

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 17—January, 1894.

I.

THE FUTURE OF CALVINISM.*

THE year 1892 was a year of great importance for the Reformed Churches of the Netherlands. Two influential groups of Churches, both originating in a secession from the Established Church, the one in 1834, the other in 1886, were, after long negotiations, brought together, and in June of that year held their "First General Synod of the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands." For various reasons this event has excited considerable interest. It was something unforeseen and unexpected. Both groups, to be sure, were one in their confession and form of government, and both shared the conviction that a Reformed Christian was in duty bound to his Bible and his confession to break with the Established Church. Still, concerning "the method of reformation," *i. e.*, the manner in which this breach ought to be brought about, there existed an appreciable difference of opinion. This difference in method gave rise to the different attitudes which the two sides assumed in relation to the property of the Established Church and the civil authorities. The Christian Reformed Church, originating in the secession of 1834, had gradually come to consider itself as an entirely new Church, and as having broken off all connection with both the governing bodies and the individual members of the establishment. Consequently it raised no claim in the civil courts to retain or recover the property of the Established Church, and presented itself to the civil authorities as a new and different organization. On the other hand, the so-called

* [Our readers are indebted to Prof. G. Vos, Ph.D., D.D., of Princeton Seminary, for the translation of Dr. Bavinck's paper.—EDITORS.]

V.

CRITICAL VIEWS RESPECTING THE MOSAIC TABERNACLE.

EX. XXV-XXXI contain detailed directions given by the Lord to Moses on Mount Sinai respecting the construction of the Tabernacle or the tent of meeting and the ark of the covenant, the table of shewbread, the ephod and other sacred articles. In chaps. xxxv-xl it is related that all these things were made in precise accordance with the divine directions. The critics challenge the correctness of these statements. Thus Dr. Briggs* alleges that "the ark of the covenant and the tent of meeting" spoken of in the time of the Judges "are different from these things as represented in the Priest code." He also says in relation to the ark of the covenant, the tent of meeting, the shewbread and ephod spoken of in the time of Samuel, that "these are sacred things of the Priest code; they imply a use of these things at this time, but do not imply a use of the Priest code; for they are in a different form and of a different character from that in which they appear in the Priest code," that is to say, in the chapters of Exodus above referred to. The meaning of this is that the primitive form of these articles, as shown by the books of Judges and of Samuel does not tally with the description given of them in Exodus. They were not really made as there described, but were of a different form and character. The Mosaic Tabernacle could only have been a simple tent affording shelter for the ark. It was not such an elaborate building, of such rich materials and so profusely decorated as it is represented to have been. And yet the materials contributed by the people for the construction of this building and its furniture are recited in detail. The leading architects are mentioned by name and their pedigree given. It is stated upon what day the work was completed, and the building finished in all its parts. The effulgence of the divine glory is said to have filled it at the time of its dedication. Various services are described, which were actually held in this Tabernacle. Two of Aaron's sons perished there for offering strange fire before the Lord. The arrangements of the camp were made with reference to it. It was set up in the centre and three tribes encamped on each

* *The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch*, pp. 112, 113.

of its four sides, the precise position of each tribe being definitely fixed. The families of the Levites were grouped about it in a prescribed order. The number of wagons and oxen provided for its transportation, the persons charged with the work of taking it down and setting it up, when Israel journeyed from place to place, the method to be observed in wrapping up and guarding the sacred vessels, and the position which they were to take in the line of march are all minutely specified. If the assertion of the critics is true, this is all a fabrication. Let us examine the grounds on which this assertion rests.

The shallow objection of Vater* and De Wette† to the historical character of the Mosaic Tabernacle is scarcely worth repeating. They urge that a nation of slaves just escaping from the bondage of Egypt would not possess the wealth nor the skill nor the leisure to construct such an edifice as is described in Ex. xxv, *seq.*, of such costly materials and so artistically wrought. It is sufficient to refer to the valuables, which were lavished upon them when they left Egypt (Ex. xii. 35, 36); to the fact that the arts employed in making the Tabernacle had been practiced for ages in Egypt from which they had come; and to the further consideration that fully seven months were spent upon the Tabernacle from the time that it was begun until it was finished, Israel being all the while encamped at the base of Sinai.

An argument upon which recent critics lay great stress is drawn from their partition of the Pentateuch. They find, as they suppose, conflicting accounts of the time when the Tabernacle was built, its location and the purpose to which it was devoted. Thus it is alleged that Ex. xxxiii. 1-11 contains a narrative of the departure from Sinai and the erection of the Tabernacle which does not agree with statements made elsewhere. This passage is ascribed to E, the Elohist, who is distinguished from J, the Jehovist, and from P, the author of the Priest code, to whom the Levitical institutions and the ceremonial laws generally are referred. R, the Redactor, has mutilated this passage by striking out some things which the critics are very anxious to find in it, and which they contend must have been in it originally; and he has also inserted it in a context, with which it has no proper coherence, and which imparts to it a sense that cannot be made subservient to the will of the critics, and could not as they claim have been intended by the original writer. When these supposed omissions have been supplied, the proper emendations made, and the passage is regarded in what the critics consider its true light, it will be found to be at variance with P's account of the same matters.

* *Commentar über den Pentateuch*, iii, p. 658.

† *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das A. T.*, i, p. 259.

The critics are unanimously of the opinion that in E's account Israel's abode at Sinai terminates at this point. The people have received the law recorded in Ex. xx-xxiii, and E knows of no further revelation there made. They now leave Sinai and proceed on their march to Canaan. The reason why they are now required to leave it is differently viewed by different critics.

Knobel does not venture to sunder it altogether from the immediately preceding context, and so finds the reason of their departure in the sin of the golden calf. God will not suffer such transgressors to remain longer at this sacred mountain, which was Jehovah's seat, and where He had revealed Himself to Israel in such a transcendently glorious manner. He accordingly directs Moses to lead them away and take them on to Canaan. Nothing is said, to be sure, of their actual departure; but this, we are told, is to be presumed. It must have been stated in E's account, but the Redactor has omitted it.

Dillmann is more thoroughgoing. He severs the passage entirely from both the preceding and the following context, and insists that it bears no relation whatever to the sin of the golden calf, of which E makes no mention, and to which he could not therefore refer in this place. The people are simply directed to leave Sinai because the purpose for which they came thither was now accomplished. They were there to receive God's laws; He had already given these to them (Ex. xx-xxiii); consequently they were now prepared to move on towards Canaan. In order to obtain this sense he finds it necessary to expunge from the text all allusions to their recent sin as interpolations by R, and introduced in order to harmonize it with its present connection. He thus rids himself of ver. 3, in which the Lord says, "I will not go up in the midst of thee; for thou art a stiff-necked people; lest I consume thee in the way;" and of words to the same purport in ver. 5, "Ye are a stiff-necked people; if I go up into the midst of thee for one moment, I shall consume thee." The clauses thus summarily ejected from the text are declared to be inconsistent with ver. 2. God there says that He will send an angel before them to lead them into Canaan and drive out its inhabitants before them; and how can He have added in the very same context that He will not go with the people Himself? In Ex. xxiii. 20-22, where a like promise is given, the presence of God's angel is equivalent to His own. The obvious answer is that there is no discrepancy, but simply a distinction. A different angel is meant and one differently empowered; not an angel having God's name in him, in whom dwells all the fullness of the Godhead, but an angel of another rank, whose presence can be contrasted with the divine presence, and the former promised while the latter is refused.

Ver. 4 also needs to be remodeled. "And when the people heard these evil tidings they mourned; and no man did put on him his ornaments." The word "evil" here is suspicious, as suggestive of the withdrawal of God's favor on account of their sin. Everything that points in that direction is most carefully weeded out of the text. The way is now cleared for asserting that the mourning of the people is not in penitence for their sin, nor on account of the Lord's refusal to accompany them further, but from regret at being obliged to leave this sacred mountain, where they had seen such displays of divine power and glory. It would seem to require all a critic's acumen to discover any cause of regret under the circumstances supposed. If the purpose for which they diverged to Sinai was now accomplished, and the Lord whose presence had made Sinai glorious was to go with them on the march, how could it occasion the slightest regret that they were now to move onward to Canaan, the goal of their hopes? But we are told there is still further evidence in the last clause that ver. 4 has been worked over so as to obscure its original sense. Not putting on their ornaments there appears to be spontaneous and a sign of grief. But this cannot have been E's meaning. He must have said, what the critics wish him to say, that these ornaments were by divine command contributed for the construction of the Tabernacle. If nothing of the sort is to be found in the present text, R must have obliterated it. Whatever thwarts a cherished project of the critics is as a last resort always traceable to R's interference.

Ver. 5, restored to what Dr. Dillmann considers its original form, read simply, "Jehovah said unto Moses, Say unto the children of Israel, Put off thy ornaments from thee." This is held to be parallel to Ex. xxxv. 5, *seq.*, where contributions of every sort are solicited for the Tabernacle. Hence not only is the middle of the verse, as we have already seen, magisterially pronounced spurious, but the last clause likewise, "that I may know what to do unto thee." If this clause were suffered to remain, putting off their ornaments must have been enjoined as an act of penitent humiliation, that God may then determine whether or not He will accept Moses' intercession on their behalf and forgive their sin. But this is unacceptable to the critics and so the clause is stricken out.

It is next assumed that the sacred tent and the ark were then made with the help of the materials thus contributed. To be sure, nothing of the sort is to be found in the passage at present; but it must have been there originally, the critics tell us, and R has omitted it. The very place where it stood in E's account can be pointed out; it belongs between ver. 6 and ver. 7; for in ver. 7 the tent of meeting is already made, and Moses proceeds to locate it and it is at once devoted to its sacred purpose.

The passage thus doctored into shape is now ready for use, and the most important critical conclusions are deduced from it. Being now purged of interpolations and its missing portions restored, it puts on an entirely new face, and tells an altogether different story from that which ordinary readers find in it. It is now adjusted to the critics' will, and contains what they are pleased to consider the original narrative of E. This is accordingly set over against P's narrative of the same occurrences, and the most astonishing divergences appear.

1. In E Israel leaves Sinai in Ex. xxxiii, after a residence of less than two months at its base; in P they take their departure in Num. x. 11, after a stay of almost a year. All that is recorded by P in the rest of Exodus, the whole of Leviticus, and the first nine chapters of Numbers is thus annihilated at a stroke. E knows nothing of it, and Israel had left Sinai before it is alleged to have taken place. The minute and extensive body of ceremonial institutions detailed by P is quite ignored by E, according to whom Israel received no laws at Sinai except those in Ex. xx-xxiii.

And in relation to the Tabernacle, which is the special subject of our inquiry at present, there are these remarkable differences:

2. In respect to time.—In Ex. xxxiii. 7, the tent of meeting is spoken of as already made, whereas, according to P, its construction was not begun until Moses had once more been in Sinai for forty days and forty nights (Ex. xxxiv. 28, xxxv, *seq.*); and then several months were spent upon its construction.

3. Its location.—In E "Moses used to take the tent and to pitch it without the camp, afar off from the camp." The tense of the verbs throughout the passage indicates habitual action; and it is claimed that what is here described was the practice in all the journeyings in the wilderness. In P, on the other hand, the Lord dwelt in the midst of the people (Ex. xxv. 8), and the Tabernacle was pitched in the centre of the camp (Num. ii).

4. Persons in charge.—In P the Levites were exclusively entrusted with the service of the sanctuary, and the priests, the sons of Aaron, were alone permitted to enter it; all others were debarred on pain of death (Num. iii. 10, 38, xviii. 7). But in E, Joshua, of the tribe of Ephraim, was on duty there as its permanent guard in the absence of Moses and departed not out of the tent (Ex. xxxiii. 11).

5. Its purpose.—In this passage in E, and certain other passages assigned to J, the Tabernacle is simply a place of divine revelation, whereas in P it is a place of sacrifice as well (Lev. i. 3, etc.).

6. Its simplicity.—In E it was a simple tent, and not such an elaborate and costly structure as is described by P (Ex. xxxv, *seq.*).

It is apparent, however, that these alleged discrepancies and contrasts are the work of the critics themselves. If the passage be sundered from its connection and interpreted at variance with it, a sense being put upon its terms which they cannot possibly have where they stand, but which they may be supposed to have had in some other imaginary connection; and especially if words and clauses are thrown out of the text and ideas imported into it at the critic's pleasure, so that an entirely different complexion is given to it from that which it has as it stands; it is no marvel if the semblance of contradictions can be thus created. But it is the critic who is responsible for them.

The passage which we have been considering, and of which such a formidable use is made by the critics, stands in the closest connection with what precedes and follows, and the charge that it contradicts statements made elsewhere is without foundation. The covenant into which Jehovah had condescended to enter with Israel had been ruptured by the sin of the golden calf. At Moses' earnest intercession they had been spared from instant destruction (Ex. xxxii. 9, 10), but the Lord refuses to acknowledge them as His people any longer. He speaks of them not in His accustomed manner as the people which He had brought up out of the land of Egypt (xx. 1), but which Moses had brought up (xxxiii. 1), and He bids Moses take them on to Canaan. The Lord will fulfill His oath to their fathers by giving them that land, but He will not go with them. He will send an angel and drive out their foes, not as He had before promised (xxiii. 20, *seq.*), an angel in whom God's name should be, the angel of Jehovah who is one with Jehovah Himself, but an inferior angel shall be substituted for God's own presence. At this threatened withdrawal of Jehovah from them the people mourned, and in token of the sincerity and depth of their humiliation, laid aside their ornaments, as they were likewise bidden to do. There is not the slightest suggestion that these ornaments were now to be contributed to build the Tabernacle. God would receive nothing at their hands now that He was alienated from them by their sin. Not until they were forgiven and the broken covenant renewed, could any gift from them be acceptable to Him. The cast-off ornaments simply betokened their penitence, and thus paved the way for Moses to intercede further on their behalf. The statement of the passage is clear that the people laid aside their ornaments in grief and penitence. Their grief was not that they were to leave Sinai and go on to Canaan. They had not come out of Egypt to take up their abode in the desert. The land flowing with milk and honey was their eagerly desired goal from the first. Their grief was that they must go laden with God's displeasure. But the critics have changed all

this. Without a word of justification in the text and in the face of its explicit declaration they claim that these ornaments were the materials for the Tabernacle. Then we are told that the original document must have related between ver. 6 and ver. 7 how the Tabernacle was made from these contributed materials. The whole thing is a sheer fabrication, based upon nothing but the arbitrary fancy of the critics.

Whence then, it is asked, came "the tent" (verse 7) which Moses used to take and pitch without the camp and call it the tent of meeting? Surely it is not necessary to the answer of this question to invent a story, which has no countenance in this passage and flatly contradicts every other relating to the subject. Yet this is what the critics do. And on the ground of the contradiction between this their manufactured story and numerous explicit testimonies, they would have us believe that this is from a different document and gives an altered version of the origin of the sacred tent. In order to set before the people a visible token of the Lord's estrangement from them, Moses places the tent which for the time the Lord makes His dwelling, at a great remove from the camp. Observe that the statement is not that Moses took "the tent of meeting," which had now been built, but he took "the tent" and called it "the tent of meeting." Obviously a preëxisting tent receives a new name, and is devoted to a new purpose. The definite article means simply that a particular tent, which though not mentioned before was definitely before the mind of the writer, and perhaps well known to his readers, was employed and designated as is here stated (compare Num. xi. 27; 1 Sam. ix. 9; 2 Sam. xvii. 17). It may have been Moses' tent, in which he received the people who resorted to him to inquire of God (Ex. xviii. 15), or it may have been some other. We are not informed, and it is of no consequence. The name applied to this provisional structure is taken from the directions given to Moses in relation to the future sanctuary (xxvii. 21, xxviii. 43, etc.). It temporarily represented the idea, which was to be embodied in that sanctuary, and thus set forth in a striking manner the strained relations between Jehovah and the people. Jehovah had not abandoned them entirely, nor withdrawn from them every token of His favor; at the same time He was estranged and distant, for their gross iniquity was still remembered against them and was yet unforgiven. A sanctuary was, therefore, set up, where Jehovah spake with Moses, and to which the people might resort; and under the circumstances this was an amazing grace, so that all the people gazed after Moses with admiration till he entered it, and when the pillar of cloud descended and talked with him they fell prostrate in adoration. Nevertheless this sanctuary was pitched without instead

of within the camp, and at a great distance from it; for Jehovah refused to have His abode in the midst of them.

This continued to be the customary location of the tent of meeting, not during the entire period of the journeyings in the desert, but while this exceptional state of things lasted. The significance of it lay in its being a departure from what had been promised and was expected and was subsequently granted. This provisional Tabernacle is only once again alluded to (Ex. xxxiv. 34, 35). Num. xi. 26, xii. 4, 5, have been appealed to as implying that in the opinion of the writer the Tabernacle was at the time there referred to in the exterior of the camp. But such an inference is quite unnecessary. The camp and the Tabernacle are set in contrast, and persons are said to go out of the camp unto the Tabernacle and *vice versâ*. But the explanation of this is simple enough. While the camp surrounded the Tabernacle, in the form of an immense hollow square, there was thus a considerable space between the tents of the Israelites and the sanctuary, which it was necessary to traverse after leaving the former before reaching the latter.

The provisional tent is spoken of as a place of revelation rather than sacrifice, because the Levitical laws were not yet given, and the sacrificial system there ordained had not yet been instituted. Joshua was in attendance there because the house of Aaron and the tribe of Levi had not yet been set apart for the service of the sanctuary. The Tabernacle proper, which was subsequently erected, is spoken of in Num. xi, xii, and Deut. xxxi. 14, 15, as a place of revelation without any allusion to sacrifice. But this does not warrant the critical assumption of variant traditions respecting its use. It was in fact intended for both uses; and the sacred writer mentions it now under one aspect, now under the other, as the occasion required. And the fact that it does not chance to be mentioned in the laws of Deuteronomy, nor in the discourses of Moses contained in that book, casts no doubt upon its real existence, of which there are sufficient vouchers beside.

It is altogether probable that the provisional tent of meeting in Ex. xxxiii was much simpler than the one which was afterwards erected for permanent use. But as they are quite distinct structures, this involves no discrepancy. Nor is there any conflict with Num. x. 11, *seq.*, as to the time of leaving Sinai. There is no intimation in Ex. xxxiii, or in the chapters that follow, that Israel actually left Sinai at this time; but the contrary plainly appears. They were told to go forward, deprived of the Lord's presence and resting under His displeasure. But when their offence had been forgiven, and the covenant with God renewed, He was ready once more to grant them His presence with them, and to take up His

abode in the midst of them. There was no longer any reason why they should be sent from Sinai without the projected Tabernacle being built. They accordingly set themselves at once to its construction (Ex. xxxv).

A second critical argument is drawn from the alleged silence of the later books of the Bible. It is affirmed that the historical books give no intimation of the existence of such a structure as the Mosaic Tabernacle is described to be, from the time of Joshua to that of Solomon. It is admitted that it is referred to in Josh. xviii. 1, xix. 51, where it is said to have been set up in Shiloh, and xxii. 19, 29, where it is also mentioned. But that style of criticism which discredits the Pentateuch, discredits likewise the Book of Joshua; and from this time forward it is said that the sacred history knows nothing of the existence of the Tabernacle. The Books of Chronicles make repeated mention of the Mosaic tent of meeting in the time of David (1 Chron. vi. 32, xvi. 39, xxiii. 32) or Solomon (2 Chron. i. 3, 6, 13, v. 5). But Chronicles was written after the exile; and it is alleged that the writer simply took for granted that the Tabernacle of Moses must have been in existence until the Temple was built, and accordingly speaks as though this were the case. But Chronicles, though written at a late period, was based upon earlier and well-accredited histories, to which it makes frequent appeal, and which are a sufficient guarantee of the truth and accuracy of its statements. Written after the exile, when Israel was diligently engaged in restoring the worship and usages of their fathers, it pays special attention to facts bearing on this subject, and records much that was omitted in preceding books composed with a different design. It is not discredited, therefore, by the silence of other historical books, which relate to the same period but treat of a different class of matters.

Judges, Samuel and Kings are not, however, as silent respecting the Mosaic Tabernacle as the objection alleges. We read (Judg. xviii. 31) of the house of God in Shiloh, where the Mosaic Tabernacle had been set up by Joshua. It is not called "a house of God," as though it were one among many, but "the house of God," as the only one; and it is set in contrast with the idolatrous worship in Dan as the one place where the true worship of God existed. And it continued in Shiloh, as appears from the parallel expression in ver. 30, "until the day of the captivity of the land." This cannot refer to the Assyrian captivity, as though the meaning were that this idolatrous sanctuary remained in Dan until that date. The captivity of the land which was the limit of the continuance of the house of God in Shiloh can be no other than the supremacy of the Philistines attained by the decisive victory over Israel, in which they

captured the ark of God (1 Sam. iv. 10, 11, 22), and which is referred to in similar terms in Ps. lxxviii. 60, 61. The sanctuary is never spoken of as in Shiloh after that. Mention is further made (Judg. xix. 18) of the house of the Lord, which from the connection (see also ver. 1) must have been in the recesses of the mountain district of Ephraim, where Shiloh lay. Here, too, it appears from Judg. xxi. 19, the feast of the Lord was annually held. These references, though occurring near the end of the book, really belong to the early portion of the period of the Judges; as we learn from xviii. 1 that the Danites had not yet received their full inheritance in the land of Canaan, and from xx. 28 that Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron, was still living and was the high priest.

At the close of the period of the Judges, the house of God was still in Shiloh, and was annually visited by Elkanah, the father of Samuel, for worship and sacrifice (1 Sam. i. 3, 7). And that it was not a local sanctuary, resorted to by the Shilonites only, as Graf infers from Judg. xxi. 21, or by those from a limited district, appears from the express declaration (1 Sam. ii. 14) that all the Israelites came thither, and (ver. 29) that it was the appointed place for sacrifice and offerings. It is besides expressly called "the tent of meeting" (ii. 22), a name exclusively applied to the Tabernacle of Moses.

It has been objected that this sanctuary at Shiloh cannot have been the Mosaic Tabernacle, since it is called "the house of the Lord" (1 Sam. i. 7, 24, iii. 15; Judg. xviii. 31, xix. 18), and "the temple of the Lord" (1 Sam. i. 9, iii. 3), implying that it was not a movable tent, but a solid and permanent structure. It also had doorposts (i. 9) and folding doors which were opened in the day (iii. 15), whereas the Tabernacle had no doors, but a simple veil, by which the entrance was always closed. And Samuel is said to have slept in the temple of the Lord, where the ark of God was (1 Sam. iii. 3); where the Authorized Version inverts the order of the clauses apparently to avoid imputing to Samuel what would have been inadmissible in the Mosaic sanctuary.

But, 1. The phrase, "house of God," has not the restricted meaning attributed to it in the objection. Jacob calls the place in which the Lord had appeared to him the house of God, though there was no building whatever (Gen. xxviii. 17). In Ex. xxiii. 19, xxxiv. 26, the Mosaic sanctuary about to be erected is called the house of the Lord thy God; so after its erection (Deut. xxiii. 18; Josh. vi. 24). In 2 Sam. xii. 20, David is said to have come into the house of the Lord, where the reference can only be to the tent which he had pitched for the ark on Mt. Zion (vi. 17). In 1 Chron. vi. 31, 32, "the house of the Lord" is used both of the temple of Solomon

and the tent sanctuary which preceded it. In numerous psalms, which are in their titles ascribed to David, the sanctuary is called the house of God (Ps. lii. 8, lv. 14), the house of the Lord (xxiii. 6, cxxii. 1, 9), or His temple (xxix. 9, lxxviii. 29), or both house and temple (v. 7, lxv. 4). If the titles are correct, David could only have meant the sacred tent by these terms; and if the titles are erroneous, and these psalms were not written by David, still the author of the titles must have understood the use of Hebrew terms, and if he saw no difficulty in referring to David psalms which spoke of the house and temple of the Lord, it is evident that those terms were in his view applicable to the sacred tent which David had pitched on Zion. In Ps. xxvii, which is likewise entitled a Psalm of David, the same structure which is called the house of the Lord and His temple in ver. 4, is, in vers. 5, 6, expressly denominated a tabernacle or tent. The application of these terms to the sanctuary in Shiloh is no proof, therefore, that it was not the Mosaic Tabernacle.

2. That neither the names applied to the sanctuary at Shiloh, nor what is said of its doors and doorposts imply a solid structure as opposed to a tent, appears from 2 Sam. vii. 6, where God says to David: "I have not dwelt in an house since the day that I brought up the children of Israel out of Egypt, even to this day, but have walked in a tent and a tabernacle." "Tent" and "tabernacle" here are not distinct structures or classes of edifices; the latter term was applied to the frame and the former to the coverings of the Mosaic sanctuary (Ex. xxvi. 7). In 1 Chron. xvii. 5 this verse is given in a slightly modified form, which is equally available for the purpose of our argument: "I have not dwelt in an house since the day that I brought up Israel to this day; but have gone from tent to tent, and from *one* tabernacle to *another*." The reference here is to the sacred tents which were successively used, that of Moses variously located at Shiloh, Nob and Gibeon, and that of David erected on Mt. Zion.

It is a common and natural supposition that during the long abode of the tabernacle at Shiloh subsidiary structures were built around it adjacent to the court for various purposes of convenience or necessity, such as the reception of tithes and offerings, and for the lodging of the priests and ministers of the sanctuary. Such chambers were in later times attached to the temple, and the need and propriety of their erection is obvious. It was entirely natural likewise that the entire complex building should be spoken of in a general way as the temple. In some such chamber, doubtless, Samuel was sleeping, and the doors which he opened were in all likelihood those which led into the court. The idea that he could have been sleeping in the very apartment of the temple which con-

tained the ark, is utterly insupposable and is not required by the language used.

When the ark was captured by the Philistines (1 Sam. iv. 11), God forsook Shiloh (Ps. lxxviii. 60, *seq.*), rejecting both the sanctuary and the priesthood (1 Sam. ii. 30-36; comp. xxii. 18, 1 Kgs. ii. 27). In the reign of Saul, the Tabernacle had been transferred to Nob, a city of the priests, and we read of David's going thither to Ahimelech the priest, and obtaining the shewbread which had been removed from before the Lord. Ahimelech was descended from Eli (1 Sam. xxii. 11, xiv. 3). It hence appears that the priestly house which had formerly been at Shiloh was now at Nob; the shewbread and the ephod which belonged to the dress of the high priest were there (1 Sam. xxi. 9, xxiii. 6); that was the place for inquiring of Jehovah (1 Sam. xxii. 10, 15), which after the destruction of Nob and the presence of Abiathar with the ephod in his camp David was thenceforth able to do without resorting to the sanctuary (1 Sam. xxiii. 2, 4, 9). After the slaughter of the priests and the destruction of Nob by Saul (1 Sam. xxii. 18, 19), the Tabernacle was removed to Gibeon (2 Chron. i. 3; 1 Chron. xxi. 29). Shiloh, Nob and Gibeon were thus successively the seats of the same sanctuary, the tent of meeting erected by Moses; they were not three different sanctuaries resorted to by different portions of the people at the same time. From Gibeon the Mosaic Tabernacle was taken with all its sacred vessels and deposited in the temple built by Solomon (1 Kgs. viii. 4). Recent critics are at great pains to show that "the tent of meeting" in this passage means the tent pitched by David for the ark on Mt. Zion. But this name is never given to David's tent, which on the contrary is expressly distinguished from it (2 Chron. i. 3, 4).

It has been objected that if the Mosaic Tabernacle had been in existence the ark would have been restored to it upon its being sent back from the land of the Philistines; whereas instead of being taken either to Shiloh or to Nob, it was kept in a private house in Kirjath-jearim (1 Sam. vii. 1). This is not to be explained by saying, with Ewald, that the Philistines destroyed Shiloh at the time that they captured the ark. For of this there is no evidence. The real reason is that God's suffering the ark to be captured by the Philistines was rightly interpreted as His forsaking Shiloh and forsaking Israel in consequence of their sins (Jer. vii. 12, 14, xxvi. 6; Ps. lxxviii. 56-64). The symbol of God's presence was taken away, implying that His gracious presence was itself withdrawn. And when the ark came back, Israel was not ready to receive it. Instead of bringing a blessing it brought a plague to the men of Bethshemesh in their profane temerity (1 Sam. vi. 19), and simply spread consternation and terror (ver. 20). All were afraid to have the ark amongst

them, and were content to have it left in obscurity. And when Israel lamented after the Lord (1 Sam. vii. 2), the essential prerequisite to His returning favor was a hearty repentance (ver. 3). It was not until the reign of David that the people were really ripe for the return of the ark and the restoration of God's sanctuary (2 Sam. vi).

It is further objected that if the Mosaic tabernacle had been in existence David would have transferred it to Zion at the same time that he took the ark there, instead of pitching a tent which he had himself prepared for the ark (2 Sam. vi. 17); and Solomon would have made use of its sacred vessels, instead of having all made new (1 Kgs. vii. 40 *seq.*, 45, 48 *seq.*). But David saw in the peaceful establishment of his kingdom (2 Sam. vii. 1 *seq.*) that a new stage had been reached in God's relation to Israel, which required a different dwelling place in the midst of his people in order to represent it properly. The period of unsettled wandering fitly represented by the Mosaic Tabernacle, constructed to be carried from place to place, was now over. And the time had come, or was at least at hand, for a more solid and permanent dwelling, a temple, which should be an indication (ver. 10) that he had at length so planted Israel that they should "dwell in a place of their own and move no more," and that his own dwelling was firmly established among them. And although David was himself forbidden to build this house, because his reign had been one of disturbance and conflict, under his son Solomon Israel should reach a condition of perfect peace, and he should build the temple. David accordingly busied himself with preparations for its anticipated erection. It was not a time to take the ark back to the old migratory tabernacle, whether at Shiloh or at Gibeon. This God had abandoned. Zion was chosen as the spot for a new and more solid structure. Till that should be built, David simply pitched for the ark a provisional and temporary shelter. According to Ps. lxxviii, and Jeremiah vii and xxvi, Shiloh and Zion were the two dwelling-places, and the only ones which God had successively chosen in Israel.

And in making a new temple Solomon naturally had all the vessels made new, that all might be in proportion and proper harmony. It is alleged that if Solomon could offer a thousand burnt offerings on the Mosaic altar at Gibeon (2 Chron. i. 6), it must have been of sufficient size to answer for all the ordinary needs of the temple ritual, and even the new altar needed to be supplemented on extraordinary occasions (1 Kgs. viii. 64). It was not a mere question of capacity, however, but of adaptation and mutual correspondence. The new house of God required new furniture throughout. The old Mosaic vessels were preserved as sacred relics and were ac-

cordingly transferred to the temple (1 Kgs. viii. 4), but all things were in addition made new.

It is alleged that the Mosaic Tabernacle, so minutely and elaborately described in Ex. xxv-xxxii, never existed; that it is a mere fancy sketch, a copy in fact of the temple of Solomon, only reduced in size and made portable, such as the imagination of later ages conceived must have been in use in the days of Moses. It is said that describing its four sides as North, South, East and West (Ex. xl. 22, 24; Num. iii. 23, 29, 35, 38) implies that it was a fixed and not a movable structure; and that the term used to describe the southern side (Ex. xl. 24) is נִגְבָּה, *toward the Neghebbh*. Now *Neghebbh* was the term applied to the southern district of Judah, which lay north of the wilderness of Sinai, which shows, it is said, that the writer in his description unconsciously uses a term appropriate only in Palestine. It is very obvious that the Tabernacle and the temple were constructed after the same general plan; but that the former is the original and not the copy is obvious from its history, which we have already traced from the time of Moses to that of Solomon; and also from the minute specifications given of the Tabernacle in matters in which it differed from the temple, as in its curtains, and boards and coverings and sockets and loops and taches, etc. And it is a curious fact that in naming the four constituents of the veil, "blue, purple, scarlet, fine linen," the account of the Tabernacle (Ex. xxvi. 31) uses ancient terms (שֵׁשׁ, תּוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי) throughout, for which the account of the temple (2 Chron. iii. 14) substitutes in the case of the last two, recent equivalents (בּוּז, בְּרִמְלִיל). The Tabernacle had its northern and southern sides, because wherever it was pitched it was always set by the points of the compass. And the word *Neghebbh* had its meaning "south" as a point of the compass, distinct from its geographical meaning of a section of Palestine. We familiarly speak of the southern States of this country as "the South." But if any one were to say that a ship was sailing southward on the Gulf of Mexico, no person would understand him to mean that it was steering towards the southern States.

Critical difficulties have been raised likewise in respect to the different articles of furniture belonging to the Tabernacle. Thus, it is said, that the accounts respecting the altar of burnt offering do not agree. According to Ex. xx. 24, 25, it was to be built of earth or stone, upon which no tool had been employed; according to Ex. xxvii. 1, etc., it was a hollow frame of wood overlaid with brass. But this latter was merely the casing to contain the altar of earth or stone, in order to mark it as belonging to the Tabernacle court, of which brass was the dominant and characteristic metal; and likewise to suggest that the altar renewed at each station on their

march was still substantially the same altar, for it had the same external covering and stood in the same sacred surroundings. And the altar continued to be built of "whole stones according to the law" in each successive temple and as long as the temple stood, as appears from 1 Macc. iv. 47; Josephus, *Against Apion*, i, 22; comp. his *Jewish War*, v, 5, 6.

It is further urged that according to the ritual law there could be but one altar of sacrifice, that at the door of the Tabernacle; whereas, according to Ex. xx. 24, such altars might be erected in various places; and this was actually done all through the period of the Judges, not by idolators merely, but by good and pious men, such as Samuel, without any thought apparently of violating any statute; and the offerings are represented to have been acceptable to God. It is, however, to be remembered that the law in Ex. xx. 24 was given before the Tabernacle was built. It is the general statute for the construction of Israelitish altars, and was intended to cover every possible legitimate case. It does not authorize rearing altars wherever any one may choose, but only "in all places where God records His name," that is to say, makes some special manifestation of His presence. When the Tabernacle was built that was the place where God ordinarily manifested Himself; so that in all ordinary cases that was the only place where according to this law an altar could be legitimately erected. As the people were on their march through the wilderness, the location of the Tabernacle was constantly changing, but at each station at which it was set up, the altar was necessarily and lawfully built. An altar was thus set up at various places successively, but there was only one altar after all, not several altars contemporaneously existing at different sanctuaries. According to this ordinary condition of things, there was but one altar and that at the place where God's presence was ordinarily manifested. But if upon any occasion God's presence were to be manifested elsewhere than at the sanctuary, the law of Ex. xx. 24 warrants the erection of an altar at such place of special manifestation. Accordingly, if the ark, which was the special symbol of God's immediate presence, was taken to Mt. Ebal, as it was in the time of Joshua (Josh. viii. 31, 33), it was proper to erect an altar there, as was done in fact by immediate divine direction (Deut. xxvii. 5). So when the ark was temporarily taken to Bethel during the war against Gibeah (Judg. xx. 26, 27, xxi. 2, 4) ["house of God," A. V., Judg. xx. 26, xxi. 2, should be "Bethel"] an altar was built there (xxi. 4), showing that it was not a customary place of offering, and sacrifices were made. So too when the ark was returned from the land of the Philistines (1 Sam. vi. 15), and when David transported it to Zion, sacrifices were offered before it (2 Sam.

vi. 13, 17). And if still further there was any immediate and extraordinary manifestation of God's presence in any place, the spot so hallowed necessarily became for the time a sanctuary, and God was worshiped by sacrifice wherever He thus chose to reveal Himself. Thus when the divine angel of the Lord appeared to the people at Bochim, they sacrificed there (Judg. ii. 5). So when the same divine angel appeared to Gideon sacrifice was offered and an altar built (Judg. vi. 21, 24), and another altar built and sacrifice offered by immediate divine direction (vers. 25, 26). So Manoah offered sacrifice on a rock when the Lord appeared to him (Judg. xiii. 19).

There is not a single instance recorded in the Book of Judges, not an instance in fact from the time of Moses to that of Samuel, in which sacrifices were offered elsewhere than at the Tabernacle, unless it was in the presence of the ark or upon the occasion of a supernatural divine manifestation: and in these latter instances no permanent sanctuaries were created, but the offering of sacrifice was strictly limited to the occasion which justified it and called it forth. Upon the return of the two and a half tribes to their inheritance east of the Jordan after the conquest of the land of Canaan, they built an altar at the Jordan (Josh. xxii. 10). This was, however, resented by the other tribes as a serious offence against the unity of the sanctuary, until they came to understand that it was not intended for sacrifice in violation of the divine statute, but simply as a witness that they too had a part in the altar at the sanctuary (vers. 21-29). Mention is made (Josh. xxiv. 26) of a sanctuary of the Lord at Shechem; but there is no indication that sacrifice was offered there. And it is plain that there was no building there, for there was an oak *in* (not *by*, A. V.) the sanctuary of the Lord. This is no doubt the oak at Shechem under which Jacob buried the idolatrous emblems of his household (Gen. xxxv. 4). It was a spot hallowed by sacred memories and associations from the days of the patriarchs, and is for this reason called a sanctuary. But it had no altar and was not a place of sacrifice.

Still another case arose when the ark was captured by the Philistines (1 Sam. iv. 11.) That was practically the withdrawal of God's presence from Israel, and from the sanctuary which He had established in the midst of them. The Mosaic Tabernacle deprived of the ark ceased to be the dwelling place of God in the same sense in which it had been before. From that time until the ark was taken to Zion, in the reign of David (2 Sam. vi), and the temple erected for it by Solomon, there was no sanctuary of God in Israel in the full sense. During this anomalous period, as is declared (1 Kgs. iii. 2), "The people sacrificed in high places, because there was no house built unto the name of the Lord until those days."

Hence we find the prophet Samuel building an altar at Ramah (1 Sam. vii. 17), and offering sacrifice besides at Mizpah (ver. 9), at Gilgal (x. 8, xi. 15), at Bethlehem (xvi. 2-5) and elsewhere. He had in his childhood been dedicated to the Lord in the sanctuary at Shiloh (i. 28), to remain there all his days. But when by the withdrawal of the ark Shiloh ceased to be the seat of God's special presence, Samuel forsook it, and as the prophet of God, and acting under immediate divine direction, devoted himself to laboring for the reformation of the people, that he might heal the breach between God and Israel, and thus prepare the way for the reëstablishment of the sanctuary amongst them. In this temporary cessation of a sanctuary, the law prohibiting the erection of an altar elsewhere was virtually repealed; things reverted to the condition in which they were before the Tabernacle was built. Sacrificial worship must be suspended altogether, or else it must be tolerated elsewhere than at a sanctuary, inasmuch as none existed in the strict and proper sense. In this state of things the people offered sacrifice at various places, particularly those which had been hallowed by divine manifestations in former times, in the days of the patriarchs. And these extraordinary altars obtained a certain legitimacy during this extraordinary period. When the temple was built, however, and the ark was deposited in it, and the divine glory took possession of it, it became the sole legitimate place of sacrifice, and altars built elsewhere were thenceforth unlawful. Only in the ten tribes after the schism of Jeroboam a like anomalous condition was to a certain extent again created. The pious in the northern kingdom were debarred access to the temple at Jerusalem, and they must sacrifice on high places or not at all. Hence Elijah, who by divine direction rebuilt an altar of the Lord on Carmel that had been broken down (1 Kgs. xviii. 30, 36), makes his complaint to the Lord that apostate Israel had thrown down his altars (xix. 10, 14).

Apart from these exceptional cases of extraordinary divine manifestations on the one hand, which made the scene of their occurrence for the time a sanctuary, and the absence of a duly authorized sanctuary on the other hand, the uniform law of Israel's history was the unity of the sanctuary and the unity of the altar. There was but one place of lawful sacrifice, that in which God had recorded His name.

There was but one ark. With this God's presence was inseparably connected. There could, therefore, under all ordinary conditions, be but one sanctuary and one altar of sacrifice.

It has been alleged, however, that the description of this ark as given in Ex. xxv. 10, *seq.*, is not correct. It represents the cherubim as upon

the ark and of one piece with the golden mercy seat; whereas in the temple the cherubim were not upon the ark, but were (1 Kgs. vi. 23) large figures of olive wood, each ten cubits high, overshadowing the ark with their wings. This, however, does not exclude the golden cherubim upon the ark; and that this was really their position appears from 1 Sam. iv. 4, 2 Sam. vi. 2, where the Lord is spoken of as dwelling between the cherubim, or sitting enthroned upon the cherubim, because of his connection with the ark itself before the temple was built.

It is further objected that the laver and the altar of incense do not belong to the original description of the Tabernacle, but form a subsequent addition to it. In Ex. xxv. directions are given for making the sacred vessels of the Tabernacle—first, the ark (ver. 10, *seq.*) and mercy seat (ver. 17, *seq.*) for the most holy place, then the table of shewbread (ver. 23, *seq.*) and candlestick (ver. 31, *seq.*) for the holy place, without any allusion to the altar of incense; then (chap. xxvi) the Tabernacle itself; then (chap. xxvii) the altar (as though it were the only one) and the court, with no mention of the laver; then (chap. xxviii) the dress of the priests; (chap. xxix) the ceremonies to be observed in the consecration of the priests; and then, in chap. 30, which it is claimed must be an appendix of later date, direction is given among other things for making (ver. 1, *seq.*) an altar of incense and (vers. 17–21) a laver. But there is no need of supposing, with the critics, that this chapter is by a different hand and written at a later period than chaps. xxv–xxix; nor even with Delitzsch that these articles were less essential to the idea of the sanctuary, and did not occur to Moses until after the previous directions had first been drawn up; nor with Baumgarten that the ark of the covenant and the altar of incense were the two most sacred vessels of the sanctuary, and therefore one is placed at the beginning and the other at the end of the directions for making them, that all might be included between these two extremes. The real reason appears to be because the altar of incense and the laver stood in a very special relation to the priests, which was to be explained at the time direction was given for making them (xxx. 7–10, 19–21). Hence they were not mentioned until the consecration of the priests had first been spoken of, and the way had thus been prepared for a description of their use. But in the subsequent account of the construction of these articles (xxxv. 15, 16, xxxvii. 25, xxxviii. 8, xxxix. 38, 39), and in the setting up of the Tabernacle (xl. 5, 7, 26, 30) they are enumerated with the other vessels of the holy place and of the court.

Further, it is said that, according to Lev. iv. 7, in a sin offering for a priest, the blood was to be put upon the horns of the altar of

incense, but in the directions for consecrating Aaron and his sons, though a sin offering was to be presented (xxix. 14), no mention is made of the altar of incense; nor is it mentioned in the actual account of the consecration (Lev. viii. 14, 15). The explanation of which is that Aaron and his sons were being set apart to the priesthood, but were not in fact priests until their consecration was concluded; so that the law of Lev. iv did not apply.

It is also said in Ex. xxx. 10, that atonement was to be made on the horns of the altar of incense once in the year, the reference obviously being to the annual day of atonement. And yet it has been claimed that in Lev. xvi, in which the services of that day are minutely described, only one altar, viz., that of burnt-offering, is referred to. The fact is, however, that it is the altar of incense which is meant (ver. 18) by "the altar which is before the Lord" (this being its standing designation; compare iv. 7, 18), to which the priest "goes out" from the most holy place and upon which he puts the blood of atonement. This is different from "the altar before the Lord," spoken of in ver. 12, from which he was to take the coals (compare i. 5, 11), the altar of burnt offering being also said to be "before the Lord," because it was in front of the sacred Tabernacle.

It is further said that while in certain sections of the law the altar in the court is called the brazen altar (Ex. xxxviii. 30, xxxix. 39), or the altar of burnt offering (xxx. 28, xxxi. 9, xxxv. 16, etc.), to distinguish it from the golden altar of incense, in other sections presumably written before the altar of incense had been thought of, the altar of the court is simply called "the altar," as though there were no other (Ex. xxvii. 1, *seq.*—not *an* altar, but *the* altar—xxviii. 43, xxix. 12, *seq.*; Lev. viii. 11, *seq.*, ix. 7, *seq.*). But the altar in the court was by way of eminence "the altar" as the place of sacrifice; and in Chronicles, where these two altars are repeatedly distinguished, the altar in the court is often called simply the altar of the Lord (2 Chron. vi. 12, 22, viii. 12, xv. 8, xxix. 19, 21, xxxiii. 16, xxxv. 16) and the altar (2 Chron. vii. 9, xxiii. 10, xxix. 22, 24, 27). If it can be so called in Chronicles without implying the non-existence of the altar of incense, why should such an inference be drawn in the Pentateuch?

It is further urged that Ezekiel in his detailed description of the temple speaks indeed of an altar in the holy place (Ezek. xli. 22), but he says of it, "This is the table that is before the Lord," and again (xliv. 16) he speaks of the Lord's table; from which it is inferred that he intends simply the table of shewbread, and not the altar of incense. The fact is, however, that in speaking of the temple, Ezek. ix. 2 makes mention of "the brazen altar," implying that there was another altar of different material. And the passages

first quoted occur in a vision, significant of the ideal future, which is not intended to correspond precisely with the temple as it actually was; in fact, it purposely departs from it in various particulars. There is no mention of the ark, or the candlestick, or the table of shewbread, or the laver, or of any articles of furniture in fact, but the altar in the court and the altar in the holy place; the latter is called a "table," just as Malachi i. 7 calls the altar "the table of the Lord."

It has even been claimed that there was no altar of incense in the temple of Solomon. Wellhausen goes so far as to urge that there was none even in the second temple, since in the spoils taken by Titus there is represented on his arch of triumph the golden candlestick and the table of shewbread, but no altar of incense. But if there never was an altar of incense in the temple, and the Tabernacle is but an imaginary copy of the temple, how did it ever come to be inserted in the latter? The existence of the altar of incense in the temple is explicitly affirmed in 1 Macc. i. 21, iv. 49 and in Josephus' *Jewish War* (v, 5, 5), and it is implied in the legend 2 Macc. ii. 4. It is implied also in the term "brazen altar," as the altar in the court is called by way of distinction (1 Kgs. viii. 64, 2 Kgs. xvi. 14, 15). Both altars are mentioned together in 1 Kgs. ix. 25. It is explicitly spoken of as made by Solomon (1 Kgs. vi. 20, 22, vii. 48) in the account of building the temple, though singularly enough no mention is made of his making the altar of burnt offering, which, as appears from 2 Chron. iv. 1, belongs between 1 Kgs. vii. 22 and ver. 23. The critics (Wellhausen and Stade, *Zeitschrift für A. T. Wissenschaft* iii, 143, *seq.*, 168, *seq.*) escape this testimony only by arbitrarily changing the text in 1 Kgs. vi and vii.

PRINCETON.

WILLIAM HENRY GREEN.