THE OPENING SENTENCES OF WELLHAUSEN'S "PROLEGOMENA."

THE justly famous and epoch-making Prolegomena to the History of Israel, by J. Wellhausen, commences with the following sentences:

> "As is known from the Gospel, the Jews and Samaritans in the time of Christ wrangled over the proper place where men should worship; that there could be only one was no less certain in their minds than the unity of God Himself. The Jews said it was the Temple in Jerusalem, and after its destruction they ceased sacrificing."

The principle here formulated would doubtless have been regarded as orthodox in the first century A.D.; for Philo and Josephus approve the doctrine "One God, one Temple," both basing it on grounds of natural fitness,[1] while Philo further argues that the principle involved furnishes a splendid test of the purity of the sacrificer's intentions; for no one, unless he meant a pure sacrifice, would endure to leave home, friends and relations, and become a pilgrim and wanderer. The Samaritan woman indeed asserts the principle of the Jews only, not of her own people; but the story told by Josephus[2] of the trial in Alexandria indicates that the Samaritan doctrine was the same. The identification of "worship" with "sacrifice" is also defensible; for the former word means here literally "prostration," defined by Maimonides[3] as "stretching out the hands and the feet till the whole body is on the ground," which is equivalent to kissing the ground, a mode of render-

[1] *C. Apion*, ii. § 23. *De Monarchia*, p. 223.
[2] *Archæology*, XIII. iii. § 4.
[3] *Yad hachazakah*, "Rules of Prayer," § 5.

ing homage to sovereigns in use in some Oriental courts; the Hebrew word probably signifies "to ask to live," and the ceremony is almost a pretended death. Similarly one theory of sacrifice is, clearly, recognition that the whole of the produce belongs to the Deity, who receives a part as a symbol for the whole. Kissing the ground naturally localises the ceremony, for the ground that should be kissed is what is near the sovereign's feet. Since the Jewish doctor quoted—of the twelfth century—recognises "prostration" as a constituent of prayer, and prayer is in general a substitute for sacrifice, it is noteworthy that a surrogate or substitute should serve in the one case but not in the other; and indeed we learn from the Book of Daniel that so simple a surrogate as looking through an open window in the direction of Jerusalem would serve instead of prostration in the Temple area itself. Further, it may be observed that Jewish sacrifice (in a sense) seems to have terminated with the destruction of the Temple of Heliopolis, which outlasted that of Jerusalem by a short time; and that Samaritan sacrifice went on at intervals many centuries after the destruction of their Temple on Gerizzim.[1]

The theory of Philo, that pilgrimage was a test of faith, would apply to Christian or Moslem pilgrimage; the former is a voluntary act of piety, the latter obligatory, but once in a lifetime. Ghazali (a Moslem Philo) regards it as a rehearsal of the Day of Judgment; and some doctors have endeavoured to find some substitute for it, owing to the difficulty, danger, and loss of life which it occasions. In both these cases homelessness and loneliness are associated with pilgrimage. It does not appear that the Deuteronomic Code contemplated either accompaniment. The worshipper is represented as being at the place of pilgrimage with his household;[2] "all the males" are to pay the three

[1] V. Guérin, *Samarie*, i. 442. [2] xv. 20.

annual visits to it ; [1] indeed it would seem that the assembled family is to include the Levite or temporary resident,[2] who in any case is no actual member of the family.

Supposing that the Code speaks here of a single sanctuary for the whole nation, it is to be observed that the national frontier is put at the Euphrates ; [3] the nearest point of which to Jerusalem is reckoned by the Arabic geographers to be at a distance of 350 miles. Three times a year then all the males are to leave the frontier undefended, and undertake a journey which will occupy some thirty-five days. But for this only one day is allowed them ; for though they are to spend the night of the Passover at the Sanctuary, the rest of the days of the feast they are to spend at home.[4] This legislation then, if the theory "One God, one Temple" be really there, cannot be based on the principle suggested by Philo ; for the pilgrim by no means leaves his family, at least the males of it, and is only away from home at most a day. If it is a test of anything, it is a test of the power to crowd the work of thirty-five days into one.

He who consults the text on this subject will find the difficulty which meets him everywhere in the Old Testament : the want of MSS. of reasonable antiquity and authenticity. There are three editions, belonging to different communities, the Samaritan, the Jewish and the Hellenist ; and each tells a different tale.

The formula for the sanctuary or place of pilgrimage is, according to the Samaritan text, "the place which the Lord thy God has chosen," according to the Jewish "the place which the Lord thy God shall choose," according to the Hellenist "the place which the Lord thy God may choose." Although the difference between the Samaritan

[1] xvi. 16. [2] xiv. 27. [3] xi. 24.
[4] xvi. 6–8 (cf. LXX.).

and the Jewish texts is confined to one iota, it recurs too often for us to doubt that an important point of doctrine is at stake. All agree that the place is not to be casual or arbitrary (xii. 13); it is to be a place chosen. The Samaritan text implies that it has been chosen already, the others that it is to be chosen or may be chosen in the future.

The Semitic languages shrink from employing the passive when the agent is mentioned; the English for these phrases is "the place chosen by the Lord your God." That formula would not, of course, imply that there was to be only one such place; it would imply only that there was a proper place for each individual. If a government order ran: "Civil servants are not to travel by any steamer but by the steamer chosen by the Government," its interpretation would certainly be that: each servant may travel only by one particular steamer. For if the meaning were that there was one steamer for all, its name would obviously be mentioned in the order; they must all travel by the steamer Britannia (or whatever its name might be).

The Jewish reading suits the view of the Rabbis that the place of pilgrimage shifted from Shiloh, etc., to Jerusalem, and that prophets such as Elijah had occasionally the right to sacrifice elsewhere; the Samaritan reading suits the view that the place was chosen for all time, and never varied. The Rabbinic interpretation makes it clear why the place is not named, whereas the Samaritan view is confronted with that difficulty.

The Jewish and Samaritan texts, however, are agreed that the place is one, because in xii. 5 the formula runs, "the place chosen by the Lord your God out of all your tribes." A place chosen out of all the tribes is not a convincing expression, since a tribe consists of families or men rather than places; it is not surprising to find that the

Hellenist tradition has something different: "in one of your cities," [1] where "cities" doubtless stands for "gates." In xii. 14, where the Hebrew texts have also "in one of," there is the same variation in reference to the locality: the Hebrew has "tribes," the Greek favours, or at any rate countenances, "cities."

The difference between the Hebrew and Greek tradition appears to be vital with reference to this question; the place chosen in one of your cities or districts need mean no more than a place chosen in a district; and to make all the males of the community appear three times a year in the parish church is a very different order from making, say, all the males in England appear three times a year at St. Paul's Cathedral; and there is no reason to ask why the place is not mentioned. Each community or unit is to sacrifice on consecrated ground; and the ground is to be consecrated by God, not by man. This consecrated ground is to be looked out for,[2] doubtless in accordance with some augural system, and not chosen at haphazard.

The next difference between the Hellenist and Jewish tradition is in the formula whereby the divine ownership is described; where the Hebrew has *shakken*, the Greek exhibits "to be called," both in reference to God's name. Geiger fancied both texts had been altered to get rid of an anthropomorphism "to dwell there." But there appears to be no need for conjectures, since the first time this formula occurs, the interpretation is given: "the place which the Lord shall choose to set his name there, to *shakken* it"; where clearly we are informed that *shakken* is a technical term, meaning in connexion with a name "to set." To "set the name to" in many languages, if not in all, means to claim or appropriate; and this word *shakken* is regularly in Syriac "to bestow." "To bestow His name" is a fairly

[1] xii. 5. [2] xii. 5.

clear expression; but the literal meaning of the word, "to plant or stick in the ground," is clearer still, and suggests in what way the consecration of the ground would be indicated. Hence we have not to do with an anthropomorphism, but with a legal formula signifying merely "to appropriate."

That there is some more technical and augural language in these rules seems likely. The word "see" (xii. 13) is suggestive of caprice;[1] the root used in the formula for "to choose" is suggestive of the Ethiopic word for "region," "circumscribed space," which is the true sense of the Latin *templum*. When a community, for which the technical term appears to be "gate," was founded, a *templum* then was to be discovered which was appropriated to divine use. This is the interpretation of the LXX. also in xvi. 5, where the "gates" are described as "what the Lord thy God giveth *thee*"; the sacrifice is to be performed and the tithes eaten on ground which He has chosen for Himself (xii. 18).

In xvii. 8 the LXX. by their introduction of a word or rendering of one show that their theory is what we have seen, viz., that each community has its sanctuary, or rather Divine land. In the event of the civil tribunal in any of the "gates" being unequal to dealing with a case, they are to go up to the place which the Lord shall choose *there*; according to the Hebrew "there" may be omitted. The rule then is not, as might be supposed from the Hebrew, that the central sanctuary is to be used as a court of appeal; but that the sanctuary attached to each "gate" is to be so used, when those who deal judgment in "the gate" are themselves unable to decide a case.

In xvi. 21 a similarly slight difference between the two texts suggests a similar difference of interpretation. Heb.

[1] For the Arabic usage see Goldziher, *Zahiriten*, p. 10.

"Thou shalt not plant thee an Asherah [of] any tree near unto the altar of the Lord thy God which thou shalt make thee"; LXX.: "thou shalt not plant thee a grove; any wood by the altar of thy God thou shalt not make thee." That the LXX. tradition is the more probable is evident; for the Asherah is a religious object, coming under the category of wood; the command is then extended to any form of wooden object over against the altar. The formula "which thou shalt make thee," as applied to the altar, avoids the natural view that the command is a general one, with regard to *any* altar; the Hebrew reading brings the rule under the rules connected with *the* altar.

Hence, as was observed above, the three texts offer three codes; and the Greek text in general makes it clear that the "place which the Lord thy God may choose" is not one place for the whole nation, but a number of places, one for each "gate" or "city"; large enough to hold the population of that particular region, and easily within a day's journey. For the words far and near are relative; a church is far off if the worshipper has to walk ten miles to get there.

The omission or addition of a word in xviii. 6 affects the meaning with reference to this question vitally. The Hebrew texts offer: "If a Levite come from any of thy gates out of all Israel where he sojourned and come with all the desire of his mind to the place which the Lord shall choose: then he shall minister, etc." Here it is evident that the place which the Lord shall choose is distinguished from the gates in such a way that there can be only one. But the LXX. alters the whole import of the rule by omitting the word "the Lord," and making it the place which the Levite shall choose. The words "with all the desire of his mind" should, of course, be rendered "exactly as he pleases"; and the whole means "if a Levite who is sojourn-

ing in one place decides to go to any other place which he is free to choose exactly as he pleases"; i.e., if he think fit to leave one sanctuary and go to another, then he is to enjoy the perquisites which fall to the priests of that sanctuary, with a certain exception. The Levites, whose name probably means *attachés*, are not then to be regarded as permanently attached to a sanctuary, but as free to migrate from sanctuary to sanctuary as they please; they are to be the element in the community which, by not being attached to any spot, permeates the nation, and keeps it together—unless indeed a king be appointed. For the government contemplated in the first place is not by kings, but by *suffetes*,[1] who are town ("gate") magistrates, as in Phœnician states.

The MSS. of the LXX. which supply "the Lord shall choose" or "the Lord thy God shall choose" doubtless exhibit correction from the Hebrew; according to the older text a Levite might have gone from Jerusalem to Heliopolis, and claimed the right to minister there.[2]

He who forgets at any moment that with the ancients the natural seat of a book was the memory, and not the written page, is likely to misjudge as well as misunderstand. As we have seen, our three editions of what is ostensibly the same code exhibit divergences which absolutely alter the nature of the precepts and situations contemplated; were these the result of wilful and arbitrary alteration? That view is not really probable; the truer view is that the copies were in all cases made from the memory,[3] and that the alterations were such as had been produced by this process of retention.

[1] xvii. 9; cf. xvi. 18.

[2] In xxxi. 11 the difference is introduced by the LXX. reading "ye shall read" where the Hebrew is "thou shalt read."

[3] Cf. xvii. 18, where the expression is obscure, but explained xxxiii. 10.

To the question whether Deuteronomy contains the doctrine "One God, one Temple" the reply is that the book knows nothing of a Temple except in the augural sense, and that the Greek recension knows nothing of either unity or centralisation of worship; indeed, expressly and absolutely excludes it.

With regard to Philo and Josephus, it is not certain that they can be regarded as independent authorities, and any reader of Josephus is aware that he has taken little trouble to reconcile theory with practice. His *Jewish War* would show that internal dissension was what ruined the Jewish cause; in his reply to Apion he maintains that the institutions of the race lead to extreme harmony. Although then he formulates the doctrine cited, it is not surprising that the fault which he finds with the Temple of Heliopolis —to judge from the letter which he cites[1]—is not that no second Temple was permissible, but that the ground whereon it was built was unclean. Had the ground been properly chosen, as e.g. by the LXX. translators,[2] the enterprise of Onias might conceivably have been glorious.

Philo holds that there were no "home sacrifices," though he is compelled to allow of sacrifices "away from the altar."[3] Josephus has no hesitation in using the phrase "home sacrifices."[4] The purpose of these is, according to Philo, meat-eating, according to Josephus feasting. But they are called sacrifices, because that term is used in Deuteronomy xviii. 3 and xii. 20, where it is provided that certain portions of sacrificial animals shall be the priests' perquisite, wherever they are "sacrificed," i.e., slaughtered. If a man slaughtered a sheep on the bank of the Euphrates, was it the legis-

[1] *Archæology*, XIII. iii. § 2.
[2] Philo, *Vita Moysis*, p. 136.
[3] *De Sacerdotum honoribus*, p. 235.
[4] *Archæology*, IV. iv. § 4.

lator's intention that he should send "the shoulder, the two cheeks and the maw" to Jerusalem? They would be valueless by the time they got there. Doubtless the priest was hard by at the sanctuary of the place; only in this case the priest would come to the owner (probably to kill the beast) instead of the owner and his family going to the "temple."

The New Testament is more vivid than Josephus, but it is difficult to know whether the theory really prevailed in Gospel times or not. The Synoptists all tell us of a leper being miraculously cleansed in Galilee,[1] and being then told to go and show himself to the priest; and to offer for his cleansing as Moses prescribed. What Moses prescribes involves the sacrifice of animals. Has the man to go to Jerusalem? According to Mark's account the man goes about proclaiming the cure, and, it would seem, immediately.

To propose a new theory of the location of Deuteronomy is naturally not the writer's intention; for the result of the present inquiry is not such as to encourage any such attempt. The LXX. version, perhaps of 200 B.C., is doubtless the earliest of our three texts; since it knows nothing of centralised worship, whereas the academical texts of the Samaritans and the Jewish clients of the Sassanian and Moslem empires are clear on this point, the ordinary basis for its location is withdrawn, but another not substituted. If, however, the period for the establishment of this doctrine is thus somewhere between the time of the LXX. translation and the days of Philo, to how many more doctrines may the text of the code have been accommodated in the centuries which preceded? There is no more remarkable provision in the book than that according to which the king is to make his copy of the law not from that conned by his predecessor, but from "before" the priests, the Levites;

[1] Luke v. 12.

the oral tradition, not the written copy, is what is to be trusted. Supposing this rule had been carried out, it is certain that the copies of no two kings would have been absolutely coincident. The second Caliph addressed a paper of instructions to a judge whom he appointed; we have five copies of it, preserved in the first place by oral tradition; no two agree absolutely, and in some cases the differences are considerable.[1] Only the comparison of copies in our possession is a very different process from the reconstruction of lost copies. Modest industry is sufficient for the one process; the genius of a Wellhausen perhaps scarcely sufficient for the other.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

THE ANGEL-PRINCES OF DANIEL.

IT is evident to all men reading the Book of Daniel that a doctrine of angels comes to the front there which is not found elsewhere in the Bible. Traces of it, indeed, may be discovered elsewhere in the Old Testament, and something analogous to it is sufficiently plain in the New. But the teaching itself, in a direct and unmistakable form, is confined to the Book of Daniel among inspired writings. It seems to me that it has never been taken with sufficient seriousness, or at all adequately accounted for. It was at one time thought to be sufficiently explained by being called "Persian," because its rise coincided with the period of Persian domination. Nothing, however, was discovered in Persian lore which corresponded at all closely to the angel-princes of Daniel. Moreover, it was seen to be excessively unlikely that devout Jews (like the author of Daniel) would have taken over any doctrine of religion from their

[1] *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1910, p. 307.