

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 VII.

THE FIFTH CHAPTER OF WELLHAUSEN'S
PROLEGOMENA.

BY HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., OF LINCOLN'S INN,
BARRISTER-AT-LAW.

THE fifth chapter of Wellhausen's Prolegomena completes the "History of Worship," which forms the earliest and most important division of this celebrated book. It is entitled "The Endowment of the Clergy," and while it does not possess anything like the interest or the consequence of the first four chapters it yet claims consideration in this series of articles. In many respects it carries to their logical conclusions mistakes that we have had to examine in their earlier stages. It is thus natural to subject it to some consideration, although the topics with which it deals are in some instances incapable of satisfactory treatment because of the extreme scantiness of our material. The chapter itself is divided into two main sections, — the first dealing with certain offerings, the second with the Levitical cities.

I.

The various kinds of offerings must, of course, be considered separately. This chapter is singularly difficult to deal with satisfactorily, for Wellhausen here surpasses himself in inaccuracy and confusion; as, for instance, when he writes, "In Deuteronomy the priests are entirely thrown upon the sacrifices.....if they are not exercising the priestly function they must starve (1 Sam. ii. 36)."¹ How or when

¹ Prolegomena (Eng. Trans.), p. 155.

First Samuel became a part of Deuteronomy is not explained nor are we told why the denunciation which obviously applies only to a single house — that of Eli — should be extended to the other priestly houses which were not implicated in its guilt. The statement itself is contradicted on the preceding page, where we are informed that “at an earlier date the priests of Jerusalem received money from those who employed them (Deut. xviii. 8), but for this had the obligation of maintaining the temple.” This is an extraordinary falsehood, for Deuteronomy xviii. 8 reads: “They [i.e. Levites coming from the provinces] shall have like portions to eat, beside that which cometh *of the sale of his patrimony.*” In Wellhausen’s hands this becomes a payment of money from those who employed them, coupled with an obligation of maintaining the temple, and that though, on the very next page, he alleges that they are entirely thrown upon the sacrifices.

In refuting such a discussion the only course open is to pick out the more or less salient points and treat of those — for the correction of every minor inaccuracy would consume space needlessly. The first matter of importance appears to be a comparison of the priestly dues in 1 Samuel ii. 12–16; Deuteronomy xviii. 3; and Leviticus vii. 34. In the first passage the “tribute of raw portions of flesh before the burning of the fat” is “treated as a shameless demand.” “More tolerable is it, though even that is an abuse, when the priests cause boiled flesh to be brought them from the pot” (p. 153). Now I have already shown that, contrary to Wellhausen’s assumption, the Priestly Code contemplates boiled flesh for the priestly dues,¹ and of course, on any view,

¹ *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, pp. 211 f. = *Bibliotheca Sacra*, October, 1909, pp. 728 f.

the conduct of the priests is an abuse; thus there is no discrepancy between this passage and Leviticus. There remains the question of the relations between Deuteronomy and Leviticus.

" We have it in Deuteronomy as 'the priest's due from the people' (xviii. 3=1 Sam. ii. 12) that he receives the shoulder and the two cheeks and the maw of the slaughtered animal; and yet this is a modest claim compared with what the sons of Aaron have in the Priestly Code (Lev. vii. 34),—the right leg and the breast. The course of the development is plain; the Priestly Code became law for Judaism. In sacrifice, its demands were those which were regarded; but in order to fulfil all righteousness the precept of Deuteronomy was also maintained, this being applied—against the obvious meaning and certainly only as a result of later scrupulosity of the scribes—not to sacrifices but to ordinary secular slaughterings, from which also accordingly the priests received a portionthe precept being thus harmonistically doubled" (pp. 153 f.).

It will probably come as a surprise to Wellhausen's followers to be told that Deuteronomy does not permit any "ordinary secular slaughterings" in the religious capital; but the express terms of the law are in this matter too clear for doubt: "If the place which the Lord thy God shall choose to put his name there be too far from thee, then thou mayest kill of thy herd and of thy flock. . . .and thou mayest eat within thy gates" (xii. 20). That is plain enough: the permission is limited to those who live at too great a distance from the place. But it is so worded as not to apply to the capital. Hence animals slaughtered there for food purposes, only, would still have to be sacrificed. If we turn to Deuteronomy xviii. 3, we find that it deals with the priests' due "from them that slaughter a sacrifice." The conjecture lies close at hand that the law is intended to apply to inhabitants of the capital sacrificing merely for food purposes. They would be under a heavy disadvantage as compared with per-

sons dwelling at a distance in having to pay any due at all on such animals, and accordingly the legislation grants them some relief in making it lighter than that on an ordinary peace-offering. It is of course impossible on our present materials to prove this with certainty. All that can be said is that the permission of profane slaughtering did not apply to these inhabitants so that they must have had to pay *some* due; that Deuteronomy xviii. in terms covers their case; and that it is, therefore, reasonable to suppose that it is to them that the due contemplated by Deuteronomy xviii. applies.¹ This explains the difference of terminology between Deuteronomy and Leviticus (which applies in terms to sacrifices of peace-offerings).

The next matter of importance dealt with in this chapter is the question of firstlings. I have treated of this before, but I think it well to allude to the matter shortly. Wellhausen believes that in Deuteronomy xv. 19, 20, "to sanctify unto the Lord," "to eat before the Lord," and "to offer to the Lord" are three equivalent ideas.

" If now, in Num. xviii. 15 seq., every first birth is assigned without circumlocution to the priest, and a special paschal offering is appointed in addition, this can only be understood as the last phase in the development, partly because the idea of dues altogether is secondary to that of offerings, and partly because the

¹ During the desert period, animals killed for food were to be sacrificed for peace-offerings from the time of the enactment of Leviticus xvii. 5. Presumably, therefore, the usual dues on a peace-offering were paid on them, and so long as a sufficiency of manna was miraculously provided for food, this involved no hardship. But the case of the inhabitants of the capital was different. From the time of the settlement they alone of all Israelites were under a legal incapacity to slaughter non-sacrificially for food. It would therefore be reasonable that a smaller due should be paid by them on such sacrifices than was habitual in the case of ordinary peace-offerings.

immense augmentation to the income of the priests points to an increase of the hierocratic power" (pp. 155 f.).

The answer is shortly that a careful examination of the legal texts shows that in the Law this sanctifying of an animal meant withdrawing it from ordinary use, and sacrificing it to the Lord; and that the rule in Numbers v. 9 f. expressly applies to such cases, and explains the relationship of Deuteronomy xv. and Numbers xviii. On the true construction of the laws, a heave-offering was to be given to the priest; and Numbers xviii. only applies to such heave-offerings. Probably this heave-offering usually consisted of one or more firstlings. The fact that the law was interpreted otherwise after the exile cannot of course override its very plain expressions.¹

Before dealing with tithes, we may clear away the unsound views entertained by Wellhausen about first-fruits.

"With the tithe of the fruit of the soil the first-fruits are at bottom identical; the latter were reduced to definite measure later and through the influence of the former. . . . But also the *reshith*, usually translated first-fruits, occurs in Deuteronomy, — as a payment of corn, wine, oil, and wool to the priests (xviii. 4); a small portion, a basketful, thereof is brought before the altar and dedicated with a significant liturgy (xxvi. 1 seq.). It appears that it is taken from the tithe, as might be inferred from xxvi. 12 seq. taken as the continuation of vers. 1-11; in one passage, xxvi. 2, the more general *usus loquendi* reappears, according to which the *reshith* means the entire consecrated fruit, which as a whole is consumed by the offerers before the Lord,² and of which the priests receive only a portion. But in the Priestly Code not only is the entire tithe demanded as a due of the clergy, the *reshith* also is demanded in addition (Num. xviii. 12), and it is further multiplied, inasmuch as it is demanded from the kneading-trough as well as from the threshing-floor; in every leavening the *halla* belongs to the Lord (xv. 20). Nor is this all; to the *reshith* (xviii. 12) are added the *bikkurim* also (xviii. 13), as something distinct. The distinc-

¹ For proof of the above, see the Churchman (London), July, 1906, pp. 425-430.

² As usual I have substituted "the Lord" for Wellhausen's transliteration of the Tetragrammaton.

tion does not occur elsewhere (Exod. xxxiv. 26); prepared fruits alone are invariably spoken of, the yield of the threshing-floor and the wine-press, of which first produce—"the fulness and the overflow"—was to be consecrated. The *fat* of oil, wine, and corn is the main thing in Num. xviii. also, and is called *reshith* (ver. 12) or *terumah* (ver. 27); but the *bikkurim* (ver. 13) seem to be a separate thing, and, if this be really the case, must mean those raw fruits which have ripened earliest" (pp. 157 f.).

It is well in answering this to begin with *reshith* and *bikkurim*. There can be no doubt as to the enormous difference between the two in the legal texts.

First, as to the *dates*. In Leviticus xxiii. we have clear proof that the two offerings were separated by an interval of *seven weeks*. *Reshith* was offered (ver. 10 and 11) forty-nine days before *bikkurim* (ver. 15-17). The day of the *bikkurim* was the feast of weeks, or Pentecost, and it is with this date that the *bikkurim* are invariably associated in the legal texts (compare Ex. xxiii. 16, 19; xxxiv. 22, 26; Num. xxxiii. 26). No attempt to divide into different codes can alter this, for the dating appears equally in passages that are assigned to the earliest and to the latest stage.

Secondly, as to the *preparation and treatment*. *Reshith* was offered raw, *bikkurim* were cooked: *reshith* could not constitute a meal-offering, *bikkurim* could and did. We see this clearly in Leviticus xxiii. 10-20, where an omer (either sheaf or measure) of *reshith* is waved, while *bikkurim* are offered in the form of a meal-offering, loaves made of flour. We see it not less clearly in Leviticus ii. 11-16. The two earlier verses (11 f.) make it plain that *reshith* could not come up for a sweet savor on the altar: while in verses 14-16 *bikkurim* are constituents of an offering made by fire. Note, too, that *bikkurim* are "parched with fire, bruised corn of the first ear," while *reshith* was not treated in any way, as appears from the fact that honey could be offered as *reshith*.

Thirdly, as to the *materials*. *Reshith* is applied to oil, wine, corn, wool, fruits of the ground, honey, leaven, and dough (or meal?):¹ *bikkurim* in the legal texts relates only to that "which thou sowest in the field."² But even here it must be obvious that the *reshith* of cereals offered raw seven weeks before the beginning of wheat harvest was really a different material to *bikkurim* offered at the opening of the harvest as loaves or parched corn. Of the perfect distinctness of the two offerings throughout the Mosaic legislation there can be no reasonable doubt. It may be added that this fixes the meaning of Exodus xxii. 28 (29), which is rendered literally, "thy fullness and thy tear thou shalt not delay." Such terms could not apply to *bikkurim* of that which was sown in the ground. These latter are enjoined in Exodus xxiii. 16, 19; and consequently it will be seen that we find both offerings side by side in the so-called Book of the Covenant.

If now we turn to vegetable tithes, with which Wellhausen supposes the first-fruits to be at bottom identical, we shall see that these are differentiated from both *reshith* and *bikkurim* with the utmost clearness.

First, as to *date*. We have seen that *bikkurim* were offered at the opening of the harvest, and *reshith* of wheat seven weeks previously. Now of tithes we read: "thou shalt surely tithe all the increase of thy seed, that which cometh forth of the field year by year. And thou shalt eat before the Lord the tithe of thy corn, of thy wine, and of thine oil,"

¹ See Lev. ii. 11 f.; Num. xv. 17-21; xviii. 12; Deut. xviii. 4; xxvi. 1-10.

² It is otherwise in Numbers xiii. 20, where, however, the Samaritan text has a different word and in Nehemiah x. 36 (35), where the word is applied to the fruit of trees. This is only one more proof of the wide difference of date between the Pentateuch and the post-exilic period and the frequent misapprehensions of the true meaning of the laws after the exile.

etc. (Deut. xiv. 22 f.). Those were not operations that it lay within human power to perform at the *beginning* of the wheat harvest — still less seven weeks previously. Harvesting must have been completed before this command could be executed.

Secondly, as to *preparation and treatment*. For the present purpose it is sufficient to draw attention to Deuteronomy xiv. 22 ff. and xxvi. In the former of those two passages the tithe is regarded as the material of a festive meal, and also as something that might, if necessary, be sold and turned into money before being utilized. In the latter it forms the material for a meal for the Levites, etc., consumed *locally*. It need scarcely be said that these provisions are in glaring contrast with what we have seen as to *reshith* and *bikkurim*. In the case of the tithes there is neither wave-offering nor meal-offering. The *bulk*, too, differentiates tithes very sharply: for the provisions as to *reshith* and *bikkurim* obviously relate to small quantities.

Thirdly, as to *material*. "The tithe of thy corn, of thy wine, and of thine oil" necessarily includes much that could not fall within the conception of *bikkurim* of that which thou sowest in the field. Again, in the case of the corn — the only common material — we have to remember that the difference of date between the beginning and the end of the harvest would count for something. As to *reshith* we have already observed that the offering of corn was made seven weeks before the harvest opened, so that no confusion was possible here. It is true that in one passage we have *reshith* of wine and oil as well as of corn, but here the same principle applies. All offerings of *reshith* were (as the name itself implies) made of the *first* produce that came to hand. Tithes, on the other hand, were necessarily dependent on

the ingathering of the whole of the produce. In other words, the two offerings mark respectively the opening and the close of the agricultural season.

Once these distinctions are clearly grasped, it will be seen that it is sheer nonsense to speak of *reshith* as being taken from the tithe. One might as well say that January is taken from December. But one other point remains for consideration. Why is it that the vegetable tithe is not mentioned in the Book of the Covenant? No certain answer can of course be given, but it is to be remembered that the practice of tithing had been instituted long before the Mosaic age. It was Jacob, not Moses, who vowed to God a tithe of all that he should give him (Gen. xxviii. 22). No doubt the custom applied in the first instance, chiefly at any rate, to cattle—the main source of the patriarch's wealth—but the extension to crops was so natural that it may not have been felt necessary to incorporate any reference to the matter in the Book of the Covenant. First-fruits, on the other hand, were probably introduced into the religion of Israel for the first time by the provisions of Exodus. There is no ground for supposing that they were offered to Israel's God in patriarchal times, though of course the idea of an offering of first-fruits is common enough in other religions all the world over.

What has been said of pre-Mosaic tithing disposes of Wellhausen's trouble as to animal tithes.

"It is absolutely astounding that the tithe which in its proper nature should apply only to products of definite measure, such as corn and wine and oil (Deut. xiv. 23), comes to be extended in the Priestly Code to cattle also, so that besides the male firstling, every tenth head of cattle and of sheep must also be paid to the priests. This demand . . . first occurs as a novel in Lev. xxvii. 32 (1 Sam. viii. 17)" (p. 157).

In point of fact the animal tithe dated from the time of

Jacob. The animals were not to be given to the priests, nor is there any command to bring them to the religious capital: and the provisions of Leviticus xxvii. 32 merely provide for the animals being "holy," and not being redeemed. A "holy" animal was withdrawn from ordinary use and sacrificed. In the absence of any command to bring it to the capital it could presumably be sacrificed locally in the pre-exilic period at lay altars of earth or unhewn stone.

With regard to vegetable tithes I have treated of these elsewhere,¹ and will not here repeat myself.

There is but one other point to notice in this division of the chapter. On page 159 we read: "there is a poll-tax, which is not indeed enjoined in the body of the Priestly Code, but which from the time of Nehemiah x. 33 [32] was paid at the rate of a third of a shekel, till a novel of the law (Exod. xxx. 15) raised it to half a shekel." As I have shown before, Exodus deals only with the census, the half shekel being a ransom; and, consequently, in its original meaning the passage has nothing on earth to do with any annual poll-tax (which was quite independent of any census). Here again interpretations and inferences designed to meet post-exilic needs cannot override the plain meaning of the law in a historical inquiry.

II.

In discussing the question of land it will be best to begin by noting the influence of one of our old friends — the confusion between the two kinds of altars.

"Originally the altars were asylums (Exod. xxi. 14; 1 Kings ii. 28), some in a higher degree than others (Exod. xxi. 13). In order not to abolish the asylums also along with the altars, the Deuter-

¹ Churchman, September, 1906, pp. 548 f., 554 f.; cp. Murray's *Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, s. v. "tithe."

onomic legislator desired that certain holy places should continue as places of refuge. . . . The Priestly Code adopts the arrangement. . . . But as all these asylums are at the same time priestly and Levitical cities, it is an obvious conjecture that these also in like manner arose out of old sanctuaries" (p. 162).

Mark how subtly the confusion has here done its work. Ignore the distinction between the hornless lay altars of Exodus xx. 24-26 and the single lawful horned altar of the religious capital, and the attributes of the latter can be attributed to the former. Then every lay altar of which we read becomes an asylum, and a wonderful piece of history that never happened can be constructed on this foundation. Yet 1 Kings ii. 28, with its reference to the horns, shows quite clearly what contemporaries understood, and proves that such altars as those of Exodus xx. 24-26 could not give asylum: for no partisan of Wellhausen has yet been able to show how either loose earth or stone that would be defiled by the swinging of a tool on it could without such defilement be made to yield horns. With regard to Exodus xxi. 13 f. the meaning is plain enough. The murderer was to be taken—as Joab was—even from the altar of the religious center: the homicide who was merely guilty of something like manslaughter was to have appointed for him (as actually happens in Numbers and Deuteronomy) a place of refuge. It is at this that 2 Samuel xiv. 14 glances. The idea that the Deuteronomic legislator desired something "in order not to abolish the asylums also along with the altars" is due to the failure to discriminate between objects which no eye-witness could possibly have confused.

Turning now to the other points in order, we find that Wellhausen first objects that, in a mountainous country like Palestine, the land could not be geometrically portioned off in the method contemplated by Numbers xxxv. (p. 159).

Here the answer of Van Hoonacker is extremely able and convincing: "As to the way in which the measurements were to be carried out in the mountainous country of Palestine, the legislator doubtless knew what method was usually employed. Besides we are free to believe that he only gives these figures as approximate indications."¹ Wellhausen next raises the following objection:—

" . . . Besides, from the time of Joshua there is not a historical trace of the existence of the Levitical cities. Quite a number of them were in the hands of the judges and down to the early monarchy still in the hands of the Canaanites,—Gibeon, Shechem, Gezer, Taanach; some perhaps may even have so continued permanently. Those on the other hand which passed into possession of the Israelites at no time belonged to the Levites. Shechem, Hebron, Ramoth, were the capital cities of Ephraim, Judah, and Gilead: and Gibeon, Gezer, Heshbon were in like manner important but by no means ecclesiastical towns. In the Deuteronomic period the Levites were scattered throughout Judah in such a manner that each locality had its own Levites or Levite; nowhere did they live separated from the rest of the world in compact masses together, for they made their living by sacrificing for others, and without a community they could not exercise their calling. Some indeed possessed land and heritage; such were at an earlier period the Silonic family at Gibeath-Phineas, Amaziah at Bethel, and Ablathar at Anathoth, and at a later period Jeremiah, also at Anathoth. But Anathoth (for example) was not on that account a priestly city in the sense of Josh. xxi.; Jeremiah had his holding there as a citizen and not as a priest, and he shared not with the priests but *with the people* (xxxvii. 12). As a tribe Levi was distinguished from the other tribes precisely by holding no land, and its members joined themselves to the settled citizens and peasants, for the most part as dependent inmates (Deut. x. 9, xviii. 1)" (p. 160).

In reply, the first point to note is that there are traces of Levitical cities in the history. Amaziah of Bethel falls out of account because, as we are told in 1 Kings xii. 31, Jeroboam had made priests of non-Levitical families. But Anathoth is an absolutely clear case (1 Kings ii. 26; Jer.

¹ *Sacerdoce lévitique*, p. 433.

i. 1; xxxii.), and the fact that after an invasion we find that Jeremiah is stated to have gone forth to receive his portion in the midst of the people in no wise affects its importance. What precisely the phrase refers to — whether the reclaiming of the patrimonial property at Anathoth or the obtaining of some land that had been rendered vacant by the invasion — is not perhaps as clear as it might be. But it is plain from the other passages that, before this invasion, priests, who, on the Wellhausen theory, should have been entirely landless, in fact owned land at Anathoth. Jeremiah i., with its reference to the *priests* that were at Anathoth, is particularly important from this point of view. The plural “priests” shows that we are not dealing with the case of a single individual. Similarly with Beth-Shemesh. In 1 Samuel vi. 13–15 we have the clearest indications of the presence of Levites.¹ Again, in 2 Samuel xx. 26, Jattirite appears to be the right reading, and the fact that David had a Jattirite as priest points to his Levitical origin.²

Thus we have traces in the history of three Levitical cities. Further, Deuteronomy itself recognizes patrimonial property on the part of the Levites; for it expressly speaks of this (xviii. 8.) and sees in it nothing inconsistent with the fact that Levi had no portion or inheritance, i.e. no proper tribal lot. It seems tolerably obvious that if Deuteronomy regards the two things as consistent, there can be no reason why other parts of the Pentateuch should not do the same. In point of fact, the total area of the whole forty-eight cities would have amounted to less than sixteen miles. When we remember that the family of Aaron alone received thirteen out of the forty-eight, it will appear that the remaining

¹ On the text, see *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1910, pp. 521 f.

² On the whole subject, see the article “Priests and Levites,” *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1910, p. 516, and *passim*.

thirty-five did not form a very extensive territory for a whole tribe. Of the question of the diffusion of the Levites it is not necessary to speak here, for this was discussed at sufficient length in the article "Priests and Levites."

On the other hand, one true point is made in the above extract. It is the case that at sundry periods of history some of the Levitical cities were not in Levitical possession. No doubt, in the confused period from the invasion to the consolidation of the national power under the monarchy, much occurred of which we have no record. Probably some of the cities were not conquered in the first instance; but it is also quite possible that, during the course of the struggles in the time of the Judges, some cities may have changed hands. That the law was ever carried out in its entirety does not seem likely: that it was put into operation to some extent appears to be beyond dispute. The quantum of disobedience must remain uncertain, because our data are insufficient; but yet there is one other consideration to which attention should be drawn in this connection — I mean the evidence that some of these places were centers of worship. The great high place at Gibeon provides a ready example (1 Kings iii. 4). It can scarcely be supposed by anybody that this was unserved by priests. It is not necessary to discuss the Levitical character of the priesthood once more: that was fully considered in the article "Priests and Levites," to which reference has already been made so often.

On the other hand, Wellhausen's conjecture that all the Levitical cities were ancient sanctuaries (p. 162) suggests two more probable conjectures. One is that in some cases such cities might have been assigned to the Levites in the hope that members of the tribe which was most intimately associated with the worship of Israel's God would prove the

most efficient guardians of the purity of religion in towns where the ancient associations rendered it particularly liable to danger. The other is that at times when confused political circumstances made the lawful pilgrimage difficult or impossible it would be just these very Levites who as hereditary priests would feel the strongest temptation to practise their professional craft at local centers. But it must be realized that these are mere conjectures, and that the paucity of our materials makes it impossible to speak with any certainty on such points.

To return to our analysis of Wellhausen's theories. He writes:—

“ . . . it [i.e. the execution of the law. H. M. W.] was not in truth within the power of man, and cannot be seriously demanded in the Priestly Code itself, which contemplates a purely ideal Israel, with ideal boundaries, and leaves the sober reality so far out of sight that on archæological grounds it never once so much as mentions Jerusalem, the historical capital of the priests” (p. 160).

Now here we have another piece of confused thinking. Wellhausen has failed to understand the difference between a priestly city (in which priests have certain special rights of property) and a city in which priests happen to dwell. There are Jewish priests to-day in, e.g., London, Paris, New York. Some of them may even own houses, etc., in these places; but that does not make these cities priestly cities. And so it was with Jerusalem. It was undoubtedly the religious capital, but it never was a priestly city in the same sense as, e.g., Anathoth. This, therefore, provides no argument whatever in favor of the Wellhausen theory.

Lastly, Wellhausen thinks that “the immediate starting-point. . . . for this territorial donation to the Levites is perhaps to be sought in Ezekiel, in the picture of the future

Israel which he draws at the close of his book" (pp. 162 f.). And he proceeds to discuss the prophet's land scheme. Here Van Hoonacker's brilliant and convincing reply must be quoted:—

"Strictly we could ask . . . whether Ezekiel did not found himself on the description of the camp of the Israelites in the desert. It is only too manifest that the division and apportionment of the territory as presented in ch. xviii. of the prophet are scarcely inspired by practical necessities, that they have a very pronounced character of ideal vision; and as 'no fancy is pure fancy' we ought also to find the elements which are at the basis of Ezekiel's vision. The tents of the tribe of Levi ranged around the tabernacle explain themselves in the priestly code; we may doubt whether the Levites, deprived of territory (Ezk. xlv. 28) and nevertheless grouped on a common territory, in the conditions described in Ezk. xviii. explain themselves with equal facility. A camp is readily conceived on the pattern of a chessboard, but not the country of Canaan. We need not stop there. It is in fact certain that Ezekiel here has in view the protection of the holiness of the temple from all profanation; and in the realm of the ideal, the means are appropriate to the end."¹

Thus in this chapter, as elsewhere, Wellhausen's theories of historical reconstruction are seen to be of the most baseless and impossible character.

¹ A quotation from Wellhausen; see *Prolegomena*, p. 161.

² *Sacerdoce lévitique*, pp. 425 f.