, and were they utterly removed from the priesthood on the appointment of the Aaronic priesthood (Ex. xxviii. 1); or were they merely degraded, and if so, to what rank?

c. Graf finds in the Book of Joshua as in Deuteronomy an assignment of priestly duties to all Levites, and the use of the expression "the priests the Levites" or "the Levites" as signifying priests, but never the words "priests and Levites" (Josh. iii. 3; viii. 33. These passages speak of the crossing over Jordan and the covenant upon Ebal and Gerizim). The priest-Levites bear the ark (the Aaronic priests were not to bear the ark); they have no possession save "the priest-

hood of Jahweh," *יהוה יראת* (Josh. iii. 4, 6, 14; xviii. 7; cf. Deut. x. 8; xxxi. 9; xviii. 1).

d. In the Book of Judges Graf finds described a sanctuary and a family of Levitical priests in the city of Dan, formerly called Laish, in the northern possession of the tribe Dan. These continued to exist there from the days of the judges (say 1100 B.C.) until the time of the Captivity (590 B.C.). The father and founder of this priestly house was a descendant of Moses, and had lived in his youth in Bethlehem. He finds that a house of Levites not descended from Aaron exercised priestly functions, and that not at all in Jerusalem, throughout the whole period of the kings. These priests in Dan were certainly priests of Jahweh, although they used images in their worship of Jahweh (Judges xvii. and xviii., especially xviii. 30, observing the Masoretic foot note, and comparing Ex. ii. 22).

e. Further, the Book of Samuel states that a house of priests dwelt and officiated at Nob (1 Sam. xxi. 1, etc.). They were related to the house of Eli in Shiloh (1 Sam. xiv. 3; xxii. 20), and were therefore Levites (1 Sam. ii. 27, etc.). They were destroyed by Doeg, eighty-five priests being slain (1 Sam. xxii. 11, 18). Solomon deposed their sole surviving representative, Abiathar, from his priestly office for political reasons (1 Kings ii. 27). Thus the kings held the power of deposing priests; and, moreover, the whole of the house of Eli was removed from their priestly office. Indeed, they were almost annihilated, in spite of their office, whatsoever that may have been. The writer of Kings seems to have no idea of any one family holding the priesthood forever.

f. According to the Book of Kings, Solomon appointed Zadok and his house to be priests in the room of the deposed Abiathar (1 Kings ii. 27, 35). We read also that "the priests bore the ark" at Solomon's dedication of his temple (1 Kings viii. 3). Doubtless these were Solomon's Zadokite priests. In earlier days Zadok the priest and all the Levites had borne the ark at David's flight (2 Sam. xv. 24). Thus bearing the ark was the work of priests or of Levites without

distinction. The custom was therefore contrary to the Aaronic system of Leviticus. Under King Joash we read of "Jehoiada the priest, and the priests" (2 Kings xii. 7. See *h* below).

g. Jeremiah speaks likewise of the Levites as the priests. They are God's ministers, with whom Jahweh made a covenant to bless them peculiarly (Jer. xxxiii. 18-22). Ezekiel writes, as already stated, of the priests, the Levites, the sons of Zadok," and of "the priests, the Levites, viz. they of the seed of Zadok." He differs from the Book of Kings in the reason assigned for the appointment of this particular family of Levites to the priesthood of the temple (xliiii. 19; xliv. 15).

The evidence thus far adduced proves to Graf that, between the Exodus and the Captivity the expressions "priest," "Levite," "bearer of the ark of covenant" were synonymous. At the least, they were used as synonymous by the writers of Judges, Samuel, Kings, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel.

h. At various times during this period certain expressions were used to designate particular priests, perhaps to indicate particular rank and service. Under Joash (878-838 B.C.) one priest was called "the great priest," *הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל* (2 Kings xii. 10). Under Josiah (640-609 B.C.) one had the same title (2 Kings xxii. 4, 8; xxiii. 4), and there were also priests of a second rank. Under Zedekiah (599-589 B.C.) Seraiah was *כֹּהֵן רִאשׁוֹן*, "priest of the head," and Zephaniah was *כֹּהֵן שֵׁנִי*, "priest of a second rank" (2 Kings xxv. 18). In Jer. xx. 1 we read that Pashchur was "the priest, and he was a foremost overseer," *הַכֹּהֵן הָרִאשׁוֹן עֹשֵׂה הַמְּשָׁרָה*. These distinctions hardly necessitate the supposition that the conception of an Aaronic high-priest as described in Leviticus was constantly realized, or even known to the leaders of the people, throughout the period of the kings. When the Book of Deuteronomy appeared, in Josiah's time, it contained no allusion to a high-priest, in Graf's opinion; and it is scarcely probable that this was looked upon as a violation of a sacred

custom or as an innovation. Here seems to him evidence that an Aaronic high-priest was unknown; for had such been known Deuteronomy would have spoken of the fact as a thing sacredly important. It may be here observed that we owe to the Septuagint our term "high priest (*ἀρχιερεύς*)."
The title given to Aaron in Leviticus and allied passages is simply *קֹהֵן*, save twice, where *קֹהֵן גָּדוֹל* is added. The distinction made is rather a distinction of functions than of title.

i. Graf believes that we may trace the history of the gradual introduction of the distinction of priestly from non-priestly Levites. The reformation of Josiah was based on the exhortations of Deuteronomy. In Deut. xviii. there is a direction that the country Levites, i.e. priests who come up to Jerusalem to minister there, should receive a share of the temple revenues. In the story of the reformation we are told (2 Kings xxiii. 9) that country priests declined to come up, thus declining also the revenues just mentioned. Moreover, we find Ezekiel proclaiming that a distinction must be made between Zadok's descendants, on the one hand, — who were apparently the Jerusalem priests, having been so appointed by Solomon, — and all the remaining Levites, on the other hand, whom Ezekiel declares to be unworthy of the priestly office, because of their going astray after idols (xliv. 10). Ezekiel was a priest, and apparently a Jerusalem priest, — i.e. a Zadokite, — who began his ministry in the end of Josiah's reign. What is the exact significance of his declaration that the Zadok Levites alone are fit to continue to be priests, while all other Levites must be degraded to the rank of priest's servants? Graf combines the various materials for the answer to this question thus: The country priests, the non-Zadokites, had declined, according to the quotation from 2 Kings, to leave their scattered homes, the many local sanctuaries, which had become the scenes of much false worship. They had declined to remove to Jerusalem, and there help to establish Zion as a pure and only sanctuary. No doubt the removal would have cost much self-denial, yet without it the country sanctuaries would continue to be at-

tractive. Quite possibly this was foreseen by the writer of Deuteronomy, and would lend earnestness to his appeal in xviii. 6, etc. The country priests declined (1) to help to establish Zion; (2) to disestablish the old sanctuaries, which were regarded by most devout men as centres of religious indifference; and they had declined (3) to accept a generous measure of compensation. The Jerusalem priests, and Ezekiel among them, might well feel henceforth that their fellow Levites dwelling in the country lacked utterly the spirit needed in priests of the new Zion cultus. Moreover, no doubt they felt that they would be relieved from the fear of decrease of their revenues, if all possible claim of these unsympathetic country Levites to a share of the revenue were formally annulled. If the privilege of making the claim were offered, but refused, and if the refusal implied indifference towards the new cultus, it would naturally seem righteous to deny the claim. Thus Graf thinks Ezekiel's proclamation an indication that the Jerusalem priests opposed energetically the direction of Deut. xviii. 6. In any case, he says, Ezekiel implies that up to his time all Levites had possessed equal right to perform priestly offices. A distinction between priests and Levites was entirely new to him.

2. Graf passes from these reports of pre-exilic or early exilic witnesses to examine, secondly, the testimony which is clearly post-exilic. He finds evidence that the system described in Leviticus was known and observed after the Exile, and was then regarded with a veneration whose depth is measured by the belief of the times that those ceremonies and that law had been given by Moses, and must have been observed by the nation constantly since the days of Moses. The evidence of this post-exilic practice and opinion is to be found throughout the Books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, Maccabees, the New Testament, and Josephus. It has been pointed out lately by a conservative scholar, and acknowledged by the advocates of the Graf theory, that the system described by the chronicler may not be considered as altogether identical with the system

of Leviticus. There arose really *many* distinct systems, and at a later point in our exposition Graf's theory of Chronicles may be stated. Meantime, let us refrain from wandering from our present subject.

In the worship of the second temple there were, as in Leviticus, two distinct classes of officers, the priests and the Levites; the former supposed to be sons of Aaron only, while all other Levites were subordinate to these priests. We read constantly of the priests and the Levites (1 Chron. xv. 4 ff.; 2 Chron. xiii. 9, 10; xxxi. 17, 19, etc. We may observe that the chronicler twice uses the old expression, "the priests the Levites." See 2 Chron. xxiii. 18; xxx. 27. The former passage is an interesting illustration of the chronicler's efforts to interpret and supplement the language of the Book of Kings. In both cases the context seems to indicate that the omission of the conjunction "and" was a mere slip). The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah never neglect the distinction. Excellent illustrations of the post-exilic practice of distinction and of decided subordination of the Levites is to be found in Neh. x. 39 and xii. 47. The context of these passages illustrates also the post-exilic habit of imputing to early days the origin of post-exilic customs (Neh. x. 29 to 32; xii. 46). It might almost be asserted that the chronicler quoted the very words of Deut. x. 8 concerning the Levites' duties, when he wished to speak of the duties that were in his day Aaronic only. We read in Deut. x. 8, "Jahweh caused to separate the tribe of Levi to minister to him and to bless in his name unto this day," *וַיִּבְרַח יְהוָה אֶת שֵׁבֶט לְמִינֵי וּלְבָרְכָהּ בְּשֵׁמוֹ עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה*. But we read in 1 Chron. xxiii. 13, "and there became separated Aaron and his sons forever to minister to him and to bless in his name forever," ... *וַיִּבְרַח אַהֲרֹן וּבָנָיו עַד עוֹלָם לְשֵׁרְתוֹ וּלְבָרְכָהּ בְּשֵׁמוֹ עַד עוֹלָם*. Thus the chronicler appears to record from memory a much used formula of Deuteronomic origin, or to write with Deuteronomy before him, and to regard that book as requiring interpretation by the light of the customs known to the chronicler. Of course the interpretation is not critical, nor does it make any claim

to be so. It is hardly necessary to give references to the abundant evidence that the system of Leviticus agrees with the chronicler's formula, rather than with that of Deuteronomy. In a succeeding Article will be presented an exposition of Graf's comparison of the Deuteronomic and Levitical laws concerning sacerdotal income. As already stated, the present writer reserves entirely his own conclusions; holding that, thus far, only hypotheses are possible.

ARTICLE V.

THE INTEGRITY OF THE BOOK OF ISAIAH.

BY REV. WM. HENRY COBB, UXBRIDGE, MASS.

THE *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April and October 1881, and for January 1882, contained Articles aiming to show a linguistic correspondence between the main divisions of the Book commonly ascribed to Isaiah too minute and undesigned to be accounted for on the hypothesis of a diversity of authorship. Since those Articles were written, the thirteenth volume of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* has appeared, with an Article on Isaiah from the pen of Rev. T. K. Cheyne, which may be regarded as giving the high-water mark of recent exegesis, as its author has written the latest, and in some respects the best, commentary on the prophecies of Isaiah.¹ This commentary, especially its appended essays, should be read in connection with the Article in the *Encyclopedia*, as the latter is too brief to express justly the writer's cautious, reverent, and thoroughly Christian spirit. It is gratifying to find him treating the conservative view with far more respect than was evinced in his earlier work.² It is well to remind a certain class of critics that such epithets as "blind conservatism," "hard-and-fast traditionalism," fail to meet the present conditions of the problem. Professor Plumptre, for example, who cannot be accused of an orthodox bias, declares³: "My own conviction is, that the second part of Isaiah bears as distinct traces of coming from the author of the first as *Paradise Regained* does of coming from the author of *Paradise*

¹ London: C. Kegan Paul and Co. 1880-1.

² The Book of Isaiah chronologically arranged. London: Macmillan and Co. 1870.

³ Contempor