
A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Of all the discoveries which the Palestine Exploration Fund has made, the greatest is the discovery of Mr. R. A. Stewart Macalister. Other men have served the Society well and made a name for themselves. He has lifted the work of Palestine Exploration into the place of one of the exact sciences.

All his work has been done scientifically. Men say that he was fortunate in hitting upon the Mound at Gezer as the place of his excavations. It was the fortune of a shrewd eye and a sound judgment. And when the discoveries began to be made, he knew that they were discoveries.

He is both an explorer and an expositor. Never was the *Quarterly Statement* so interesting to the student of the Bible as it has been these last three years. For it has not only contained an account of wonderful discoveries in the Land, it has also contained an account of wonderful discoveries in the Book. Thus, from certain saucer-like marks on the surface of a bared rock at Gezer, Mr. Macalister has recovered the long lost religion of the Horites. The story may be read in fulness in a recent number of the *Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund*. It may also be read more shortly in a volume entitled *Bible Side-Lights from the Mound of Gezer*, which Mr. Macalister has just published (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.).

Who were the Horites? That is just what we did not know till now. Besides a genealogy in Gn 36^{20}, which tells us nothing, they are mentioned three times in the Bible. In that chapter of most ancient and instructive history, the fourteenth chapter of Genesis, we are told that Chedorlaomer smote the Horites in their Mount Seir (Gn 14^{6}). And in two places of the second chapter of Deuteronomy ($2^{12.\ 22}$) we are told that the Horites dwelt at one time in Mount Seir, from which the children of Esau dispossessed them. And that is all.

What has Mr. Macalister discovered about the Horites? Directly, he has discovered nothing. They dwelt on the east of the Dead Sea, while Gezer, where the excavations have been made, is situated on the west of the Jordan. He has seen none of their homes, he has gathered none of their pottery, he has read their name on none of the numerous jar handles which he has examined. He simply accepts the probability that the name 'Horite' means 'cave-dweller.' Then, by the use of the imagination, the highest and most useful of all scientific endowments, he writes their history.

For he has found cave-dwellers at Gezer. Their caves were hollowed in the soft rock of a mountain. They were irregular chambers, from twelve to thirty feet across. Occasionally they were groups

of chambers, two or three in number, connected by narrow doors. These chambers were entered by a door in the roof, and a rock-cut flight of steps led down to the floor of the cave. The rain ran in and gathered in large pools on the floor. Sometimes it was checked by a channel round the mouth of the entrance. In one case it was directed into a cistern in the floor of the dwelling, and stood for future use.

There was no decoration on the walls, and the pottery proves that the furniture was of the most primitive description. Metal was unknown. Knives and other cutting implements were made of flint, the majority roughly flaked. Smooth round stones were much in use. One was a potter's palette; it is still stained with the red paint that had been ground upon it. Others may have been heating stones; and others missiles, in case of wild beasts or other undesirable intruders seeking their way into the cave.

That is the history of the Horites. What was their religion? About the middle of the mound the surface of the rock was found to be completely covered with saucer-like indentations. Beneath this rock surface there were two large caves. One was an extensive chamber which had been cut out of the rock with flint tools, and was divided into two parts by a partition. It was well adapted for the performance of the mysteries of religious medicine-men, or whatever equivalent of the medicine-man existed among the cave-dwellers of primitive Palestine.

The other cave is yet more interesting. It is a low irregular excavation, in the roof of which is a funnel-shaped perforation. A broad, shallow channel is cut in the upper surface of the rock leading into this perforation. Within this channel an animal might be placed for slaughter, the blood being allowed to trickle through the hole in the roof of the cave. The cave was probably regarded as the habitation of earth-gods, to whom the blood was poured out as a sacrifice.

In this cave there were also found a number of pig bones. Did the cave-dwellers sacrifice the pig? Mr. Macalister believes that they did. And he thinks it probable that this fact has some bearing on the aversion with which the pig was regarded by the Israelites. It was one of the abominations of those nations whom the Lord drove out before them.

One thing more. The cave-dwellers disposed of their dead by cremation. The Israelites and other Semites did not do so. Among the Arabs of to-day the notion of burning the body of the dead is abhorrent. '"May God burn the sinners who burn the dead," said an old Arab to me inside the great columbarium at Beit Jibrîn, on being informed of the purpose of the loculi in its sides.'

It has been said of a recent volume of sermons by Professor Gwatkin of Cambridge that there is a thought in every sentence. The same might be said of all Professor Gwatkin's writings. It may be said quite literally of his most recent book, *The Knowledge of God* (T. & T. Clark; 2 vols., 12s. net).

Mr. Wilfrid Ward tells us that one day Cardinal Wiseman said to his students, 'Fifty years hence the professors of this place will be endeavouring to prove not transubstantiation, but the existence of God.' The fifty years have come and gone. Has the prophecy been fulfilled? Not precisely. The discussion of to-day is not of the existence, but of the knowledge, of God. Even in our day it is supposed to be the fool who says in his heart 'There is no God.' The wise man says, 'There may be a God, but we know nothing about Him.'

Professor Gwatkin was called to Edinburgh to deliver the Gifford Lectures there. He is an ecclesiastical historian, and he might have chosen some thrashed-out theme of the past. But he is a living man, throbbing with interest in the things

which concern us now. He chose the Knowledge of God.

Now, Professor Gwatkin knew very well that it is impossible to speak of the knowledge of God without referring to revelation. Could he take revelation for granted, and simply describe its progress? He could not. Lord Gifford's will prevents it. Nor would that have served his purpose. For the question in dispute in our day is not, What is the nature of revelation? or, What does revelation tell us about God? It is, Can there be such a thing as revelation? Can any knowledge of God by any means whatever be arrived at? If there is a God, is He not unknowable—unknowable by the simple fact of being God?

First of all, therefore, Professor Gwatkin had to prove that revelation is possible. But what is revelation? It is simply a name for any means by which we may know God. If you say that God has never revealed Himself supernaturally to man, but that man has gained his knowledge of God by his own discovery, Professor Gwatkin will not be disturbed. It may be more convenient to confine the word 'discovery' to physical things, and the word 'revelation' to religious things. But if you admit that man has obtained any knowledge of God in any way whatsoever, you admit, he says, both the possibility and the fact of revelation.

And surely Professor Gwatkin is right. Whether we limit 'discovery' to physical facts or not, surely we make a mistake when we limit revelation to the act of God, and deny it to the act of man. We are not arrested by the question of Zophar the Naamathite, 'Canst thou by searching find out God?' For we do not take Zophar now as a final authority on these things. And we do not believe that Zophar himself intended to say that man could find out nothing about God. His meaning, according to the margin of the Revised Version is, Canst thou find out the deep things of God? Or, as the parallelism expresses it, Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?

Nor are we troubled with phrases like 'the unaided faculties.' For when are the faculties of man unaided? And what use would they be to him if they were, whether in things physical or religious? It may be that if we are to obliterate the distinction between revelation from above and revelation from below, we must revise our conception of the supernatural. But if that is so, the sooner we make the revision the better.

The question rather is, Should any distinction be made between revelation and discovery? Is not the discovery of physical truth a revelation, and a revelation of God, equally with the revelation of religious truth? There is a passage in the Book of Proverbs (25^2) which says: 'It is the glory of God to conceal a thing.' What things has He concealed? Surely both physical and religious things.

It is His glory, that is, His wisdom and love, to conceal the things of the Spirit. We find them out in the experience of life and by the exercise of faith. It is also His glory to conceal the things of the body, that by the exercise of our bodily faculties we may discover them. What hast thou, says the Apostle, which thou didst not receive? Nothing. But how have we received it? By asking, by seeking, by knocking. There is no other way. The Psalmist discovered the meaning of one of the mysteries of life when he went into the sanctuary of God. To the scientist was revealed the uses of electricity when he went seeking along the lines of God's material government.

The Psalmist made a discovery, and was glad. The moment that the scientist perceived that the things which he found out had been concealed by the wisdom of God, until the time should come when their discovery would be beneficial to mankind, he knew that they had been revealed to him. The distinction between revelation and discovery has passed away.

And when the distinction between revelation

and discovery has passed away, there has passed away also the antagonism between science and religion. Religion no longer commits the offence of deciding questions of science by authority, and science no longer allows religion to be condemned by philosophy masquerading in the dress of science. Things spiritual and things physical, God has concealed them both; and religion and science now go hand in hand in their discovery. And what shall the end be? 'The heaven for height, and the earth for depth,' says Professor Gwatkin, quoting the very next verse of this Book of Proverbs.

'The heaven for height, and the earth for depth; for the revelation of science is more unsearchable than the counsel of kings. Because science is truly a revelation, it has beaten the dwarfed and distorted religions of authority from position to position like a routed army. It has forced us to drop our puny theories, and face the glory of truth. Instead of the round world which cannot be moved, every star that twinkles in the sky becomes a fiery sun whirling through the deeps of space. Instead of the six days of creation, we look down vistas of time to which a thousand years are no more than a watch in the night. Instead of repeated acts of creation, we see a mighty chain of life stretching up from the sea-weeds and the sponges to—— Where shall we fix a limit for all-enduring patience and all-sovereign goodness? The Christians put there an incarnate Lord of all, in whom both heaven and earth consist and have their being; and even those who are least disposed to follow them must allow that this is no unworthy climax for the ripened work of all but everlasting ages.'

In a volume which was lately noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, a volume entitled *Astronomy in the Old Testament*, translated into English from the Italian of Dr. G. Schiaparelli, Director of the Brera Observatory in Milan, and published at the Clarendon Press, there is a clear and convincing explanation of an Old Testament phrase which has greatly puzzled the commentators. It is the phrase 'between the evenings.'

We shall see what it means in a moment. But let us begin, as Dr. Schiaparelli does, by noticing that the Jews placed the beginning of their civil day in the evening, as the Italians did a hundred years ago, and as the whole Muhammadan world does still. In the account of the Creation we read, 'And the evening and the morning were the first day,' the evening coming first. Still more convincing is Ps 55^{17}, where the words are, 'At evening, and at morning, and at midday, will I complain, and moan.'

Why did they begin their day in the evening? Because they began their month with the first appearance of the new moon. The new moon first became visible, of course, in the evening twilight. The moment they caught sight of it the Jews began to reckon their month. And they began to reckon the first day of the month at the same moment. For it would have been extremely inconvenient if the month had begun at one moment and the first day of it at another.

Now, the moment at which, under average conditions, the new moon becomes visible in Palestine is half an hour after sunset. That half-hour the Jews spoke of as one of the evenings. After the moon becomes visible, there still remains an hour before the twilight is ended, and the complete darkness of night begins. That hour was spoken of as the other evening.

We have reached the phrase 'between the two evenings,' and understand it. It is the moment at which the new moon is visible on the first day of the month. It is preceded by the half-hour after sunset; it is followed by the hour before darkness sets in. Aaron lights the lamps of the Tabernacle 'between the two evenings' (Ex 30^{8}). He would not light them the moment that the sun set, because their light was not yet needed. He would not light them after the darkness of night

had come down, when it would be impossible to see to do it. The matter has been much discussed. For it determined the right moment at which the Paschal lamb was sacrificed, and the Week of Unleavened Bread began. There is little doubt that this eminent astronomer has settled it at last.

There is an article in the *London Quarterly Review* for July under the title of 'Primitive Astronomy and the Old Testament.' The title does not promise much excitement. But in the days of the yellow journal we have learned to look for the weightiest matters under the least sensational titles. Here we are sure that at least the astronomy will be unimpeachable. For the author is Mr. E. Walter Maunder, F.R.A.S., Superintendent of the Solar Department in the Royal Observatory, Greenwich.

The article takes the form of a review of Schiaparelli's *Astronomy in the Old Testament.* But it belongs to that easy, irrelevant manner of reviewing which the great Quarterlies have always affected, and which enables the writer to say as little as he chooses about the book, and as much as he pleases about everything else. Schiaparelli is little more than a text for Mr. Maunder's sermon on the connexion between Babylonian mythology and the Old Testament. And a right profitable sermon it is.

The profit arises out of Mr. Maunder's abundant knowledge and impartiality. Keeping strictly to the subject, which he knows, it has not occurred to him to show favour to critic or archæologist. He estimates the names he meets with, not by their greatness in their own department, but by the success of their incursions into his. And we should imitate his example. For if Professor Friedrich Delitzsch falls into error when dealing with the astronomy of the ancients, it does not by any means follow that he is an incompetent decipherer of cuneiform.

The reference is to a statement in the famous 'Babel und Bibel' Lectures. There Professor Delitzsch, eager to claim greatness and originality for the things of Babylonia, says: 'The sciences, *e.g.* geometry and mathematics, and above all astronomy, had reached a degree of development which again and again moves even the astronomers of to-day to admiration and astonishment.' What does this mean? It means no more than that, under the Parthian Dynasty of the Arsacidæ, two centuries after the conquest by Alexander the Great, we find Babylonian tablets exhibiting systematic observations of the planets, mathematical tables, and calendars in which future astronomical events were predicted. These things are of much interest, but they are not earlier, nor are they more precise, than the observations which were certainly obtained by the Greek astronomers of Alexandria. But Professor Delitzsch 'so sandwiches the statement between descriptions of the Babylon of Hammurabi and of Nebuchadnezzar, as to leave his reader no choice but to infer that Babylonian astronomers had already attained this eminence in the days of Abraham, two thousand years before the date of the tablets which he is really describing. This,' says Mr. Maunder, 'is as gross an anachronism as it would be to describe Cæsar's invasion of Britain as taking place under the conditions which would prevail to-day, and ascribing to him the use of railway trains, the electric telegraph, cannon, and ironclad steamers.'

Take another example. On a later page of 'Babel und Bibel,' Professor Delitzsch says: 'When we divide the Zodiac into twelve signs and style them the Ram, Bull, Twins, etc., the Sumerian-Babylonian culture is still living and operating even at the present day.' Now all that this statement means is that as early as certain Babylonian 'Boundary Stones' which have been discovered, the principal constellations had the same *forms* which they have now. They may also have had the same names. But it is from Homer and Hesiod, and not from Babylonia, that we have learned what their names were. There is no

evidence that the Sumerian-Babylonians either originated the constellations or transmitted them to us. The evidence is all the other way.

For when we examine the constellations, as they are described in the poem of Aratus, and especially as they are given in fullest detail in the catalogue of Ptolemy, we find that they do not cover the entire heavens, but leave untouched a wide and roughly circular area in the South. Why were the stars in this area not gathered into constellations? Simply because they never appeared above the horizon of those primitive observers who carried out the work of constellation-making. Thus we can tell where those observers lived, and when. They lived not far from north latitude 38°, and about 2700 B.C.

These old and quaint designs, then, which have been so carefully preserved, were first allotted to the star groups more than a thousand years after the date of Sargon, and assuredly not in Sargon's country. The latitude proves that they were designed neither in Egypt, nor in Arabia, nor in India, nor yet in Babylonia, but that they must have come from the further north. 'The occurrence of the ship *Argo* amongst the constellation figures suggests a people acquainted with navigation; and the curious tradition of the sea-horizon to the north, very definitely retained by Aratus, leads us to the southern shores of the Caspian or Euxine.'

If it was the purpose of Professor Delitzsch, in delivering the 'Babel und Bibel' Lectures, to prove the dependence of the Old Testament upon the Babylonian mythology, he seems to have been singularly unsuccessful in accomplishing it. Thus far he has only proved his own inaccuracy. And Mr. Maunder is not done with him yet. Professor Delitzsch claims that we owe our day of rest to Babylonia. 'It is scarcely possible for us to doubt,' he says, 'that we owe the blessings decreed in the Sabbath or Sunday day of rest in the last resort to that ancient and civilized race on the Euphrates and Tigris.' But the Babylonians did not keep a weekly day of rest. On what is called their Sabbaths, that is, the seventh, fourteenth, and twenty-first days of the month, they went about their work as on other days. That is now made manifest by the number of business contracts which have been discovered; for as many of them are dated upon these days as on any other. Nor did they even hold their 'Sabbath of Sabbaths' as a day of rest. For on that day, being the nineteenth day of the month, eighty-nine deeds are dated, which is only a fraction below the average for the other days.

So far as it touches astronomy, the whole case of the dependence of the Old Testament upon Babylonia breaks down in this astronomer's hands. Even the record of the Creation is not Babylonian. In 'the account of the Creation, the only point of contact, says Mr. Maunder, is the reference in Gn 1^2 to the deep (*tehom*); for Marduk in the Babylonian myth fought and overcame the dragon of chaos, *Tiamat*, and built the heaven and earth from her body. But this Tiamat legend, at least in its present form, is of no great antiquity. For, in the first place, the eleven monsters which are born of Tiamat are clearly derived from the constellation figures, and so are later than 2700 B.C. And, in the next place, certain lines in the fifth tablet refer not only to the constellations, but to the *signs* of the Zodiac. Now, while the grouping of the constellations was made as early as 2700 B.C., that division of the ecliptic into twelve equal parts, which we call the signs of the Zodiac, cannot have taken place earlier than 700 B.C. For it was then that Aries was adopted as the leading constellation, and it is with Aries that the Zodiacal signs begin.

But there is another thing. Professor Delitzsch says that 'the priestly scholar who composed Gn 1 endeavoured, of course, to remove all possible mythological features from this creation story.' Did he? Then he did what was never done before, and has never been done since. The

evolution of nature myths is all the other way. First, the observation of the natural object and then the myth, not first the myth and then the natural object without it. We, says Mr. Maunder, do not learn of the existence of the sea by 'removing the mythological features' from 'Old Father Neptune,' and we may be quite sure that the Jews did not do so either.

It may not be a whit more wonderful to find that the Hebrews did not borrow their religion from the Babylonians, purifying it of its mythological elements, than to believe that they did. But it is not less wonderful, and it seems to be the truth. Where they got it, and why it differed from the religion of the rest of the Semites, still remains a mystery.

But there is no doubt that it did differ. 'Alone,' says Mr. Maunder, 'amongst the ancient peoples, they "feared not the signs of heaven, at which the heathen are dismayed" (Jer 10^2), and scoffed at "the astrologers, the star-gazers, the monthly prognosticators"' (Is 47^{13}). And he quotes from Schiaparelli, and says: 'Truly it is no small honour for this nation to have been wise enough to see the insanity of this and of all other forms of divination. Of what other ancient civilized nation could as much be said?'

The Religion of Palaeolithic Man.

By the Rev. J. A. MacCulloch, Portree.

Palæolithic man, though primitive to us, was already far from being primitive, as compared with the 'hairy ancestor of arboreal habits,' or even his more obviously human successor who lived

> Long ago,
> In the morning of the world.

Of that 'very beginning' we have no authentic information. The case is different with the men of the early stone age. We may surmise many things regarding their life and surroundings, based on more or less certain data. They could make tools and weapons, and use them; they clothed themselves in the skins of the animals they hunted; they decorated their persons with colouring matter, shells, bits of bone, even with beads. Latterly, they began to domesticate animals—the horse, dog, ox, and reindeer,—to make pottery (though this is not quite certain), and to cultivate cereals. They had bone needles with which to stitch together their skin robes. The art of the later palæolithic period is yet the wonder of archæologists, and each year adds to our knowledge of the power and skill in æsthetics shown in that age. Sculpture, carving, engraving, and painting were all successively tried and excelled in; regular 'schools' of art seem to have existed, and the traditional methods of these 'schools' were handed on for ages.

With all this primitive civilization and this marvellous flourishing of the artistic instinct, was palæolithic man a religious being? *A priori*, in view of his other accomplishments, there seems little reason to deny him the comforts of religion. Many archæologists refuse to do so, but there are some who doubt, like M. Mortillet and Dr. Robert Munro. Even the ingenious Professor Pinsero, who finds religious sentiments and the beginnings of culture in the anthropoid apes, who, he says, worship serpents and bury them, placing a supply of insects in their 'graves' as a provision for the future life, refuses to believe that palæolithic man had religion.[1] But to him the modern analogues of the men of the stone age are the Eskimo and the Australians, who, *ex hypothesi*, are also non-religious. We know, however, that the contrary is true of both these races, and if anthropoid apes have the faculty of worshipping 'pizen serpents,' it seems cruel to deny palæolithic man the faculty of worship. We shall see later that quaternary man may have worshipped the serpent.

Most writers on the origins of religion, if they attributed it to the men of the stone age at all, would credit them with little more than ghost,

[1] *La psicologia dell' uomo preistorico.* Palermo, 1895. It would be interesting to know how far this statement has been corroborated by naturalists.