

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

6-1-1923

The Theology of Israel (From Abraham to Moses)

Leroy C. Rincker

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rincker, Leroy C., "The Theology of Israel (From Abraham to Moses)" (1923). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 583.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/583>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

CONCORDIA SEMINARY

T H E T H E O L O G Y O F I S R A E L
(FROM ABRAHAM TO MOSES)

A T H E S I S

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF SACRED THEOLOGY

BY

LEROY C. RINCKER

SAINT LOUIS

JUNE 1923

THE THEOLOGY OF ISRAEL
(From Abraham to Moses)

Our Position.

The last two decades have marked an increased interest in the study of religion. Modern scholarship boasts of stupendous results, which it has lately attained in this branch of learning. History, anthropology, psychology, archaeology, comparative religion, sociology, and other sciences have been recruited in the effort to construct a complete, but above all a scientific exposition of religion and its development. The religion of Israel especially has been made the subject of many lectures and treatises. Learned men have performed the Sisyphean task of developing out of bits and fragments the ancient languages of Egypt and Babylon, they have left no stone unturned in their search for more and better records, and, as the result of their best and utmost endeavors, have given to the world what they believe to be a scientifically true and comprehensive interpretation of Israel's religion. Can we appreciate and accept it as such? Suppose one of these volumes that represent the last word in the scientific study of religion would fall into the hands of an ordinary lay Christian! He would find the truths which are to him the source of his greatest joy and comfort twisted and turned into myths or fiction, and the questions, which he could have answered from his childhood, shrouded in mystery, or answered by wild suggestions. Instead of accepting it as truth he would thrust it from him as a corruption of that which is most holy

to him. And so every Christian must act, for modern scholarship and higher criticism have torn the Old Testament, especially the Pentateuch, into shreds, representing it as a collection of absurdities and myths, and the Hebrew religion at best as "one of the principal religions, nothing less but also nothing more."¹⁾

In spite of his love for the scientific and his really diligent research, the higher critic approaches the Scriptures with a prejudice. He assumes much of that which he is required to prove. Before he opens a book of the Bible he assumes that its own account of itself, as containing the history of a supernatural revelation of divine truth to a divinely chosen people, is simply incredible.²⁾ He comes to the Scriptures biased, and then proceeds to rearrange the history and literature of the Hebrews in accordance with his own a priori conception of what the course of development must have been. Criticism appeals to most anything but logical argument and certainly has no claim to be regarded as truly scientific. But a Christian does not read the Bible with the object of picking holes in it, or of discrediting its claims to his affection and admiration,

1. A. Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel*, vol. I, p. 5.

2. Kuenen, *ibid.* p. 12ff: "The testimony of Israel's sacred books could not stand the test of searching inquiry. We cannot use the Old Testament accounts of the history of Israel as a foundation for our own review of its religious development. -- The representation of Israel's earliest history presented to us in the Books named after Moses and Joshua must be rejected as in its entirety impossible. The principal element is legend!"

and neither shall we endeavor to build the edifice of Israel's theology "with one hand working in the work, and with the other holding a weapon," with which to tear it down. Our position is entirely different. In the first place we firmly believe that all Scripture has the unique distinction of being inspired by God. By this we do not understand a mere mechanical transmission. The Bible was inspired in such a way that "God breathed His Word into the minds of the writers, incidentally making use of their intellect, of their mental ability and equipment, in producing a series of books which plainly show the peculiarities of the writers and yet are, word for word, the product of God Himself."³⁾ The writers of Holy Writ themselves give us the most direct and conclusive evidence for this doctrine. St. Paul says 2 Tim. 3, 16: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," and St. Peter testifies 2 Pet. 1, 21: "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Moses,⁴⁾ too, often tells us that God gave him the words which he should speak unto the children of Israel. To reject their testimony would be to impeach their veracity and thus to take away the foundation of the Christian religion. Yet scholars and critics ridicule such statements, and even Christian theologians reduce this doctrine to something entirely meaningless. If there is any inspiration of Scripture at all we hold that it must be verbal,

3. P. Kretzmann, Popular Commentary, p. 413, Vol II, New Testament.

4. Ex. 19, 6; 25, 22.

plenary inspiration. God determined that his counsel and will should be written in a book which might be handed down to all generations. He breathed into the minds of holy men what they should write, and they expressed these thoughts and commands in words. Without words the thoughts could not have been recorded. The Bible therefore consists of words and sentences, each one of which has been inspired by God. The denial of verbal inspiration reduces God's Word to the level of human historical documents and gives rise to the absurdest aberrations, which never cease to shoot out into fresh crops of mischief. Volumes without number have been broadcasted by critics in their frenzied attempt to destroy man's belief in verbal inspiration and ultimately his faith in the Scriptures as the fountain of truth. "But each critic writes at his own peril, and is subject to destruction as knowledge increases. He is gathered to his fathers on the dusty shelf, while the great book still remains unharmed, and becomes better understood."⁵⁾

The second great difference between the position of the critics and ours is that we regard the Pentateuch as a unity and not as a mere collection of loose fragments carelessly put together by writers at different times. With the utmost ingenuity higher critics have devised a host of arguments by which they would prove that the Pentateuch is composed of a number of documents written by men who lived many hundreds of years apart. They make much of the alternate employment of the divine names Elohim and Jehovah; they maintain that several sections or paragraphs, respectively assigned to the supposed

5. Col. C. R. Conder, *The Rise of Man*, p. 278.

writers separately, when put together form a continuous and connected whole, and they point to parallel passages, which are alleged to be separate accounts of the same thing taken from different documents. But all their arguments have been found inadequate. In spite of the unbounded confidence and the peremptoriness with which they are proclaimed, their hypotheses cannot be fitted to the phenomena of the Pentateuch.⁶⁾ Such casually collected stories do not yield the kind of history we have for instance in the Book of Genesis. All the efforts of the critics have only demonstrated the impossibility of such a dissection and have led to the development of a vast mass of positive evidence of unity. That the Pentateuch in its present shape proceeds from a single author, is proved above all by its aim and plan.⁷⁾ The whole contents refer to the covenant concluded between Jehovah and His people by the instrumentality of Moses, in such a way that everything before his time is perceived to be preparatory

6. W. Green, Higher Criticism of the Pent. p. 132.

7. E. Naville, Archaeology of the Old Testament, p. 52: "What constitutes the admirable unity of Genesis, and what is utterly disregarded and destroyed by critics, is that from the beginning every narrative is chosen so as to show Israel is set apart from the rest of mankind. The reason of that choice is that a special duty will be laid upon Israel, it will have a primary task to fulfill: the mission of worshipping Jahweh-Elohim and of having no other God but Him. Everything tends towards that central idea from the very beginning."

to this fact, and all the rest to be the development of it. One might also point to the language of the Pentateuch as an argument⁸⁾ for its unity. No one has been able to prove a twofold usage of a word, such as would be fatal to the unity of composition of the whole work.⁹⁾

In the third place we accept Moses as the author of the entire Pentateuch, and on that point not only differ with all the higher critics but even with such conservative men as Dr. James Robertson.¹⁰⁾ The majority of scholars are of the opinion that the accounts contained in the early books of the Bible are separated by an interval of many centuries from the facts which they communicate to us. Kuenen, Budde and many others agree that not one can be proved to have been written before the year B.C. 800.¹¹⁾ Moses is at best the heroic leader to whom Israel owed its liberty rather than its history and laws.¹²⁾ The arguments against the Mosaic authorship

8. On this point, however, I am inclined to favor the theory of Dr. Edouard Naville, who holds that the greater part of the Old Testament (all that written before Solomon's time) was not written (in the Hebrew language, nor) with the Hebrew script, but with Babylonian cuneiform. The tablets of Tel-el-Amarna show that Babylonian cuneiform was the usual written language of Palestine at the time of Moses and later. Cf. Naville, Arch. of the O.T., p. 4ff.

9. W. Green, Unity of the Book of Genesis, p. 549: "The earlier forms of the deistic hypothesis were wrecked by their inability to establish a diversity of the diction between the Elohist and the Jehovist."

10. J. Robertson, The Early Religion of Israel, p. 332: "The books of the Pentateuch are anonymous compositions."

11. Kuenen, *ibid.*, p. 16f and Karl Budde, The Religion of Israel to the Exile, p. 13.

12. J. E. Carpenter in the Oxford Hexateuch, p. 19.

are similar to those urged against the unity of the Pentateuch.¹³⁾
We shall reject them all by advancing the threefold testimony of
Scripture.¹⁴⁾ In the first place the Pentateuch itself expressly
tells us that Moses is the author. Not only are certain portions
ascribed to him (Ex. 17, 14; 24, 4.7; Num. 33, 2), but the five
books in their entirety (Deut. 31, 9-11; 24-26).¹⁵⁾ This testimony
of the Pentateuch is confirmed by all the succeeding writings of the
Old Testament. The book of Joshua is pervaded throughout by refer-
ences¹⁶⁾ to it, which take for granted its Mosaic origin, and the
final injunction of the last of the prophets (Mal. 4, 4) is: "Re-
member ye the law of Moses, my servant, which I commanded unto him
in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments." Though
some of the later books do not expressly quote from the law of Moses,
they all furnish sufficient evidence¹⁷⁾ that, in spite of apostasy
and disorder, it formed the basis of the religious, civil, and polit-

13. Green, H. C. of Pent. p. 47ff; L. B. Paton, The Early Religion of Israel, p. 36; Kuenen, *ibid.*, pl 272ff.

14. James Orr, The Problem of the Old Testament, p. 80: "It is not to be thought of, that, while every scrap of testimony from profane sources is welcomed, and made the most of, the Scriptures alone are to be treated like criminal suspects, whose every word is to be doubted, unless hostile cross-examination fails to shake it, or independent confirmation of it can be produced. Like other witnesses, the biblical writers are entitled to be heard with a prima facie presumption of their honesty."

15. Keil, Introduction to the O. T., vol. I, p. 162: "The passages mentioned have always been understood by the Jews of the entire law from Gen. 1 to Deut. 34."

16. C. 1, 7.8; 8, 31.34; 23, 6; 24, 26.

17. Judges 3, 4; 1 Chr. 15, 15; 2 Chr. 8, 13; 2 Kings 21, 8.8; 1 Kings 2, 3; 2 Chr. 23, 18; Obad. 4; Is. 30, 9; Micah 1, 7; Ps. 19, 8ff; Dan. 9, 11.13; etc.

ical life of the nation. In the third place the New Testament bears abundant and explicit testimony that the Pentateuch is the work of Moses. Christ Himself calls it "the book of Moses" (Mk. 12, 26), and when it is read and preached the apostles say that Moses is read (2 Cor. 3, 15) and preached (Acts 15, 21). The Pentateuch and the books of the prophets, which were read in the synagogue, are called both by our Lord and the evangelists "Moses and the prophets" (Lk. 16, 29.31; 24, 27). This then is our position: we believe in the verbal inspiration of Scripture, the unity of the Pentateuch and its Mosaic authorship.

Note: In considering the theology of Israel we shall confine ourselves to theology in the narrow sense.

I.

The Idea of God.

The Scriptures ascribe to Abraham and his descendants a conception of God that rivals in height and purity the thoughts and ideas of the prophets. Higher critics recognize this fact¹⁾ and

1. Budde, *ibid.* p. 32: "If then the Ten Commandments really did come from this period, it appears that there existed even in the earliest times a conception of God so sublime that hardly anything could have remained for the prophets to do." --- Kuenen, *ibid.* p. 108: "Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are not only servants of Jahveh, but are also not inferior to the prophets of the 8th century B.C. in pureness of religious insight and inward spiritual piety."

therefore immediately declare the Pentateuch to the work of much later writers, who embellished these records with their own lofty views.²⁾ They refuse to believe that there are unique things in the world and will accept no features of Israel's religion for which they cannot find counterparts in other ancient religions. Goldziher³⁾ tells us that the Hebrews, like every other nation and race, originally entertained a mythological view of the world. This, he says, prepared for the rise of religion. The Hebrews developed out of their myths the figures of gods, and then ultimately rose to the heights of monotheism. But we know that the stories of the Pentateuch are entirely free from the element of myth and that the patriarchs are not mere personifications or even gods, but men of warm human sympathy, with strongly marked individuality. Fowler, Paton,⁴⁾ and others find in the Old Testament a number of passages which indicate that animism or fetishism was the origin of the Hebrew religion. Having but a vague idea of God, the Hebrews are said to have associated the divine presence with such objects as stones, trees, springs, or mountains. We know that the heathen religions

2. Budde, *ibid.* p. 16: "The ideal reflection of the nation Israel thrown back into the past,--Israel as it should have been in hoary antiquity."

3. Ignaz Goldziher, *Mythology among the Hebrews*, p. XXI: "The myth is a form of life of the human mind psychologically necessary at a certain stage of growth, through which the intellectual life of every individual, nation, and race must pass."

4. Paton, *ibid.* p. 4ff. H. Fowler, *Origin and Growth of the Hebrew Religion*, p. 11.

of all ages were animistic. Everything that moved was regarded as being alive. The fire and the stream were living snakes, the sun and moon were great birds, and the little stars were their children. The storm was a warrior armed with thunderbolts, the gods were the spirits which animated the trees and springs, and even stones and houses. To these features of primitive heathenism modern scholars claim to find a close resemblance in the forms of the Hebrew religion. They point, for example, to the erection of a stone monument⁵⁾ (ה ז ב ז) by Jacob⁶⁾ and compare this action with the worship of such mazzebas in heathenism. However, the narrative furnishes no ground whatever for their interpretation. Jacob set up the stone at Bethel and consecrated it as a memorial of the mercy that had been shown him there, and not as an idol or object of divine worship. Let us note, that not the stone but the place is called "Bethel" and "the gate of heaven." We may refer also to Gen. 31, 45 where we read that Jacob set up a pillar (ה ז ב ז) as a memorial of the covenant which he had made with Laban. These pillars set up by the patriarchs or other men of God are never represented in the biblical narratives as anything but memorial stones, and while heathenish mazzebas were from the first absolutely condemned,⁷⁾ the prophets in their later

5. Griffeth, The Problem of Deuteronomy, p. 51.

6. H. Gunkel, Die Schriften des Alten Testaments (Genesis), p. 209: "Die aelteste Anschauung, dass der Stein gottbeseelt sei, ist auch fuer Israel durch den Namen dieses Steines "Bethel" = "Gotteshaus" belegt."

7. Ex. 34, 13: "Ye shall break their images (ז ב ז); Deut. 16, 22.

polemic against this form of idolatry never intended the least disrespect to such memorial pillars as were set up by Jacob or Joshua. But the critic nevertheless holds to his theory, and boldly asserts that even the ark of the Covenant was nothing more than a fetish chest. The two tables of the Law, which were deposited in the ark, are said to be the stones in which Jehovah was thought to dwell.⁸⁾ Only the pen of a Mark Twain could deal fittingly with such hypotheses. An unprejudiced and fair-minded reader must recognize that the Bible⁹⁾ represents the ark to be merely a visible symbol of the presence of Jehovah, which helped to impress upon the people the comforting fact that God accompanied them, wherever they journeyed and encamped. But criticism rejects the history we have, and substitutes for it a construction evolved from a general theory of the origin of religion, or it represents the disobediences and corruptions of later periods as the original form of the religion. In this way it is "proved" that the patriarchs and also the Israelites of Moses time worshipped particular heathen gods and practised all manner

8. Kuenen, *ibid.* p. 231ff: "The ark of Jahveh was for a long time regarded as preeminently holy, as the true sanctuary of Jahveh. It was held to be the abode of Jahveh, so that he in some way or other was himself present in it."

9. Robertson, *ibid.* p. 222: "The idea that the Deity was believed to reside in the ark is one of those precarious inferences from an old presumed animistic belief, which are not warranted by any positive evidence to be drawn from the documents."

of idolatry.¹⁰⁾ Such argumentation, however, could easily represent America as a Mohammedan nation or the inhabitants of England as devout worshippers of Isis.

In opposition to these impossible and blasphemous theories we recognize the God of the Hebrews as "the God whom we adore." He is no vague abstraction like the unknown god of the Greeks but a reality, as we shall clearly see when we examine His names and attributes. Unlike the heathen idols, the God of Israel is never represented as a material being.¹¹⁾ The bold anthropomorphisms, which frequently occur, seem to disprove this statement, but they are merely necessary figures of speech by which God lowers Himself to the comprehension of men. Moses very earnestly reminds the people that they

10. Elford Higgs, Hebrew Idolatry and Superstition, p. 2: "Most attempts to prove this hypothesis (that the Hebrew national genius produced their remarkable religion by a gradual development from a period of grossest barbarism) base the strongest of their arguments upon the constant references to idolatrous customs practiced by the Israelites during the periods of the Kings and Prophets, and it is suggested, that they are survivals of the ancient worship of the nation. But it is most remarkable, that in every place, where mentioned, these idolatrous practices are sternly denounced, are described as the religion of the former inhabitants of Palestine, and the Divine anger is always threatened against those who practice them."

11. Goldziher, *ibid.* p. 262: "We may as reasonably imagine, that men inhabited palaces before huts and cottages, or studies gemmetry before agriculture, as assert that the Deity appeared to them a pure spirit, omniscient, omnipotent, and omnipresent, before he was apprehended to be a powerful though limited being, with human passions and appetites, limbs and organs. The mind rises gradually from inferior to superior."

saw no form or similitude of God in Horeb, though they heard His voice,¹²⁾ and the worship of Jehovah under the image of a calf or bull was always followed by terrible punishment. Abraham and Moses certainly conceived of God as a Spirit. There is no express declaration to this in the early records, but it is implied in a hundred different ways. The Lord clearly distinguishes Himself from man¹³⁾ who has flesh and blood,¹⁴⁾ and declares Himself to be the source of all life.¹⁵⁾ The names and attributes of God could not be harmonized with any material being. They imply spirituality. Surely this God, who manifested His presency in Syria as well as in Egypt, who declared Himself to be God in heaven above and upon the earth beneath, and who promised to come unto His people in all places where He records His name, surely He could have been thought of only as a spirit. But this Spirit was at the same time a person. He refers to Himself as "I," and is addressed in prayer with names that He shares with no other being. From the first chapter of Genesis throughout the Bible He is revealed as a person having reason and will. He determines to create man, to confound languages, and to destroy cities; He makes a covenant with Abraham and his seed and demands that they worship no other God but Him. This purity of Israel's religion, especially its high conception of God, will be seen in all its beauty in the following parts of our treatise.

12. Deut. 4, 12.15.23.

13. Num. 23, 19.

14. Gen. 6, 3.

15. Deut. 30, 20; 32, 39.

II.

The Names of God.

"That which may be known of God" is principally manifested in His names. They are "the shortest compendium of God's revelation."¹⁾ God's name is the representative of His being, and such expressions as "salvation in His name" show how intimate is the relation between the two. If then we can determine what precisely was the idea which the early Hebrews attached to the various names of God, we shall know definitely and fully wherein their conception of the Deity consisted.

El, ֵל , is the oldest Semitic name of God. It is the only name that enters into the composition of proper names in Genesis (Gen. 4, 18: $\text{ֵל} \text{ִּי} \text{ִּי} \text{ִּי}$; $\text{ֵל} \text{ִּי} \text{ִּי} \text{ִּי}$; 25, 13: 36, 43: $\text{ֵל} \text{ִּי} \text{ִּי} \text{ִּי}$). In Assyrian and Phoenician El is the ordinary word of "God" both as an appellative and in proper names. It occurs also in the Arabian dialects. The word is used very frequently in the Psalms and other poetry of the Bible, but in the Pentateuch it occurs only occasionally. When used alone, the name is not specific and may refer to a heathen deity as well as the true God. It is,

1. Koenig, Theologie des Alten Testaments, p. 141: "Der Name Gottes ist das kuerzeste Kompendium der Gottesoffenbarung."

icles and Nehemiah. Like E^{H} it is not specific and may be used as well of idol deities as of the true God. In the Pentateuch we find this name Deut. 32, 15, where it denotes the Almighty Creator and is used as a synonym of "the Rock of our salvation." The etymological meaning of $\text{E}^{\text{I}^{\text{E}}\text{H}}$ is as obscure as that of E^{H} . Our first thought is, that these two names, each denoting God, and each containing the common element el, are to be regarded as cognate substantives, whose original sense, as shown by the verb $\text{E}^{\text{I}^{\text{E}}\text{H}}$, is that of power. But there are other views. Some hold that the two words are etymologically distinct, and that $\text{E}^{\text{I}^{\text{E}}\text{H}}$ is to be derived from the Arabic root aliba, which means "to wander about, go hither and thither in perplexity and fear." Followed by "to" the word would mean "to betake oneself to a person by reason of fright and dear, seeking protection." Ilah might then denote God as a being to whom one resorted for protection, a refuge. By the same etymology others find the original meaning of $\text{E}^{\text{I}^{\text{E}}\text{H}}$ to be "terror" or "the object of terror."⁵⁾ But both derivations are unsafe and the definitions of the names can be regarded as little more than conjectures. We must, therefore, fall in line with those, who admit that the idea originally expressed by the word is unknown.⁶⁾ It seems probable that

5. Kuenen, *ibid.* p. 224.

6. Driver, *Genesis*, p. 404: "We must rest content with the knowledge that there were two Semitic words, 'ilah and il(u)., both of uncertain etymology, but both undoubtedly denoting 'God', and both probably existing already side by side before the different Semitic peoples had begun to separate from their common home: in after times some of the Semitic peoples preferred one of the two synonyms, while others preferred the other; in one or two cases both remained in use, though they were not in practice used quite indiscriminately."

the singular form of אֱלֹהִים is a later usage.⁷⁾

By far the most frequent name of God is the plural Elohim. This is the ordinary Hebrew word for God, which pervades all the books of the Old Testament from the earliest to the latest. Elohim is used principally of the true God, but it may also designate heathen idols,⁸⁾ and even positions of honor and authority among men. Moses, e.g., is called God, Ex. 4, 16, as being the possessor and medium of the divine Word. The plural form⁹⁾ of the name is a veritable gold mine for the critic and he loses no effort to make capital out of it. He finds in it conclusive proof that polytheism was the original belief of the Hebrews, and that the singular meaning of the word must be a later result of the triumph of monolatry or monotheism.¹⁰⁾ This name is one of the main props for the theory that polytheism is the historical "prius" of all monotheism, which can never exhibit itself except as historically evolved out of polytheism.¹¹⁾ Kuenen asks: "If from the very beginning the Israelites had represented to themselves the deity to be One, what motive could they have had for preferring to use a plural?"¹²⁾ In the first place we

7. Koenig, *ibid.* p. 145: "Diese Singularform hat sich im Hebraeischen erst spaeter neben die Pluralform gestellt."

8. Ex. 18, 11.

9. H. Gunkel, *Schoepfung und Chaos*, p. 10: "Die einzig moegliche Er-
klaerung ist die schon vom Targum des Jon. und von Philo ver-
tretene, dass Gott sich mit den uebrigen אֱלֹהִים zusammenfasse."

10. Goldziher, *ibid.* p. 270: "The Plural form Elohim decidedly indi-
cates that a plural conception was inherent in the word."

11. Goldziher, *ibid.* p. 262: "It is not possible but that every re-
ligion must begin with a multitude of divine figures, i.e., with
Polytheism."

12. Kuenen, *ibid.*, p. 224.

shall answer his question with another: If the Israelites conceived of Elohim as a multitude of gods, what motive could they have had for using the singular verb? Criticism has yet to offer an explanation for this peculiarity, for whenever Elohim designates the true God it is invariably united with the singular. The suggestion that the form of this name is but one of a few remaining vestiges which prove that the ancient religion of Israel was polytheistic needs no refutation. Not only is the Pentateuch distinguished by the absence of any allusion to polytheistic ideas among the Hebrews, such as characterize all Babylonian and Egyptian records, but it testifies from beginning to end of an original and pure monotheism, and ever represents Elohim as the one God, the only one, who made the world and all things therein. Of this Elohim Moses says Deut. 6, 4: "Hear O Israel: The Lord our God (יהוה אחד) is one Lord." Such clear testimony absolutely precludes polytheism and is, therefore, the grave of the critical theory.

But even among Christian scholars the explanations of this phenomenon are many and varied. Some hold that the expression includes the angels. When in Gen. 1, 26 we read that God said: "Let us make man," Delitzsch¹³⁾ and others¹⁴⁾ understand this of God's

13. Delitzsch, Neuer Kommentar zur Genesis, p. 64: "Wie Jahve sich Jes. 6, 8 mit den Seraphim zusammenfasst, so auch hier mit den himmlischen Geistern insgesamt."

14. Philo, see Keil's Commentary on the Pentateuch, I, p. 62:
 $\delta\iota\delta\alpha\kappa\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\ \delta\ \tau\omega\upsilon\ \omicron\lambda\omega\upsilon\ \pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho\ \tau\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\delta\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon\ \delta\upsilon\upsilon\delta\mu\epsilon\theta\epsilon\upsilon\ (\delta\upsilon\upsilon\delta\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma = \text{angels}).$

taking counsel with the multitude of heavenly spirits. The same view is found in the Targum of Jonathan and with most of the Jewish interpreters. Now the words of the text clearly imply that those, who are included in the first person plural, are invited to take part in the creation of man. Angels, therefore, could not have been meant. In spite of the fact that they are called spirits and sons of God, the Scriptures accurately distinguish between them and God, and definitely speak of them as creatures.¹⁵⁾ The most general explanation among conservative writers is the one which regards Elohim as plural of majesty. It is true, the Hebrew language knows this use of the plural. The words of "lord," "master," even when applied to a single person, are often used this for the purpose of conveying dignity and greatness.¹⁶⁾ Similarly the plural Elohim is said to be indicative of the fullness of attributes and powers, which are conceived

15. Luther, I, p. 70: "Es sagen aber allhier die Juden, dass Gott also rede mit den Engeln, item mit der Erde und andern Creaturen. Aber dagegen frage ich erstlich: warum er dies nicht zuvor gethan hat? Zum Andern: was gehet das die Engel an, wie die Menschen geschaffen werden? Zum Dritten, nennet er keinen Engel, sondern sagt schlecht: wir; darum redet er ja von den Machern und Schoepfern, welches wahrlich von den Engeln nicht kann gesagt werden. Zum Vierten ist das auch gewiss, dass man mit nichten sagen kann, wir seien geschaffen zum Bilde der Engel. Zum Fuenften, werden hier biede Worte gesetzt, in beiden Numeris: Lasset uns machen, und:Gott schuf. Darum zeigt uns Moses klaerlich und gewaltig an, dass in dem einigen goettlichen Wesen, welches alles geschaffen hat, gleichwohl sei eine unzertrennliche und ewige Mehrheit der Personen. Dies sollen uns auch die Pforten der Hoellen nicht nehmen."

16. Gen. 39, 20: "Joseph's master (~ י' 7 ה) took him and put him into the prison."

as united in the Godhead.¹⁷⁾ Luther rejects this view and thinks it absurd to suppose that the Holy Ghost uses the politeness of earthly nobles. Our main objection,¹⁸⁾ however, is this, that it does not go far enough. Regardless of the solitary stand which we take in this matter, we maintain that the plural name Elohim not only expresses fullness and majesty, but also and above all a plurality of persons. We see in it a revelation of the Trinity.¹⁹⁾ Scripture does not tell us in so many words that Abraham and Moses conceived of God as a triune being, and we readily admit that there was a development of this concept even as there was progress in revelation, nevertheless, we have a number of passages already in the first chapter of Genesis, which lead us to believe that the germ of this exalted view was to be found even among the earliest Covenant

17. Luther I, p. 71: "Das ist aber zumal laecherlich, dass die Juden vorgeben, Gott halte die Gewohnheit grosser Herren und Fuersten, die um Ehre und Reverenz willen also in der Mehrzahl von sich reden. Einer solchen kanzleiischen Hoeflichkeit folgt ja der Heilige Geist nicht; so erkennt auch die heilige Schrift diese Weise zu reden nicht."

18. Keil, Commentary on the Pentateuch, I, p. 63: "This interpretation comprehends in its deepest and most intensive form the truth that lies at the foundation of the trinitarian view, viz., that the potencies concentrated in the absolute Divine Being are something more than powers and attributes of God; that they are hypostases, which in the further course of the revelation of God in His kingdom appeared with more and more distinctness as persons of the Divine Being."

19. Stoeckhardt, Altes Testament, p. 2. Luther, I, p. 68-73.

people.²⁰⁾ When we read in the second verse of the Bible: "The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters," it is evident to us that the third person of the Godhead is meant, and it does not seem at all unlikely that the early Hebrews noticed a similar distinction. The Angel of the Lord, who appeared to the patriarchs and to Moses, must certainly have been regarded as a divine person, distinguished from Jehovah (Gen. 16, 11; 19, 13. 21.24; Num. 22, 31), and yet at the same time identified with Him (Gen. 31, 11.13; Ex. 3, 2.6). Then, too, we have the Messianic prophecies which were given to comfort the people, and which would have been idle words had they not been understood at all. In view of these facts, and because all other explanations of the plural Elohim are either false or far-fetched, we firmly believe that this name of God, the commonest of all, is a revelation of that great mystery of Godliness: three persons in one Divine Essence. For the etymological meaning of Elohim we refer to what has been said under EH. The fundamental idea attached to the word Elohim seems to be "strength." He is the God of strength, the source of all life, the Creator and Preserver of the universe.

The name El is combined with a number of descriptive adjectives to represent God in His various attributes, and these by usage have become names or titles of God.

20. Luther I, 72: "Und haben gleichwohl die heiligen Vaeter durch den Heiligen Geist dieses Erkenntnis gehabt; wiewohl die heiligen nicht so klar, wie jetzung, da wir hoeren, dass im Neuen Testament kalerlich genanneh wird Gott Vater, Sohn und Heiliger Geist."

$\aleph \aleph \sim \xi \gamma \quad \Sigma \aleph$ appears as a designation of god also in heathen religions, e.g., in the Phœnician religion it is the name of the highest god, Saturn.²¹⁾ When used in Scriptures, however, it always means the true God, the Lord of heaven and earth. $\aleph \aleph \sim \xi \gamma$, "highest," is derived from $\aleph \xi \gamma$, "to go up." The name is translated $\delta \nu \epsilon \acute{\omicron} \varsigma \delta \upsilon \psi \iota \sigma \tau \omicron \varsigma$ in the LXX and means the "Exalted one," who is lifted far above all gods and men. Melchizadek already uses this designation of God,²²⁾ which proves again that the religion of the patriarchs was monotheistic, and that their conception of God was high and pure. In Deut. 32, 8 $\aleph \aleph \sim \xi \gamma$ occurs alone without $\Sigma \aleph$, and in later writings it is also combined with $\aleph \sim \eta \cdot \Sigma \aleph$.

When God appeared unto Abraham to renew His Covenant with him and to give him the promise of a son and heir, he revealed Himself as El Shaddai.²³⁾ This name is peculiar to patriarchal times, but it is used also by the prophets. The etymology of the word again causes much controversy. $\sim \aleph \psi$ is derived from the verb $\aleph \aleph \psi$, "to be strong, to exert power, to do violence." \sim is the substantive termination as we find it in $\sim \aleph \aleph$, the festal, $\sim \psi \sim \psi \sim$, the old, and other nouns. According to this derivation Driver and others contend that the name signifies "the destroyer," presumably the storm-

21. Oehler, Old Testament Theology, p. 89.

22. Gen. 14, 18f.

23. Gen. 17, 1.

god or the scorching sun-god, or even "the Waster."²⁴⁾ They realize, however, that the name Shaddai in the Old Testament does not suggest the idea of "Waster" or "Destroyer," and therefore conclude that the real meaning is extremely uncertain. But they seem to create more difficulties than really exist. If $\underbrace{\text{ש}}_{\text{ש}}$ means "to be strong" and "to exert power," what hinders us from accepting the traditional meaning, "the Almighty," "the God of strength and power?" El Shaddai is the Covenant God, who has power to fulfil His promises although the order of nature may appear against them. The LXX and the Vulgate express this meaning when they translate: $\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\rho$ and "omnipotens." And if the idea of violence must be brought in, we may interpret it as violence done to nature, for "El Shaddai" constrains nature, so that it does what is against itself, and subdues it, so that it bows and yields itself to the service of grace.²⁵⁾ Thus we see also in this name of God conclusive evidence that the critical theory is entirely out of harmony with Scripture. Far from being idolaters groping in the darkness of animism or fetishism, the early Hebrews conceived of God as the one all-powerful Spirit whose words and promises would never fail regardless even of the laws of nature.

24. Driver, Genesis, p. 105.

25. Lange, Genesis, p. 422.

The Name Jehovah, $\text{יהוה} - \text{יהוה}$.

The true pronunciation of this name seems to have been lost. Alfred Jeremias is one of the few modern scholars who still hold that the word was originally pronounced Jehovah.²⁶⁾ This form is a combination of the tetragrammaton יהוה and the vowel points of יהוה , the word which the Massorites intended to be substituted whenever יהוה occurred in the text. It is now generally believed that the word "Jehovah" was made early in the sixteenth century by a friar who was ignorant of the rules of synagogue reading,²⁷⁾ and that Jahveh or Jahaveh is the correct pronunciation. The deciding factor for the original pronunciation is Ex. 3, 13-15, where this name of God is first revealed to Moses. The Lord instructs Moses to tell the children of Israel: " יהוה hath sent me unto you." When, therefore, in the following verse He refers to Himself as יהוה , it is clear that this word is a noun formed from the third person of the imperfect of יהוה and must be read either יהוה (יהוה) or possibly יהוה (יהוה). Nevertheless, we prefer to use the form "Jehovah," not only because it has become naturalized in our vocabulary and endeared to us through song and prayer, but primarily because higher critics use the name Jahveh to represent the God of the early Hebrews as a local baal much inferior to the

26. Jeremias, Das Alte Testament, p. 417, note 1: "Die Aussprache des feierlichen Namens wird vielmehr Jehovah von jeher gewesen sein mit den Vokalen von Adonai."

27. Driver, Genesis, p. 407, note 1: "The pronunciation, Jehovah, has no support from antiquity, being first used, so far as is known, by Petrus Galatinus in 1518."

God whom the prophets worshipped. We think of men like Budde, who says: "I employ the name "Yahweh" not merely or chiefly because it represents, so far as we can judge, the original pronunciation, but because it is appropriate for our historical investigation. The names "Jehovah" and "the Lord" mean for us the one, eternal God, who does not change; we are here dealing with the early Israelitish conceptions which, at first crude, grew constantly in purity and elevation till at last, in the progress of revelation, they reached the lofty spirituality of the New Testament."²⁸⁾ If then "Jahveh" is regarded as the symbol of a primitive deity still in the stage of development and the name Jehovah always designates the eternal, unchangeable God, we emphatically declare ourselves in favor of the latter, for we are assured, that the God of the patriarchs is also the God of Isaiah and Paul.

The etymology of the name Jehovah has already been referred to. It is derived from the verb הָיָה , which signifies "to be", and, therefore, designates God as eternal and immutable, who will never be other than the same. This is not to be understood as simply implying existence,²⁹⁾ for God is above all a living, active being, who is ever manifesting Himself to the world.³⁰⁾ The meaning is rather

28. Budde, *ibid.*, p. 1.

29. Kuenen, *ibid.* p. 279: "Jahveh is distinguished by this name from 'the gods who are not'."

30. Driver, *Genesis*, p. 408, note 2: "The verb *hayah* does not mean 'to be' essentially or ontologically, but phenomenally."

this: Jehovah as entered into certain relations with man and in these He will always remain consistent. Whatever God has been to the past generations He will also be to all the coming ones. Even as Jehovah revealed Himself to Abraham as the God who led him out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give him the land of Canaan for a possession, so He revealed Himself to Moses as the God of his fathers, to fulfil His promises to their seed, the children of Israel. When the immutability and the constancy of Jehovah are thus put in special relation to the divine decree of election and the promises that flow from it, the name implies the invariable faithfulness of God, Jehovah, the Covenant God, the God of Salvation. We shall speak of this at length in a later part of our treatise.

The origin of the name Jehovah has been sought by critical scholars in the literature of many heathen people, in Babylonia, in Egypt, and also in China. Those who believe that the deities of the heathen were worshipped as manifestation of "the Unknown God" who is none else than the God of the Hebrews, will even see in Jupiter (Jovis) a namesake of Jehovah.³¹⁾ But all attempts to derive the name from heathenism rest on arbitrary hypotheses or on strange misunderstandings. On Babylonian tablets the names (Ja-w(p)i-ilu and Ja-ah-w(p)i-ilu are often referred to as proof that the name Jahveh was in use there hundreds or thousands of years before it was known among the Hebrews. The names are translated: Jahveh is God.

31. Cf. Pope, in the Universal Prayer: "Father of all:- Jehovah, Jove or Lord."

However, the reading is exceedingly doubtful and many different interpretations have been suggested. It is very improbable that the name Jahveh should be used here in its full form while the hundreds of names in the Old Testament, which contain the divine elements, show the contracted form. "A more reasonable disposition of the element is to regard it as a verbal form, and to consider the name in connection with the many other West Semitic names having a similar formation, which are found in the tablets of the same period, as Jadah-ilu, 'God knows;' jarbi-ilu, 'God heals,' or Jaqan-ilu, 'God is precious.' Jawi-ilu or Ja'wi-ilu would then mean: 'God exists,' or 'God lives.'"³²⁾

Other scholars find an Egyptian prototype of the Hebrew

יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה "I am who I am." According to Plutarch³³⁾ there was an inscription on the pediment of the temple of Isis reading: Ἐγὼ εἰμι πᾶν τὸ γεγονὸς καὶ ὄν καὶ ἐσόμενον, καὶ τὸν ἐμὸν πέτρων οὐδεὶς πτω θνητὸς ἀπεκάλυψε.

At first glance there seems to be some similarity between these words and the meaning of the name Jehovah, but that is merely external. There is nothing in the whole inscription to suggest that any part of it represents the name of the deity. Is it strange that Isis, the personification of nature, should be regarded by her worshippers as self existent and as the author of all life? How scholars can

32. Clay, Light on the Old Testament, p. 237.

33. Plutarch, Peri Isidos, par. 9. Cf. Brace, The Unknown God, p. 45.

adduce this as an argument for the Egyptian origin of the name Jehovah and still claim to be scientific is more than we can understand. Egyptian antiquity cannot produce the slightest trace of the name Jehovah, and even Vatke³⁴⁾ admits, that the whole Egyptian pantheon did not contain a figure who in the remotest manner resembled the God of Israel. The Bible, too, tells us plainly that Jehovah was unknown to the Egyptians.³⁵⁾ When Moses and Aaron pleaded with Pharaoh and warned him that Jehovah had commanded him to let Israel depart, he answered: "Who is Jehovah, that I should obey His voice to let Israel go? I know not Jehovah." Moses thereupon testified that He was the God of the Hebrews. Numerous other extravagant theories³⁶⁾ have been advanced, but their lameness and unsoundness are so evident that they may be disregarded. Some of the most radical critics agree with us that the name Jehovah could have originated only in Israel. Goldziher³⁷⁾ says: "We must not seek the origin of the name Jehovah outside the Hebrew circle and endeavor to explain it from foreign elements."

There is, however, one more very popular theory which we must consider at some length, namely, that Jehovah was originally the God

34. Vatke, Religion des Alten Testaments, p. 680.

35. Ex. 5, 2.3.

36. Kuenen, *ibid.* p. 236: "We do not go too far in inferring from the bull-worship an original relationship between Jahveh and Moloch."

37. Goldziher, *ibid.* p. 293.

of the Kenites or Midianites.³⁸⁾ The champions of this idea assume that the pre-Mosaic Hebrews were idolaters and that the founder of their monotheistic religion was not Abraham but Moses. Jehovah, or Jahveh, they say, was not the only true God, but a local baal, who dwelt in Horeb, where from time immemorial he was worshipped by the people who lived in his territory, namely the Kenites. When Moses fled from Egypt he found refuge with this people and even married the daughter of Jethro the priest. Thus he too learned to know Jehovah. He accepted Him as his God and later induced all Israel to serve Him. The following arguments are advanced in support of this view:

1) Hebrew tradition unanimously connects Jahveh with Sinai-Horeb in such a way as to indicate that originally He was the God of this mountain. In the Song of Deborah He comes from Sinai to rescue His people in Canaan.³⁹⁾ When Elijah wishes to find Jahveh, he goes to Horeb, the mountain of God.⁴⁰⁾ A child will notice the absurdity of this argument, especially when it is remembered, that by the time of the Judges Jehovah's presence is beyond all question presupposed as in the midst of His people in Canaan.⁴¹⁾ Why then should He require to be summoned from Sinai? In fact, "the song says not a word

38. Budde, *ibid.* p. 17ff.

39. Judges 5, 4ff.

40. 1 Kings 19, 8.

41. The whole book, e.g., Judges 1, 19.22.

of Jehovah being 'summoned' from Sinai on the occasion of the battle referred to."⁴²⁾ And it is hardly fair towards Elijah, to suppose that he regarded Jehovah as the local god of Horeb after the demonstration of His power and presence on Carmel.

2) In Ex. 4, 24-26 Moses has neglected the rite of circumcision, and Jahveh seeks to slay him; but Zipporah, his wife, who knows what is required, takes a flint and fulfils the rite upon her son; then the divine wrath is appeased. Here Zipporah, the Kenite, is regarded as better instructed in the religion of Jahveh than her Hebrew husband. But the argument is weak and does not hold water. In the first place, Moses had at least two sons, as we see from verse 20, and since Zipporah circumcised only one, the other, no doubt the older, must have already been circumcised. This leads us to believe that Zipporah disliked the operation and that Moses neglected to circumcise his next son out of regard for her. The fact that Zipporah threw the foreskin of her son at the feet of Moses, shows plainly, that she performed the rite with inward repugnance and not in loving obedience to Jehovah.

3) In Ex. 18, 1-12 Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, appears as a priest of Jahveh, who initiates the elders of Israel into his religion. The truth of the matter is, that Jethro heard of the mighty works, which Jehovah did in delivering His people out of Egypt, that

42. Robertson, Early Religion, p. 193.

he recognized the God of Israel as the only true God, and now gave evidence of his faith by offering sacrifice. Jethro may be regarded as a kind of firstfruits unto God from among the heathen. The most ordinary reader of the Bible will notice the far-fetched and arbitrary character of the entire theory. Not only does it lack real evidence, but it is directly in the teeth of the fact, that the Jehovah who appeared to Moses is expressly identified with the God of the patriarchs,⁴³⁾ and that His interposition is represented as in fulfilment of His Covenant promises to them. It is evident, therefore, that the name Jehovah did not originate in any of the heathen nations surrounding Israel but inside the Hebrew circle.

Now, however, the old question suggests itself: Was the name Jehovah known to the patriarchs or was it first revealed to Moses at the burning bush? The answer to this question depends on the explanation of Ex. 6, 3. Most conservative writers hold that the patriarchs were not altogether ignorant of the name. They argue, that the words, "By my name Jehovah was I not known unto them," are not to be understood as referring to the name of God, but to His character, His personality. Dr. Kretzmann⁴⁴⁾ says: "To the patriarchs the Lord had not revealed Himself in His specific capacity as Jehovah,⁴⁵⁾

43. Koenig, Theologie, p. 154: "Diese Enthuellung Gottes an Mose (Ex. 3, 6f) fordert als ihr unentbehrliches Fundament die Identitaet der Person des Gottes, der sich Mose enthuelte, und des Gottes der Patriarchen. Das ist der letzte punkt, an dem die Keniter-Hypothese scheitert."

44. Kretzmann, Pop. Com. O.T. I, p. 121.

45. Koenig, Genesis, p. 44.

although the name was not unknown to them," and W. H. Green⁴⁶⁾ explains the passage thus: "That He was not so known by the patriarchs can only mean, that while tokens of God's almighty power had been vouchsafed to them, no such disclosure had been made of the perfections indicated by His name Jehovah as was now to be granted to their descendants." Others point to such passages as Gen. 17, 1 which seems to show a very close relation to the explanation of the name given by God in Exodus. Nevertheless, we are inclined to accept the other view, according to which the name Jehovah is a new revelation of God, which had never been discovered to men before.⁴⁷⁾ Ex. 6, 3 reads: "I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob by the name of God Almighty, (אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה), but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them." The names El Shaddai and Jehovah are evidently contrasted,⁴⁸⁾ and it is difficult to understand the words otherwise than implying, that the one name was known to the patriarchs and the other was a new revelation to Moses. If the name Jehovah had been known in pre-Mosaic times, we should naturally expect to find it as an element in some of the early names, but in all the genealogies of Genesis there is not a single Jehovah-compound. But if the name Jehovah was not known to the early Hebrews, how shall we account for its frequent occurrence in the earliest accounts in the Bible? Since we regard Moses as the sole author of the Pentateuch, nothing hinders us from believing, that he used the name proleptically.

46. H. W. Green, Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch, p. 100.

47. Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews, II, 2, 4.

48. Koenig, Genesis, p. 44.

This assumption sounds most reasonable to us, and although at first sight it would seem to favor the critical view, it most certainly does not necessitate a division of the Pentateuch into a number of different documents.⁴⁹⁾ Neither does it suggest that Jehovah was a different God from the deity whom the early Hebrews worshipped. Budde⁵⁰⁾ says: "The name makes the person, not only among men, but also among gods. If, then, the name is new, the god himself is also new." He calls the belief that the patriarchs knew this same God under different names "a palliating addition of the philosophising historian." But we know from the constant association of the various names of God that Jehovah is indeed the same God who revealed Himself to Abraham as Elohim or El Shaddai, and that all the names which we have considered are titles of one supreme God.⁵¹⁾

Ex. 6, 3 suggests to us that the different names of God have each their distinct and proper signification, but also, that they are

49. Green, Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch, p. 99.

50. Budde, *ibid.* p. 15: "Israel simultaneously with its exodus from Egypt and the beginning of its history as a distinct nation, turned to a new religion, the worship of Yahweh, the mountain-God of the Kenites, at Sinai." (Cf. p. 25).

51. Green, H. C. of Pent.: "Even if the name Jehovah were not in use prior to the days of Moses, the God of the Patriarchs was the very same as Jehovah, and the writer might properly adopt the dialect of his own time in speaking of him for the purpose of asserting the identity of the God of Abraham with the God who appeared to Moses and who led Israel out of Egypt. It is customary to speak of the call of Abraham and of the conversion of Paul, though the patriarch's name was Abrahah when he was called and the Apostle's name was Saul at the time of his conversion." p. 101.

intimately related to each other, since all represent the one true God, only from different view points and according to His different characteristics. Elohim depicts God as the infinitely great and exalted One, who created the heavens and the earth, and who preserves and governs every creature. The name Jehovah, on the other hand, is applied to all the manifestations and acts of God which had for their object the rescue of the human race from its fall. Yet this distinction is not to be stressed at every occurrence of the names, for then we should not expect Elohim in the records of God's Covenant with Noah (Gen. 9, 1-17) and Abraham (Gen. 17), nor Jehovah in the narrative which relates the wickedness of the inhabitants of Shinar (Gen. 11, 1-9). There are cases, when one of the divine names is manifestly appropriate to the exclusion of the other, and there are others in which either name might properly be used. Both are often used in the same breath, one in apposition to the other, so that the critic, according to the documentary hypothesis, dissects a single short verse into two or three sources. But instead of dividing the records according to supposed peculiarities of style, we regard them as the work of one author, and find an explanation for the constant association of the different names in the intimate relation in which they stand towards one another, each one being but another revelation of the only true God.

The Unity of Jehovah.

It is to be expected that higher critics would find in the plural form Elohim "proof" for pre-Mosaic polytheism, but we are really surprised to hear them declare, that even Moses recognized the existence of many gods. Koenig⁵²⁾ says: "The conception of Jahveh's unity cannot be ascribed to the patriarchal, the Mosaic, and the older prophetic stage of Old Testament religion. This ancient time possessed only monolatry, the germ of monotheism." Kuenen⁵³⁾ mentions three forms of Jahvism. "The people," he says, "acknowledged and worshipped other gods besides Jahveh, and thus fell into syncretism."⁵⁴⁾ The prophets saw in Jahveh the only God, and so came naturally to ascribe to Him alone all the attributes and characteristics which in polytheism and by the people were distributed among the different gods. The Law, finally, must be regarded as a compromise between the popular religion and the Jahvism of the prophets."⁵⁵⁾ Moses, then, the great lawgiver, was in reality only a compromiser, who proclaimed to the people not an exalted monotheism but a luke-warm, wishy-washy

52. Koenig, Theologie, p. 129: "Erkenntnis der Einzigartigkeit Jahwehs kann der patriarchalischen, mosaischen und altprophetischen Stufe der alttestamentlichen Religion nicht zugeschrieben werden. Die älteste Zeit besass nur Monolatrie, nur keimartigen Monotheismus."

53. Kuenen, ibid. p. 230.

54. Syncretism is a combination and intermingling of ideas and customs, which had originally been connected with various gods.

55. Kuenen, ibid. p. 280: "We have no right to call Moses a Monotheist."

henotheism! The very first commandment of the Decalogue, which we were wont to regard as a powerful declaration that there are no other gods, is used by the critic as an argument for his theory, that the Hebrews recognized the existence of many deities, though they worshipped but one. He reasons thus:⁵⁶⁾ It does not say, "Thou shalt not believe that there are other gods," but only, "Thou shalt not worship any other god." The second part of the first commandment (Ex. 20, 4-6), which modern scholars call the second commandment, is calmly brushed aside and termed a fruit of the theology of the prophets. Moses, who himself set up twelve mazzebas at Sinai (Ex. 24, 4) could certainly not have issued such a sweeping order against all images, and undoubtedly retained all the sacred objects of primitive Semitism in the worship of Jehovah. Many other passages of Scripture which we have always adduced as conclusive proof for the unity of Jehovah are conscripted by the critic to strengthen his position. When Jethro says, "Jehovah is greater than all gods," or Jehovah Himself tells His people, that He will execute judgment upon all the gods of Egypt, and when Moses sings, "Who among the gods is like Thee, Jehovah?" the modern scientific scholar dogmatically asserts, that the Bible itself supports his theory. Accordingly Stade⁵⁷⁾ says: "The ancient Israelites believed in the existence of Chemosh, the god of Moab; of Moloch, the god of the Ammonites; and Baalzebub, the god of the Ekronites, and others, just as they believed in the exis-

56. Raton, *ibid.* p. 50.

57. Stade, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Vol. I, p. 428.

tence of Jahveh, their own God. The distinction which they drew was not between God and idols, or between God and no-gods, but between Jahveh and the 'gods of the nations.'" This entire argument could be shattered by the most ordinary reader of Scripture. The learned critic, who is accustomed to reaching his goal only after laboriously working his way through a maze of scientific difficulties, pitifully misses the mark here because he fails to understand simple language. It is hard to imagine, how any literate man (unless he is prompted by malice or prejudice) could read the words of the first commandment and not find in them a definite declaration, that there is no other God but Jehovah. Will anyone argue, that when Moses said to Israel, "Thou shalt not kill," he made murder unlawful merely in Israel and not wherever men existed? Yet the case is identical. The fact, that heathen gods have names and that the Israelites used these names in speaking of the deities of their neighbors, does not argue for their existence. How else could they have referred to them? In Deuteronomy the gods of the heathen are expressly called "vanities" or "that which is not God" and are identified with wood or stone out of which they are made. It is true, that as soon as we give a thing a name it has a certain existence for us. Even Christians speak of Jupiter and Apollo as if they were real beings, though they are well aware of the fact, that "an idol is nothing in the world." Let the critics read 1 Kings 18, 27, and then ask themselves whether Elijah believed that Baal really existed, or whether he thought of him in the terms of 1 Corinthians 8, 4. We admit, that great numbers of the Hebrews were false to their faith, and that very many not only recog-

nized the existence of other gods but even worshipped them. Even Solomon wavered. But that certainly does not warrant the deduction, that monolatry or even polytheism was the standpoint of Mosaism.⁵⁸⁾ In like matter, multitudes among every Christian people are untrue to Christianity, and yet its great truths remain inviolate and are transmitted from one century to another. There is not a passage in the Old Testament which can be taken to prove, that the faithful among the Hebrews ever regarded Jehovah as on a level with Chemosh, Moloch, or Baal; whereas there is a wealth of positive evidence, which proves that the Israelites stood upon the lofty ground of pure monotheism, and that they believed Jehovah was the one and only God. The entire Law is a powerful testimony to this effect; Deut. 6, 4, which we considered in a previous chapter, is an impregnable fortress in our position; the very passages, with which the critic tries in vain to bolster up his crumbling theories, persist in proclaiming the unity of Jehovah; in fact the whole Judaic system is a standing evidence that Jehovah is God and there is none beside Him.

Those who believe that henotheism was the religion of Israel, speak of Jehovah as a national God. Sanders⁵⁹⁾ says: "Jehovah was

58. Higgins, Heb. Id. & Sup. p. 75: "The religion of the Hebrews was one of great morality, and when the nation fell into idolatry, they were acting contrary to the principles of their religion, and were adopting the lower religious standard of the former inhabitants of the land, members of such former races surviving amongst them and perpetuating the lower standards of religion."

59. Sanders, History of the Hebrews, p. 64.

thought of as a national diety, moving with the nation and sharing its fortunes, while using His power to promote them." True, Jehovah calls Israel "my people," Ex. 3, 6f, and no one will deny that He revealed Himself in the first place and most fully and continuously to Israel. On the other hand, persons like Job, Abimelech, Melchizedek, and the Pharaohs of Abraham and Moses show plainly that God would be recognized and worshipped as "the God of all flesh," and not as a mere national diety. Therefore, from the very first strangers could adopt circumcision and partake of the passover (Ex. 12, 14). Thus also during the famine in Egypt God is said to "have preserved much people"-- not only the Israelites, but also many Egyptians and foreigners (Gen. 50, 20). We have proved that the Hebrews were monotheists and as such they cannot have thought of Jehovah as a mere national God. They knew that He was the Creator and Preserver of all creatures, and that He was the Author of life in all men, "the God of the spirits of all flesh."⁶⁰⁾ The special relation between Jehovah and Israel will be treated when we speak of the Covenant in a later chapter.

In this connection we might also mention the fact, that the purity of Israel's religion, its exalted monotheism, owes nothing to Egyptian or Babylonian influences. Scholars have claimed that the ancient faith of Egypt was profound monotheism. Brace⁶¹⁾ says: "The sun and all the gods of the Egyptians were worshipped as mani-

60. Numbers 16, 22.

61. Brace, the Unknown God, pp. 17.29.

festations of the 'Unknown God' who is none else than the Jehovah of the Hebrews. Thoth is the Logos by whom all things were created, and who breathed new life and vigor into the bodies of the dead." Breasted⁶²⁾ tells us that Re was the supreme god, and that all the so-called local deities were but forms and names of Re. It is argued that some of the characteristics of the highly cultivated Egyptians must have stamped themselves deeply on the Hebrews, a race of inferior culture and less ancient existence, and that the principal religious influence is to be seen in the monotheistic faith of Moses. But all this talk is a product of fancy and imagination. Even as Egypt had nothing to do with the origin of the name Jehovah, so it offered absolutely nothing which could have elevated Israel's conception of God. The mere thought of the Egyptian pantheon with its hundred gods or more is enough to prove that the religion of Egypt was essentially polytheistic, and that its basis was fetishism and all manner of nature-worship. The only exception is Ikhnatèn's brief abortive attempt to establish monotheism, and this certainly had no influence on the Hebrew religion.⁶³⁾ Fowler⁶⁴⁾ and other scholars, while denying any Egyptian influence, on the other hand claim that Israel inherited monotheism from Assyria. Assur is repre-

62. Breasted, History of Egypt, pp. 126. 170.

63. Goldziher, *ibid.* p. 304: "Egypt was to the Hebrews a house of slaves, as the Bible says, (Ex. 13, 3), not a theological college."

64. Fowler, *ibid.* p. 9: "Most of the inherited elements of Israel's religion bear quite distinctly the marks of the Semitic culture of southwestern Asia rather than that of the Nile."

sented as the first and source of all gods, the One, the Good. The Akkadian penitential psalms are said to rival the Psalms of David. Brace⁶⁵⁾ says of them: "The human mind in its highest flights of fancy cannot obtain a more perfect view of God, and of our moral relation to Him. The Chaldean cuneiform psalms might be uttered by all men in every age of the world." We shall quote one of these psalms to show the extravagance of that statement:

"May Bel, the King, my Creator, pardon!

May Hea, Spirit of earth, pardon!

May Merodach, King of angels, pardon!

May Istar, Goddess of love, pardon!"

We fail to recognize the "perfect view of God." It is evident that the conception of Jehovah's unity could never have been inherited from the Chaldean Akkadians, for they were polytheists of the purest water. Their tablets tell us that they worshipped the powers and demons of Nature, and that they were given to every kind of superstition. Above all, the Bible tells us that these people worshipped the powers and demons of nature, and that they were given to every kind of superstition. Above all, the Bible tells us that these people worshipped many and strange gods. Ex. 12, 12 Jehovah says: "Against all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgment," and Joshua tells the Israelites: "Y our fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood in old time, Even Terah, the father of Abraham, and the

65. Brace, *ibid.* pp. 56.57.

father of Nahor: and they served other gods," (Josh. 24, 2). From such nations the Hebrews could have borrowed nothing at all that might have exalted their idea of God. When they did come in contact with them and allowed themselves to be influenced by their myths and magic, it was only to be contaminated and degraded. The idea of Jehovah's unity was original with the earliest Hebrews, God Himself revealed it to them. He is the first and He is the last, and beside Him there is no God.

The Attributes of God.

Most of the attributes of God are implied in His names. We shall speak briefly of those which we have considered at some length in previous chapters and pass on to the others.

The indivisibility of God is principally implied in the name Jehovah, which denotes His absolute self-existence. The same name also declares God's immutability. God did not gradually develop into His full divinity, but ever was and ever will be the same "I am." The world was changed and fashioned by the hands of God, and all creatures "wax old as doth a garment," but God is ever the same. The God who created heaven and earth, who called Abraham out of Ur of the Chaldees, is the same who led the Israelites out of Egypt and established His Covenant with them at Sinai. He is eternal. Abraham is said to call on the name of Jehovah, the everlasting God (Gen. 21, 33), and Jehovah Himself declares, Deut. 32, 40: "I live

unto eternity." In the ninetieth Psalm Moses says: "From everlasting to everlasting thou art God." God's eternity may be defined as the unchangeableness of His being, continuing through every change of time.

And even as the longest human measurement of time vanishes when put against His eternal duration, so He is also raised above the limitations of space. For God there is no distinction between here and there. He is omnipresent. We have heard that the Israelites realized this well. They knew that the God who called to Abraham out of heaven (Gen. 22, 11), who was with Jacob in Mesopotamia (Gen. 31, 42), who demonstrated His power in Egypt (Ex. 1-14), and who descended upon Mt. Sinai (Ex. 19, 18) was not a local baal but the omnipresent God.

Unlike the gods of the heathen, Jehovah is a living God, He is life itself. The Israelites expressly refer to Him as the living God (Deut. 5, 26) and Jehovah Himself swears by His life (Num. 14, 21.28). In fact, every action and revelation of God shows this attribute and this contrasts Him with the idols, which can reveal nothing, perform nothing, grant no requests, and send no help.

The omniscience of God has at times been questioned because of the bold anthropomorphisms of Scripture. God asks Adam: "Who told thee that thou wast naked?" and inquires of Cain: "Where is Abel, thy brother?" But the Lord knew these answers long before He asked for them, for He sees even "the imagination of the thoughts of man's

heart," (Gen. 6, 5). Abraham and Sarah realized the omniscience of God when Isaac was born according to the promise of the Lord a year before. The later Israelites, too, were well aware of the fact that Jehovah knew all things, for He punished even their murmurings and gave ear to their most secret thoughts and desires.

Closely connected with this attribute of God is His wisdom, by which He devises, disposes, and directs all things. Job says: "With Him is wisdom and strength; He hath counsel and understanding," (Job. 12, 13). The entire creation as well as its continuous preservation loudly proclaim the wisdom of God.

Bright as a beacon stands out among the attributes of God His holiness. Moses⁶⁶⁾ sings: "Who is like thee, O Lord, among the gods? who is like thee, glorious in holiness?" The word $\psi\acute{\iota}\tau\eta$, when applied to Jehovah, expresses the spotless purity of His being and His abhorrence of every impure and profane thing, both physical and moral. The most perfect of God's creatures are filthy and corrupt when compared with Him who is the Holy One $\kappa\alpha\tau' \acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\chi\eta\acute{\iota}\nu$. In God alone there is a perfect purity. He is holy in His affections: His love and hatred are both pure. He is holy in His thoughts: not the shadow of an impurity ever inserts itself into His thinking. He is holy in His will: He is never seen in any alliance with, but in stern opposition to evil. This attribute of God was manifest from the earliest times. Abraham recognized it when the Lord told him

66. Ex. 15, 11.

of His anger against the abominations of Sodom and Gommorrah.⁶⁷⁾ The Israelites of Moses' time heard the words of the Lord: "Ye shall be holy unto me; for I the Lord am holy,"⁶⁸⁾ and they beheld the terrible judgments, which befell the heathen nations round about them, because of their filthy practices. Yet Stade⁶⁹⁾ says: "The early Israelite conception of Jahaveh's holiness is in strict analogy with the heathen conception of their gods. His holiness is merely majesty jealous of its honor, and insisting on due reverence, so that the bounds between Him and man are not to be trespassed with impunity." Does he really believe that the Israelites harmonized the purity of Jehovah with the dachauchery and gluttony ascribed to the heathen Gods? The "holiness" of these deities is recorded in the Babylonian Story of Creation:⁷⁰⁾ "The sweet drink made them drunken--by drinking they were drunken, their bodies were filled." It is evident, that the early Hebrews who witnessed the awful wrath of God against sin and the terrible plagues with which the foul deeds of the heathen were punished knew full well that Jehovah's purity and holiness are unique, that "there is none holy as the Lord."⁷¹⁾

With the holiness of Jehovah are connected the attributes of righteousness, faithfulness, and truth. The three are united in the

68. Lev. 20, 26.

69. Stade, Geschichte, I, p. 434.

70. The Story of Creation, Third Tavlet, line 135f. Cf. Rogers, Cuneiform Parallels, p. 23.

71. 1 Samuel, 2, 2.

main passage, Deut. 32, 4: "He is the Rock, his work is perfect; for all his ways are judgment; a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he." Critics like Wellhausen and Stade have attacked the righteousness of "the old Jehovah" quite severely and have characterized Him as a whimsical and capricious being, a powerful sheik, as it were, who chose and dismissed his favorites according to his good pleasure. Some take offence at the idea that with respect to one small nation, not exceptionally excellent, Jehovah followed quite another line of action than with regard to all other nations on earth. Others point to the weaknesses of the patriarchs, which, they say, were ever condoned and never punished. Referring to the trouble between Abraham and Abimelech concerning Sarah, Gunkel⁷²⁾ says: "God naturally sides with His favorites, even though their right is doubtful." Many other instances are cited, which are said to prove that Jehovah's actions are characterized by the very opposite of righteousness: e.g. the borrowing of clothes and jewelery from the Teyptians. But the arguments are not sound, and if the critic could approach these accounts with unbiased mind, he would confess with Pharaoh: "The Lord is righteous and I and my people are wicked."⁷³⁾ The election of Israel as a Covenant nation certainly does not conflict with the idea of God's justice. It was part of His great plan by which He would bring all nations to partake of His

72. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 162: "Gott steht nun einmal auf der Seite seines Guenstlings, auch wenn dessen Recht zweifelhaft bleiben mag."

73. Ex. 9, 27.

salvation. And against the idea that Jehovah was partial to His favorites, we point to the example of Moses, that man of God. Though he was "faithful in all his house," (Heb. 3, 2), and was allowed to see God face to face, he was not permitted to enter the Holy Land because he sinned against the Lord at the waters of Meribah. Deut. 10, 17 Moses himself tells the people: "The Lord your God is God of gods, and Lord of lords, a great God, a mighty, and a terrible, which regardeth not persons, nor taketh reward." The absolute justice and righteousness of Jehovah cannot be questioned. They were demonstrated to the Israelites in all His actions. According to Gen. 18, 25 Jehovah is judge of all the earth, and as such He will do right and not permit the lot of the godless to fall on the righteous. His law is holy and righteous, and according to it every evil-doer is punished, while he who complies with it receives his reward.

We have already pointed out that the idea of faithfulness and truth is contained in the name Jehovah, and that the early Hebrews had a clear conception of this attribute. In the Old Testament the faithfulness of Jehovah is especially emphasized in referring to the divine word of promise, and the agreement of the divine action therewith. The Pentateuch abounds with assurances that Jehovah would remember the Covenant, which He made with Abraham and his seed. Deut. 4, 31 Moses says to Israel: "He will not forsake thee, neither destroy thee, nor forget the Covenant of thy fathers which He swore unto them. One of the chief passages is Num. 23, 19: God is not a man that He should lie; neither the son of man, that He should repent: hath He spoken, and shall He not make it good?"

The critics often represent Jehovah as a very angry and severe God. Kuenen⁷⁴⁾ says: "Jahveh was conceived by those who worshipped him to be a severe being, inaccessible to mankind, whom it was necessary to propitiate with sacrifices and offerings, even with human sacrifices." The terrible judgments with which God visited the heathen nations round about Israel, and also the rebellious of the Covenant nation itself, must have impressed the Hebrews with the fact, that "it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God."⁷⁵⁾ On the other hand, every page of the Bible proclaims the love of God, His goodness, grace, and mercy. The grandest expression of God's love to Israel is the Covenant that He made with Abraham and his descendants. Again and again we read the words: "The Lord had a delight in thy fathers to love them, and he chose their seed after them."⁷⁶⁾ In the subsequent parts of our treatise this idea of God's love will be developed and unfolded. We shall see that Jehovah loved Israel with an everlasting love, that He watched over His people and guarded and protected them as the apple of His eye. When the Israelites languished in the sweatship of Egypt, the Lord remembered His promises and delivered them; as an eagle flutters over her young and bears them on her wings, so the Lord did lead them. Though they faltered and rebelled, the Lord did not reject them but was ever "merciful and gracious, longsuffering,

74. Kuenen, *Ibid.* p. 249.

75. Heb. 10, 31.

76. Deut. 4, 37; 7, 7; 10, 15; 23, 5; 33, 3.

and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." Only the most stiff-necked among them could have conceived of Jehovah as anything but a God of love.

When we spoke of the name Elohim we said that the fundamental idea connected with it was that of strength. The Israelites knew well that Jehovah was strong and powerful, in fact, that He was omnipotent. The "mighty" gods of Egypt could not withstand Him, nor could the gods of Canaan. He was not a mere local baal limited in operation to the particular holy spot over which he presided, but He was a being who could manifest His power even in the most distant lands. Kuenen⁷⁷⁾ seeks to disparage this attribute of Jehovah and says: "Since our natural science was unknown to the Israelites of old, they ascribed to Jehovah's might many natural phenomena." But science has tried in vain to explain away the miracles of the Exodus and the wilderness journey. Its explanations are not only very uncertain, but they create new problems and difficulties. The truth remains as we have it in the narratives of the Pentateuch, and the power of Jehovah was not exaggerated when Moses⁷⁸⁾ sang: "Thy right hand, O Lord, is become glorious in power: thy right hand, O Lord, hath dashed in pieces the enemy. And in the greatness of thine excellency thou hast overthrown them that rose up against thee. Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods? Who is like

77. Kuenen, *ibid.* p. 45.

78. Ex. 15, 6ff.

thee glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders? Thou stretchedst out thy right hand, the earth swallowed them up."

Such was Israel's conception of its God, a conception lacking in height and purity very little that is known to Christians of this day. Critics may batter away at it forever, but they will never succeed in degrading the exalted theology of the early Hebrews.

III.

God's Relation to the World.

Creation.

The names and attributes of God have already demonstrated to us that Jehovah was not thought of as a transcendent being, living on some distant plane and utterly unmindful of man and his welfare, but rather as a loving Father whose relation to man and the world was the most intimate. The first chapters of Genesis and frequent references throughout the Pentateuch represent Jehovah as the Creator of heaven and earth, as the Author and Source of all creatures, animate and inanimate. According to the biblical account this visible universe of ours was called into existence by the Divine Word, without any precedent condition from which it could have naturally proceeded. The parts of which it is composed made their appearance in a certain definite order in the space of six natural days. Everybody knows what a storm-center of biblical criticism these accounts have become. Gunkel¹⁾ tells us that the Creation Story of Genesis represents the speculations of the ancient Hebrew peasant, who beholds his surroundings and asks himself, how all this came into existence. Others tell us, that the entire account is a myth similar to or even borrowed from the Babylonian Story of Creation, and that

1. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 55: "In der Schoepfungserzaehlung redet der altisraelitische Bauer, der seine naechste Umgebung betrachtet und fragt, wie das alles geworden sei."

the only reasonable explanation of the origin of the universe is the hypothesis of evolution, according to which the present state of things evolved by a natural process from an antecedent state, and that from another, and so on.²⁾ Lovers of science who profess to be Christians have endeavored to harmonize the cosmogony of Genesis with the results of scientific research, but the majority of scholars concede, that this is impossible. The next step was to declare, that the interpretation of the account of Genesis is not to be regarded as an integral element in the Christian faith, and that the science of the Bible is the science of the age in which it was written.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to treat thoroughly the whole problem of evolution and to expose all its vulnerable points. We shall simply say, that evolutionists have yet to offer an explanation of the origin of the universe that looks better than a guess, an explanation that is consistent in all its parts and requires less faith than the biblical account, and above all a sound explanation of the beginning of life. Let them answer the questions in Job 38. The suggestion, that Babylonian legends are the source of the biblical narratives hardly deserves any comment. The Babylonian history of Creation is immeasurably behind the biblical account in grandeur and simplicity, and is stamped by polytheism. The chief theme of the Chaldean epic, instead of being the creation of the heavens and the earth is the glorification of the god Bel, for whose name Marduk was

2. Huxley, Science and Hebrew Tradition, p. 54ff.

later substituted. According to it man exists because the gods are lonely and in their vanity crave worship and adoration.³⁾ What a contrast to the biblical account, where man is created in the image of God to be the crowning point of the universe, placed in an earthly Paradise by the favor of the Almighty.⁴⁾ But critics and scientists will never succeed in robbing the first chapter of Genesis of the glory of its infinite superiority. It is as high above all human conceptions as the heavens are high above the earth. And if human science contradicts it, we may be sure that human science is wrong. Scripture tells us that the entire world was created by the Triune God within six consecutive days by the exertion of His power, wisdom, and goodness. The early Hebrews accepted and believed this account not as the doubtful speculations of their own finite minds but as the sure word of Jehovah, the God of power and truth.

Preservation and Providence.

After the creation of man God rested from all His works, that is, He desisted, He ceased to create. This is not to be understood

3. The Story of Creation, Sixth Tablet, lines 1-10, Rogers, C. p. p.36.

4. M. Jastrow, Hebrew and Babylonian Traditions, p. 97f: "The various Babylonian creation stories remain on the level of nature myths. They contain a variety of interesting pictures as well as thoughts and suggestion which indicate an attempt to rise superior to the myth, but an attempt that is weak and completely fails. There is little if anything of a spiritual character in these tales. Man exists for the sake of the gods. Mankind is created to provide worshippers for the gods and to build temples in their honor."

as positive rest and relaxation, for the world which God created requires continued activity on His part, an activity called preservation. Heaven and earth, although some duration is assured to them, are not eternal, and need the steady care and protection of the Lord. This agency of God is sometimes represented as a continuous creation. Psalm 147 expresses this thought beautifully: "He sendeth forth his commandment upon earth; his word runneth very swiftly. He giveth snow like wool: he scattereth the hoarfrost like ashes. He casteth forth hiss ice like morsels: who can stand before his cold? He sendeth out his word, and melteth them: he causeth his wind to blow, and the waters flow." (cf. Ex. 4, 11). The patriarchs and later Israelites experienced the preservation of God in full measure. One of the best instances is shown in the removal of the Covenant people to Goshen. Canaan was at the time of the patriarchs in the possession of numerous tribes, who regarded the land as their own. Abraham already felt himself cramped by them (Gen. 13, 6); Isaac had constantly to retire before the powerful inhabitants by whom he was surrounded (Gen. 26), and by the time of Jacob the difficulties must have increased rather than diminished. If, therefore, the house of Israel had remained any longer in Canaan they would have encountered great obstacles to their ever becoming a large and independent nation. If their numbers had rapidly increased, it would have been impossible for them to stand entirely aloof from the Canaanites, as they hitherto had done. In such a case they must either have made war upon the inhabitants, in order to maintain a footing in the land (and it would not be difficult to foresee the disastrous issue if they had); or

they must have scattered over the neighboring countries, and then they would have lost their national unity and degenerated into a number of separate nomad hordes; or (and of this there would be the greatest fear) they would have intermarried and mingled with the Canaanites until they were completely absorbed by their superior numbers. But the maintainance of their religious peculiarities would have been even more difficult than that of their national independence. The readiness of the Canaanites to adopt the forms of the Israelitish religion without its spirit, and the seductive influence which the worship of nature exerted upon that age would all have combined to produce a result destructive of the very foundations of Israel's destiny. Similar dangers would have threatened them in Mesopotamia, if they had returned there. None of these dangers existed in Egypt. There they could become a great nation without any difficulties or obstructions, and without any interference with their national and religious peculiarities. The hatred which the Egyptians cherished towards every foreigner, and the contempt in which shepherds especially were held furnished an indestructible safeguard against any such danger. And it was of no little importance that just the land of Goshen was assigned to them. Even through the famine the fertility and extent of Goshen furnished them with a plentiful supply, so that they had no occasion to scatter or separate from the main body. Here they had opportunities of making provisions for their future wants as a nation. Goshen was just as well fitted for agriculture as it was for grazing, and so it naturally induced them to combine the pursuits of farming, gardening, and vine growing

with those of their earlier life. And in the midst of the science and civilization of Egypt Israel was in the best school for that general culture, which it would afterwards require. Hundreds of other instances could be mentioned to show how God bore them as on the wings of an eagle, and how His Divine providence sustained them.

God's Revelation:

The most general revelation of God to the early Hebrews was His name. Man cannot mention the name of the true God without perceiving a revelation of His nature. Oehler⁵⁾ says: "The name of God is not merely the title which God bears in virtue of the relation in which He places Himself to man; but it designates at the same time the whole divine self-presentation by which God in personal presence testifies of Himself--the whole side of the divine nature which is turned towards man." But we have spoken at length of the names of God in a previous chapter and shall, therefore, pass on to the other modes of God's revelation.

In these early times it was not an uncommon occurrence that Jehovah revealed Himself by His voice. Gen. 15, 1 is sometimes referred to, but we prefer to interpret that as being an inward revelation. When Hagar wept in the wilderness because her child was dying for want of water, God called to her from heaven and comforted her. Abraham heard the voice of the Lord when his faith was tried

5. Oehler, O. T. Theology, p. 125.

on Mount Moriah. At the burning bush Jehovah called to Moses and spoke with him, and from Mount Sinai the children of Israel heard the sound of Jehovah's words, though they saw no form. His voice was also heard in all the manifestations of Jehovah as the Angel of the Lord.

The $\text{אֲנֹכִי הָאֵל} \text{ or } \text{אֲנֹכִי הָאֵל}$ was without doubt the most significant and important form of God's revelation in the Old Testament. With Keil, Hengstenberg and most of the old church fathers we hold that the Angel of the Lord who appeared to the Hebrews was not a created angel, but rather the self-manifestation of Jehovah, a revelation of the eternal Logos, the angelus increatus. The opposite view is held by Hofmann, Kurtz, and Delitzsch, as well as by the majority of Catholic scholars, whose interest, no doubt, is to support saint-worship. Even Luther⁶⁾ does not agree with us. A brief consideration of the most important manifestations, however, will prove that our position is correct. In Gen. 16, 7ff we read that the Angel of the Lord appeared to Hagar while she was fleeing from the face of Sarah, and said: "I will multiply thy seed

6. Luther, I. 1183: "Ich folge erstlich der gemeinen Art und Weise der Schrift, die da sagt, dass Gott rede, wenn Engel oder heilige Menschen reden aus Gottes Befehl oder Offenbarung. -- Gleichwie ist Gott in der Taufe, im Sacrament, im Gebrauch der Schluessel gegenwaertig, darum dass sein Wort da ist, ob wir ihn derhalben nicht sehen, noch hoeren, sondern sehen und hoeren den Kirchen-diener, so ist doch Gott selbst auch gewisslich da, tauft und absolviert."

exceedingly." Hagar recognized the Angel as Jehovah Himself,⁷⁾ as we see from verse 13, and called Him "a God of seeing." This name may be interpreted in the sense of "a God who is seen," in accordance with Hagar's surprise that she has seen God and lived.⁸⁾ Luther regards the name as an expression of Hagar's gratitude to God for his mercy.⁹⁾ After Hagar was cast out of the house of Abraham according to the command of God, this same Angel called unto her out of heaven (Gen. 21, 17ff). This time He is spoken as the Angel of God. His identity with Jehovah may be seen from the fact, that He heard the cry of Ishmael, that He called out of heaven, and that He Himself promised to make the lad a great nation.

Gen. 22, 15 the Angel of the Lord called to Abraham just as he was about to slay Isaac. Goldziher¹⁰⁾ tells us that according to the original form of the "myth" Abraham really killed his son as a sacrifice to the gods, and that the intervention of the Angel of God is only the modification of later monotheistic theology. But the New Testament¹¹⁾ places its infallible sanction on the account of Genesis and we therefore see in the Angel of the Lord another self-

7. Gunkel finds real difficulty in explaining away the identity, and can do so only "durch eine religionsgeschichtliche Erwägung." In this way he proves that the Angel of the Lord was a mere phantom. Cf. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 146.

8. Driver, Genesis, p. 183, note.

9. Luther, I, 1001: "Hagar nennt Gott einen Seher, als der ihre Demut oder Elend angesehen habe."

10. Goldziher, *ibid.* p. 45ff.

11. Heb. 11, 17.

manifestation of Jehovah. The words, "Now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me," could have been spoken only by Jehovah, and Abraham received them as such. On the other hand, verses 15-18 point to a personal distinction from Jehovah, though the identity remains. After Abraham's faith is confirmed, the Angel takes occasion to repeat and ratify His previous promises to him.

When Jacob returned from Mesopotamia he wrestled with the Angel of the Lord at Penuel, (Gen. 32, 24-32). The narrative does not expressly mention that it was the Angel of Jehovah, but verse 28 tells us that it was Elohim, and from Hosea 12, 4 we learn, that it was an angel. Jacob himself says verse 30: "I have seen God face to face." The remarks of Gunkel¹²⁾ on this passage are interesting. He suggests that the God with whom Jacob fought is the spirit of the

12. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 231f: "Ganz eigentuemlich ist die Art dieses Gottes. Er ist ein den Menschen feindliches Wesen, das hier an der Furt des Jabbok am Wege lauert, den arglosen Wanderer ueberfaellt, und auf Leben und Tod mit ihm ringt. Vielleicht duerfen wir uns vorstellen, dass er das Numen des Flusses ist und dem Jakob zuernt, weil er seine Furt ueberschreitet. Die Kraft des Gottes haben wir uns groesser als die der gewoehlichen Menschenkinder, aber doch auch nicht allzugross zu denken: durch Jakobs gewaltigen Schlag wird er gebaendigt. Zu seiner wilden Mordlust passt seine lichtscheue Art: er muss mit der Nacht verschwinden. Sein Name wird nicht genannt. Jahve ist dieser Gott jedenfalls nicht; Jahveh ist ja der Gott, der Jakob liebt und ihm hilft. Diese Gottesfigur ist ein bedeutender Beitrag fuer unser Wissen ueber die vorisraelitische, durch den Jahve-Galuben zu-raeckgedraengte Religion. Als Parallele hierzu koennten wir an-fuehren die Sage von Menelaos, der den Meergreis Proteus so lange festgehalten, bis er ihm sein Wissen offenbarte."

stream, certainly not Jehovah, since this deity was hostile to Jacob while Jehovah favored him. The thought requires no refutation.

At the close of his life Jacob refers to the Angel of the Lord while blessing the sons of Joseph, (Gen. 48, 15f). He identifies Him with the God of his fathers, Abraham and Isaac, bears witness that it was He who preserved him all his days, and puts his trust in Him as his Redeemer. In Ex. 3, 2ff the Angel of the Lord appeared to Moses at the burning bush. When Moses turned aside to see the great sight, it was Jehovah Himself who spoke to him and called him to be the leader of Israel. According to Ex. 13, 21 it was Jehovah who went before Israel when they left Egypt, while Ex. 14, 19 states that it was the Angel of the Lord. God later promises his people that He will bring them into the promised land by the hand of His Angel (Ex. 23, 20ff); and warns them to be obedient to Him. for Jehovah's name is in Him. This passage again clearly shows the distinction of persons along side of the closest unity in essence or being. The Angel of the Lord who appeared to Balaam in the way (Num. 22, 22-35) is undoubtedly Jehovah Himself. This seems to be indicated in the first place by the fact, that the name occurs some ten times in exactly the same form. A comparison of verses 20, 35, and 38 proves it conclusively. Verse 20 we read that the Lord appeared to Balaam at night and warned him not to speak any word which he had not received from God. In verse 35 it is the Angel of the Lord who enjoins him to speak only His words, and in verse 38 Balaam tells Balak: "The word that God putteth in my mouth, that shall I speak."

These remarks are sufficient to show the identity of the Angel of the Lord and Jehovah, and the passages which indicate a distinction of persons are supported by Mal. 3, 1, which definitely represents the Angel of the Lord as the second person of the Godhead, the Messiah. While it is probably asserting too much if we say, that the early Hebrews had a clear conception of the Trinity, there is every reason to believe that the germ of the idea was there.

A later, extra-biblical term to express the relation of Jehovah to the world and His revelation to Israel is the word "Shekinah." It is derived from שׁוּב , "to dwell," and denotes the dwelling of God among the children of Israel, His visible presence among them.¹³⁾ The term is first found in the Targums, where it is used to stress the immanent activity of God as opposed to the Alexandrine doctrine of a supramundane deity. An example or two from the Targums will serve best to explain its use. The words Gen. 9, 27: "God shall dwell in the tents of Shem," are interpreted by Onkelos thus: "God shall make His Shekinah to dwell in the tents of Shem." In Ex. 25, 8 the Hebrew reads: "Let them make me a sanctuary, that I may dwell (אֶשְׁבֵּט) among them," while Onkelos has: "I will make my Shekinah to dwell among them." Thus we may infer that the Targums used the word Shekinah as a synonym or periphrase for God, whenever He is said to dwell among His people, e.g. between the cherubim in the Tabernacle. The idea which Scripture conveys to us of

13. Luther, III, 885.

the Shekinah is that of a most brilliant and glorious light enveloped and usually concealed by a cloud, so that the could itself was for the most part alone visible, the glory appearing only on particular occasions. From Gen. 3, 24 Oehler¹⁴⁾ concludes that the first abode of the Shekinah was the garden of Eden. He evidently believes the etymological meaning of "cherubim" to be "covering clouds,"¹⁵⁾ and therefore identifies them with the Shekinah. But this derivation is not warranted by the lexicons, and, furthermore, God stationed the cherubim on the eastern side of Paradise not to inhabit the garden, but "to keep the way of the tree of life." It is possible that Gen. 15, 17 records the first appearance of the Shekinah. As in later times the Glory of the Lord was hid by the bush and by the cloud, so here it appears enveloped in a furnace, a cylindrical fire-pot. In fact the Jewish Synagogue has interpreted all the passages which we considered in the foregoing paragraph as manifestations of the Shekinah.¹⁶⁾ When the Israelites left Egypt the Angel of the Lord went before them by day in a pillar of cloud, and by night in a pillar of fire. This was undoubtedly but one pillar, the cloud being the covering of the fire. In this cloud Jehovah, or the Angel of the Lord was really present with Israel, (Ex. 14, 19; 13, 21), so that He spoke with Moses and gave him commandments out of the cloud. In this, too, appeared the "Glory of the Lord," (Ex. 16, 10), the

14. Oehler, *ibid.* p. 137.

15. Goldziher, *ibid.* p. 196: "Kerubh originally denotes the covering cloud."

16. Edersheim, *Bible History*, vol. I, p. 71.

Shekinah of the later Jewish theology. From the day of the completion of the Tabernacle the Shekinah dwelt within it. Ex. 40, 34 tells us that the cloud--namely the one in which Jehovah had hitherto been present with His people--covered the Tabernacle and the Glory of the Lord filled it. Jehovah that day filled the entire sanctuary with the cloud, so that Moses could not enter. Later on, the cloud was confined to the most holy place, to dwell there above the outspread wings of the cherubim of the ark of the Covenant. Here Moses pleaded for the people, here he spoke with Jehovah "face to face, as a man talketh with his friend," here "he heard the voice of one speaking unto him from off the mercy seat that was upon the ark of testimony, from between the two cherubims." The Glory of God was not habitually seen by Moses or the people, but occasionally it flashed forth from the cloud which concealed it, (Es. 16, 7; Lev. 9, 6. 23). On the day of the dedication of Solomon's Temple the Shekinah passed into this new sanctuary, where it remained until the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple by the Chaldeans. Like the ark of the Covenant and the Urim and Thummim it was wanting in the second Temple. In the New Testament we are reminded of the Shekinah by references to the dwelling of the eternal Logos in our midst (John 1, 14: ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν).

The ark of the Covenant was another vehicle of Jehovah's revelation. Together with the capporeth or mercy seat, the ark was the throne of Jehovah in the midst of His chosen people, the footstool of the God of Israel. We have already rejected the absurd claim of

the critics, that the ark was a kind of fetish-chest, in which Jehovah was thought to be carried about. Kuenen's view,¹⁷⁾ that "the Pentateuch gives us a later conception of the ark, which cannot have been completely constructed until after the Babylonish exile," is without a single historical evidence. The ark was a box of an oblong shape, made of shittim wood, a cubit and half broad and two and a half cubits long. It was covered on all sides with pure gold and decorated with a golden border. At each of the four corners it had a golden ring, through which were passed the gold covered poles by which the ark was carried. The cover was a massive golden plate, at the ends of which two cherubim were placed, facing each other and inclined a little towards the lid, over which their wings were spread out. The contents of the ark were the two tables of stone and most likely also the pot of manna and Aaron's rod. From the beginning the lid of the ark, the capporeth, was the most important part of it. While the tables of the Law within the ark reminded the Israelites of their sins, the capporeth or mercy seat assured them that their sins were atoned for.¹⁸⁾ We shall come back to this when we speak of the sacrificial system and atonement. Here at the mercy seat God promised to reveal His Word to the Covenant people and here He would hear their prayers.¹⁹⁾ This was the footstool of the throne for Him, who

17. Kuenen, *ibid.* p. 233.

18. Stoeckhardt, *Biblische Geschichte*, A.T., p. 98.

19. Luther, IV, 2933: "Gott hat durch sein Wort angezeigt, dass er da sein und daselbst die Gebete seines Volkes hoeren werde."
Cf. Ex. 25, 22; 30, 6; Num. 7, 89.

caused His name to dwell in a cloud between the two cherubim above their outspread wings.

In the New Testament the Lord reveals Himself to man principally by His Spirit, and Pentecost Day showed that this is preeminently a gift of God to the Church of Christ. Nevertheless, we know that this form of revelation was already used by Jehovah in His dealings with patriarchs and the Covenant nation. Pharaoh saw that the supernatural insight and wisdom of Joseph was the work of the Spirit of God dwelling in him, (Gen. 41, 38). The marvellous workmanship displayed by the tabernacle and all its parts was not due alone to the natural or acquired skill of the craftsmen, but was above all the work of God's Spirit, who is the source of all extraordinary powers or capacities. Ex. 31, 3 tells us that Bezaleel, the skillful artificer, was filled with the Spirit of God. Being thus endowed with supernatural gifts, he was able "to devise cunning works, to work in gold, and in silver, and in brass." In Num. 11, 17ff we read that the Spirit of God bestowed on Moses and the seventy elders skill to guide the people. As a manifestation of the fact that Jehovah had endowed them with His Spirit, "they prophesied, and did not cease," (v. 25). Even Balaam received the Spirit of God and the ability to prophecy, so that he became a medium of revelation, although contrary to his will, (Num. 24, 2; cf. 22, 38).

The forms of revelation discussed in the preceding paragraphs may all be classified as miracles. Revelation is itself a miracle, its object being to tell us things which we could not otherwise know.

Without such miraculous revelation there could be only natural religion, since no man can of his own power or experience know the nature of God of His revelation to the world. But in another sense the Old Testament understands by miracles the revelation of divine power in nature, or in history. We find that such miracles usually occur when the point in question is to give testimony for the reality of Jehovah, the God of Israel, in opposition to the false gods of the heathen, which are "nothing in the world." In most cases man is the agency by which these miracles are wrought. The patriarchs evidently were not endowed with this gift, but Moses and Aaron performed scores of miracles in Egypt as well as in the wilderness. Oehler²⁰) divides the miracles of the Old Testament into two classes, positive and negative, according to their different names or designations. He says: "The most general expression חֲזָקָה , חֲזָקוֹת , from חָזַק , to select, characterizes miracle in its negative aspect, as an occurrence withdrawn from the common course of things, and thus an extraordinary occurrence. In the New Testament this negative characteristic of a miracle is denoted by the expression τέρας . The positive side of a miracle is expressed in the term קִרְוֵי עֲזָרָה (mighty deeds), corresponding to the New Testament δυνάμεις , that is, indications of divine power, side by side with which there appears the more general emphatic expression ΠΡΟΪΣΤΗΤΕΙΑ , or more frequently ΜΕΓΑΛΕΥΤΕΡΑ , great deeds, corresponding to ἐργα in John. According to this, a miracle would mainly be

20. Oehler, *ibid.* p. 139.

a divine act of power, exempt from the common course of nature and history." The division is justifiable especially in regard to the etymology of the different words. On the other hand, it would seem that all the names have a negative character, since they are all designations of irregular phenomena, out of harmony with the laws of nature. They are all supernatural signs which serve a definite purpose of God. The design of the many miracles which Moses performed in Egypt is stated Ex. 7, 5: "And the Egyptians shall know that I am the Lord," (cf. Ex. 8, 10), also Ex. 9, 16: "That my name may be declared throughout all the earth," and Ex. 10, 2: "That thou (Moses) mayest tell in the ears of thy son, and of thy son's son, what things I have wrought in Egypt, and my signs which I have done among them; that ye may know how that I am the Lord," (Cf. Ex. 19, 4ff). When the earth opened and swallowed up Korah and his band of rebels, (Num. 16, 28ff), it was the aim of the miracle to show that Moses was sent by the Lord. The miraculous budding of Aaron's rod, (Num. 17, 1ff), was to counteract any further murmuring of the people against his priesthood. Thus we might continue throughout the Old Testament. Wherever a miracle was performed, God made known His power for the purposes of His kingdom. At every occurrence the impression was conveyed: "This is the finger of God," (Ex. 8, 19).

These manifestations of God were general and public and could be seen by all the people in their natural waking condition. It was usually different when a man received a direct or personal revelation

from God. The Lord says Num. 12, 6: "If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream." The only exception to this rule was Moses with whom the Lord spoke mouth to mouth and face to face (Num. 12, 7.8). Moses saw the $\text{ה' יי} \text{ו} \text{ה'}$ of Jehovah while the other prophets saw Him in $\text{ה' 7} \text{~} \text{ה'}$. This was one of the distinctive peculiarities of Moses, which made him a type of that Prophet "like unto him," (Deut. 18, 15ff). In all other instances of God's extraordinary, immediate communications to men, we read that they were given by means of visions or dreams. To Abraham the Lord spoke in a vision (Gen. 15), and also to Jacob at Beersheba (Gen. 46). Abimelech was warned by God in a dream to restore unto Abraham his wife (Gen. 20, 3ff). On his way to Mesopotamia Jacob saw in a dream a ladder reaching to heaven, and received from God the blessing of Abraham (Gen. 28, 12). By means of a dream the Lord also revealed to Joseph his future station of honor (Gen. 37, 6ff).

A word might be said about the difference between these two physical states in which men received revelations. Luther²¹⁾ says: "Visions and dreams are one and the same." A slight difference, however, can be made. In a dream the perceptive faculties of the mind, the sensational powers and imagination, are active, while the reflective powers are generally asleep. In a vision (which may be had asleep or awake) even the reflective powers seem to be active (cf. Gen. 15). A stricter definition of visions also implies a state of transport or ecstasy.

21. Luther, VI, 1593: "Weissagung, Gesicht, Traeume sind eins und dasselbe."

IV.

The God of Salvation.

The whole course of Sacred History implies a continual agency of God to bring man back to the Paradise he has lost. In the Old Testament as well as in the New this was to be accomplished by means of a covenant between God and man. We know that the New Testament Covenant was made with all nations on the basis of Christ's salvation, which in the fulness of time had actually been accomplished. It was not so in the Old Testament. Here God chose one particular people as the Covenant nation. Israel alone was known by God of all families of the earth, (Amos 3, 2), every revelation of God clustered round that nation, and amid all the vicissitudes and dangers of life it was preserved and directed until finally the great Prophet was born and salvation issued from its midst.

Fowler¹⁾ and many other critics hold that the Covenant between God and the Hebrews was not made until after the Exodus. But this position is untenable also for the critic. He may reject the testimony of the early records, but what will he do with such later texts as Micah 7, 20? Even Kuenen²⁾ admits that the bond between Jehovah and Israel must have been prepared before their deliverance out of Egypt. The narratives which tell of the calling of Abraham to be

1. Fowler calls the deliverance from Egypt the birthday of the Hebrew faith. Fowler, Origin and Growth, p. 23.26.

2. Kuenen, ibid. p. 101.

the ancestor of a chosen race are not mere myths, the product of national vanity, but indisputable facts confirmed throughout the Scriptures by God Himself.

Sitting almost in the shadow of the famed temple of the Moon-god at Ur, and surrounded by a thousand solicitations to Akkadian magic Abraham was inspired to leave that country and move to Haran. Here the Lord appeared unto him and commanded him to part with all that was naturally dear to him and settle in another land. Palestine was selected to be a nursery to the Kingdom of God. At the same time Abraham received the glorious promise that he was to be the father of a great nation and that in his seed all the nations of the earth would be blessed. From then on Abraham experienced the mercy and loving kindness of God in all his dealings. He was blessed with a wealth of earthly goods, he found favor with Pharaoh and Abimelech, and he gained a victory over Chedorlaomer, the powerful king of the East. But in spite of all this the heart of Abraham was sad, for he was still childless and the promise of a large posterity had yet to be fulfilled. To this may have been added fear and dread of the vengeance of Chedorlaomer. The Lord, therefore, appeared unto him and encouraged him with the words: "Fear not Abram: I am thy shield and thy exceeding great reward." He then showed him the stars of heaven and assured him: "So shall thy seed be." Abraham believed the words of the Lord, but required a sign, a confirmation of the promise, and the Lord gratified his request by commanding him to make preparation for the conclusion of a covenant.

A heifer, a goat, and a ram were cut in half lengthwise and the several pieces laid over against one another; also a turtle-dove and a young pigeon were placed in the group. These animals represented Abraham and his seed, not in the fact that they were slaughtered, but only in what happened to them after they had been laid in order. When birds of prey came down to feed on the carcasses, Abraham drove them off, and when extreme darkness came on, the Glory of the Lord passed through them. The birds of prey represent the foes of Israel, who would seek to exterminate it. But as Abraham drove the birds away, so the Lord would deliver His people Israel for the sake of the promise made to Abraham. The great darkness pointed to the severity of the miseries and tribulations which would strike Israel, but even as the Glory of the Lord passed between the halves of the animals so God would not forsake His people in the dark and dreadful periods of its history. Thus God accommodated Himself to human customs and made a covenant with Abraham to assure him that all the promises he had received would certainly be fulfilled. His seed would be without number, it would inherit all the country from the river of Egypt unto the Euphrates, and he himself would be a blessing unto all nations, for of his seed the Messiah would be born, the Savior of the World.

The Lord was ever mindful of His Covenant. He renewed it with Isaac and with Jacob, and remembered it when Israel was in Egypt. With a mighty arm He led His people out of the house of bondage and, in spite of their murmuring and dissatisfaction, their sins and hard-

heartedness, He did not reject them, but again renewed His Covenant with them on the basis of the Law.

The moral law, which is contained in the Decalogue, was given as binding upon men of all ages. But the Jews received other laws, which, like the Covenant promises, were calculated to separate them from all the nations of the earth. These were the ceremonial laws. Like the nature and position of the promised land, these laws were intended to preserve in purity the true religion of Israel amid the darkness of heathenism, until the time should come for the gathering in of all nations to enjoy the blessing promised to Abraham. Among these ordinances which made of Israel a peculiar people two are especially emphasized, namely, circumcision and the Sabbath. Circumcision was the main sign of the Covenant, the constant symbol of Covenant obligations and Covenant rights. It was already prescribed to Abraham, (Gen. 17, 11). Every new-born boy as well as all strangers who were received into the nation had to be circumcised. Kuenen calls it something entirely adventitious and cannot see why this particular ceremony was to serve as a token of the Covenant between Jehovah and Abraham together with his descendants. From the incident of Zipporah's circumcision of her son he derives the notion, that it was originally a bloody sacrifice³⁾ to propitiate Jahveh. In later times he supposes that its meaning was modified and that it

3. "Daumer as usual goes further and maintains that circumcision was only a milder substitution of castration, and refers to such a custom among the Hottentots." Robertson, p. 250.

was then looked upon as purification by which the Israelite was rendered fit to draw near to Jahveh.⁴⁾ But the fact that Kuenen cannot understand its import says nothing, and we have already explained Ex. 4, 24ff. It is possible that circumcision was practised in other tribes before it was introduced among the descendants of Abraham,⁵⁾ but that certainly does not keep us from regarding it as a distinctive Hebrew rite. Other nations may have regarded it as a hygienic measure but for Israel it was the sign of the Covenant, which declared that the propagation of the Covenant race was to be consecrated to God.

The Sabbath, too, was declared by God to be a sign between Him and the nation of His choice, (Ex. 31, 13). Many seek to find the origin of the institution in Paradise, but while we read, that God blessed and hallôwed the seventh day, there was no express command regarding it until after the Exodus, (Ex. 16, 5.22-30). Critics generally regard it to be of Babylonian origin, since it is certain that the Babylonians observed the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-first, and twenty-eighth day of the lunar month. Paton calls the Sabbath a Babylonian taboo day.⁶⁾ Prof. Clay, however, has pointed out that the Hebrew Sabbath had nothing in common with the Babylonian. He says: "The Babylonian Sabbath was not a day of rest for the common

4. Kuenen, *ibid.* p. 238.

5. Fowler, *ibid.* p. 10.

6. Paton, *ibid.* p. 18. Fowler, *ibid.* p. 31.

~~7. Clay, *Light on the O. T.*, p. 15f.~~

people, but was observed, as far as we know, only by the king and his officials; when they were prohibited from eating meat that had touched the fire; when they could not change their garments, dress in white, offer sacrifices, mount a chariot, pronounce judgment, or the physician touch a sick man."⁷⁾ In Israel, on the other hand, the Sabbath was a day of rest for all the people, a day on which all were set free from the labors, the cares, and the burdens of this life, that they might withdraw their souls from the influences of earthly occupations and by earnest meditation on the Law of the Lord be edified and quickened. The day was also marked by increased or doubled offerings, and by the providing of a new shew-bread in the holy place. From Ex. 20, 11 and Deut. 5, 15 we learn that the Sabbath was founded partly on God's resting after His creation of the world and partly on the redemption of Israel from the bondage of Egypt. It was the type of another Sabbath, and taught the people to look upward and onward to that day of rest which God has prepared for the elect.

The eternal Sabbath of God was the goal of every Israelite; but before he could hope to reach it, his sins and transgressions had to be atoned for. This was done in the fullness of time, when Christ bore the sins of the world on the cross. The people of the Old Covenant looked forward to this event, and were saved by faith in the coming Messiah. In the meantime, however, they had the shadow, the

7. Clay, Light on the O. T., p. 15f.

type of the good things which were to come, God Himself pointed out to them and sanctioned the way by which sin should be removed from the nation and the broken Covenant restored. In the minutest detail He prescribed for them a system of sacrifices which typified that atonement of Christ. These Old Testament sacrifices are a kind of material prophecy which like the word of promise foretold the suffering and death of the incarnate Son of God for the sins of the world.⁸⁾ In this idea of the Old Testament sacrifice lies its chief distinction from heathen customs which were outwardly very similar. While the heathen believed that the sacrifice itself averted the wrath of the gods and gained their favor, the Hebrews regarded it as a prefiguration of that one atoning sacrifice by which sin was put away forever, (Heb. 10).

The Day of Atonement.

The supreme act of the Old Testament sacrificial cultus was the sin-offering on the Great Day of Atonement, which took place on the tenth day of the seventh month (Tishri). This day was a high Sabbath for all Israel, a day on which they were commanded to set aside all work and "to afflict their souls," under pain of being "cut off from among the people." It was on this occasion only that the high-priest was permitted to enter the Holy of Holies. Having bathed his body

8. F. Pieper, Dogmatik, II, p. 454: "Man hat die alttestamentlichen Opfer passend eine Realweissagung genannt."

and put on the holy garments⁹⁾ especially prescribed for this service, he presented for himself and the whole priesthood a bullock for a sin-offering and a ram for a burnt offering, which he purchased at his own cost. For the congregation he presented two goats for a sin-offering and a ram for a burnt-offering. These were paid for out of the public treasury. Over the two goats he cast lots before the door of the Tabernacle, one for Jehovah and one for Azazel, (Lev. 16, 8). The goat which fell by lot to Jehovah was sacrificed as a sin-offering. The other, on which the lot for Azazel fell was presented¹⁰⁾ alive before Jehovah to be sent into the wilderness, after atonement had been made. Hereupon the high-priest sacrificed the bullock for himself and his family. Taking with him some of the blood of the bullock, he filled a censer with burning coals, took a handful of incense and entered the most holy place. He then threw the incense on the burning coals before Jehovah and enveloped the mercy seat in a cloud of smoke. Then, dipping his fingers in the

9. Edersheim, The Temple, p. 305: "The high-priest was arrayed in a peculiar white dress, which differed from the of the ordinary priests, in that its girdle also was white, and not of the Temple colors, while the 'bonnet' was of the same shape though not of the same material as the 'mitre,' which the high-priest ordinarily wore."

10. Edersheim, The Temple, p. 312: "The goat that was to be sent forth was turned round towards the people, and stood facing them, waiting, as it were, till their sins should be laid on him, and he would carry them forth into 'a land not inhabited.' Assuredly a more marked type of Christ could not be conceived, as He was brought forth by Pilate and stood before the people, just as He was about to be led forth, bearing the iniquity of the people?"

blood, he sprinkled it on the mercy seat and before it seven times. The goat upon which the lot for Jehovah had fallen was now killed and its blood sprinkled on the capporeth in the same manner. Thus atonement was made for the Holy of Holies. By the sprinkling of blood the high-priest also purified the holy place and the altar of the court. This being completed, he laid his hands on the goat for Azazel, confessed over it all the sins of the people, and sent it away into the wilderness by a man chosen for the purpose. After this the high-priest bathed himself again, put on his usual garments of office, and completed his own and the people's burnt offering in the court. Both of the sin-offerings were carried away and burned outside the camp. The feast was closed with the offering of a goat as sin-offering, a bullock, a ram, and seven lambs as burnt-offerings.

On this day the Old Testament provision for pardon reached its climax. The central services consisted of a series of grand expiatory sacrifices, unique in their character, purpose and results, as described Lev. 16, 33: "He shall make an atonement for the holy sanctuary, and he shall make an atonement for the tabernacle of the congregation, and for the altar, and he shall make an atonement for the priest, and for all the people of the congregation." The atoning acts of this day had for their objects complete atonement, not only for the transgressions which had remained unatoned for in the course of the year, but for all sins and misdeeds, whether already atoned for or not, and also for the expiation of the sanctuary and altars. The need of such a Day of Atonement, after the daily offerings, the

various festive sacrifices, and the private and public sin-offerings all the year round, showed the insufficiency of all such sacrifices. But even the offerings of the Day of Atonement, which had to be repeated every year, proclaimed themselves to be only temporary and provisional, merely typical of something infinitely greater. Three rites of the day appear to be of very distinctive character: the white garments of the high-priest, his entrance into the Holy of Holies, and the rites connected with the two goats. The simple white of the high-priest's array, in distinction to the "golden garments" which he otherwise wore, pointed to the fact that on that day the high-priest appeared as bearing in his official capacity the emblem of that perfect purity which was sought by the expiation of that day. It was a symbolical shadowing forth of the holiness and glory of the one perfect Mediator between God and man, who, being the radiation of the glory of God and the image of His nature, effected by Himself the perfect cleansing away of our sin, and who, as the true High Priest, being holy, innocent, unspotted, and separate from sinners, entered once by His own blood into the holy place not made with hands, namely, into heaven itself, to appear before the face of God for us, and obtain everlasting redemption, (Heb. 1, 3; 7, 26; 9, 12.24). The meaning of the rite connected with the goats depends on the correct understanding of the term אֲזָזֵל (for Azazel). The explanations of the name Azazel are many and strange. Some hold that it is to be identified with the scapegoat itself, but the Hebrew אֲזָזֵל will not permit this interpretation. Keil takes

Azazel to be a demon of the wilderness, Satan himself.¹¹⁾ But the text contains nothing in favor of this view; it is strange and forced. In accordance with the significance of the Day of Atonement, as well as with the etymology of the word, (from עָזַז , to depart, go away), we hold that the best interpretation is "the Remover."¹²⁾ It is the Messiah who is typified by both goats. The one represents Him as the Lamb brought to the slaughter, and the other as a man of sorrows, despised and rejected, who has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows.

This comforting idea that God had provided Salvation for His people in a coming Redeemer runs like a golden thread through all the books of the Old Testament. Like a trickling stream the glorious promise took its rise in Eden on the day when sin first broke the harmony between God and man, then gradually grew in depth and volume with the passing centuries until it became a mighty river of blessing, a glorious gospel of hope that cheered the faithful in earlier ages. The first Gospel, (Protevangelium, Gen. 3), told them that the Messiah, who would gain the victory over Satan, was to be born of woman, a human being. According to the blessing of Noah He would be born of

11. Keil, Biblical Archaeology, II, p. 43f: "Azazel is a spiritual personality, in contrast to Jehovah, who must be thought of as dwelling in the wilderness, the habitation of demons and impure beings. He must belong to the kingdom of evil-spirits, and that not as a subordinate demon, but as the ruler of the kingdom of the demons, that evil spirit who is afterwards called Satan."

12. J. T. Mueller, Theol. Quart. Vol. XXIV, p. 10ff.

Shem and his posterity, (Gen. 9). Gen. 12 the family of Abraham is chosen out of all the Semitic tribes to be the bearer of the Messianic promise, and in Gen. 49 Judah is selected out of the twelve tribes of Israel. This progressive unfolding of the plan of salvation is continued throughout the Old Testament until Malachi, the last of the prophets, sees the morning dawn, which announces a glorious day.

We have thus endeavored to present Israel's early conception of God. The critical theories have been tried and found wanting. They are weak and instead of going to the core of the matter, they harp on external details. At times we were grieved by the blasphemous assertions of men, who refuse to bend their way to embrace plain facts; then again the naive and arbitrary interpretations of Gunkel and Goldziher have interested and amused us. Nothing that science or criticism could suggest has succeeded in disproving a single sentence of God's early records. Our position has rather been confirmed and strengthened. The critics have not only failed, but by their failure they have testified to the infallibility of Scripture. Instead of representing the fanaticism of prophets or the frauds of priests, the Pentateuch is the divinely inspired work of Moses. His account of Israel's religion is true and will stand forever amid the countless failures of criticism and pretended science.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- Brace, C. Loving, The Unknown God.
- Breasted, James, The History of Egypt.
- Budde, Karl, The Religion of Israel to the Exile.
- Conder, Col. C. R., The Rise of Man.
- Clay, Albert, Light on the Old Testament from Babel.
- Driver, Genesis.
- Green, W. H., Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch.
- Green, W. H., The Unity of Genesis.
- Goldziher, Ignaz, Mythology among the Hebrews, and its Historical Development.
- Gunkel, H., Die Schriften des Alten Testaments. (Genesis).
- Edersheim, A., Bible History.
- Edersheim, A., The Temple.
- Fowler, H. T., The Origin and Growth of the Hebrew Religion.
- Griffiths, The Problem of Deuteronomy.
- Higgins, Elford, Hebrew Idolatry and Superstition.
- Huxley, T. H., Science and Hebrew Tradition.
- Jastrow, Morris, Hebrew and Babylonian Traditions.
- Jeremias, Alfred, Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients.
- Keil, C. F., Commentary on the Pentateuch.
- Keil, C. F., Biblical Archaeology.
- Kurtz, J., History of the Old Covenant.
- Koenig, Eduard, Theologie des Alten Testaments.
- Koenig, Eduard, Genesis.

Kuenen, A., The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State, Volume I.

Luther, Martin, Volumes I, II, III, and VI.

Lange, Commentary on Genesis.

Oehler, G. F., Theology of the Old Testament.

Orr, James, The problem of the Old Testament.

Paton, L. B., The Early Religion of Israel.

Neville, Edouard, Archaeology of the Old Testament.

Pieper, Dr. F., Christliche Dogmatik. Volume II.

Stoeckhardt, Dr. G., Biblische Geschichte des Alten Testaments.

Sanders, F., History of the Hebrews.

Robertson, J., The Early Religion of Israel.

Tomkins, Abraham and His Age.

Rogers, Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament.

Kretzmann, Dr. P., Commentaries.

Mc Clintock and Strong Encyclopedia.

Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia.

International Standard.