

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

As regards the disposition of the fifteen sayings, the nine first verbs arrange themselves easily into three verses. The first verse describes the principal qualities of love, the second the simplicity and truth of its appearance, the third the selflessness and unalterable kindness of its inmost nature. This eulogistic description closes with the pithy balanced sentence, "It rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth." This leads over to the 2 x 2 great positive sayings.

A. HARNACK.

Helena Ramsay, transl.

THE ARK OF THE COVENANT.

THE subject of the ark was much discussed some years ago by German scholars. The opinion of Wellhausen, that the ark was an old sanctuary belonging to the clan of Joseph and that it was afterwards adopted as the chief sacred symbol of Jahve, held the field among critical scholars. It was promulgated by Wellhausen's *Prolegomena* (3rd edition, p. 47) and accepted by such scholars as B. Stade (*G.V.I.*, i. 458), W. Nowack (*Hebr. Arch.* ii. 6), T. K. Cheyne (*Enc. Bibl.*, i. 307), K. Marti (*Geschichte der Isr. Religion*, 68), Holzinger (*Exodus*, p. 123) and others. A new solution, however, was offered by Reichel (*Ueber die vorhebräischen Götterkulte*, Wien, 1897), and J. Meinhold (*Die Lade Jahves*), who supposed the ark to be a throne. M. Dibelius (*Die Lade Jahves*, Göttingen, 1906) shared this opinion and sup-

ἀληθεία ἀλλὰ εὐδοκῆσαντες τῇ ἀδικίᾳ. This meaning for ἀληθεία was at that time current among both Jews and pagans; two parallel developments took place here. Hundreds of Jews and Greeks at that time might have written the sentence of Clemens Rom. (xxxv. 5): ἀκολουθήσωμεν τῇ ὁδῷ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπορριψάντες ἀφ' ἐαυτῶν πᾶσαν ἀδικίαν καὶ πονηρίαν. Clemens Alex. writes (*Quis dives*, 38): οὐκ ἐπιχαίρει τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, σύγχαίρει δὲ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. For love and truth, comp. also 2 Thess. ii. 10, and Eph. iv. 15.

posed that the temple of Shiloh existed already in the pre-Mosaic period. This temple and its holy throne, the ark, was adopted by the Israelites as a temple of Jahve. The theory that the ark originally had no association with Jahve was also defended by H. Winckler (*Geschichte Isr.*, i: 77) and R. Kraetzschmar (*Die Bundesvorstellung*, 1896, p. 213).

The majority of Old Testament scholars seems inclined to assume that the ark, whatever its original nature may have been, was of non-Jahvistic origin. The tradition that it was made at Mount Sinai is supposed to be untrustworthy. The narrative of its construction is assigned by the school of Wellhausen to the Priestly Code, and therefore is regarded as unimportant for our knowledge of the real nature of this sanctuary.

The chief argument for this theory is that it is not possible to assume that Jahve dwelt at various places at the same time. There can be no doubt about the fact that Mount Sinai was the abode of Jahve. Moses went up into this mount in order to receive the laws and ordinances of Jahve, and he is said to have remained forty days and forty nights in the presence of Jahve. That Mount Sinai is also in later times the fixed abode of Jahve follows from the song of Deborah (Judges v., Psalm lxxviii. 9), where Jahve is called "the Lord of the Sinai." (The Hebrew יְהוָה here is the equivalent of Arabic Dhu, "Lord.") In 1 Kings xix. Elijah went unto the mount of God, Horeb, and God spoke to him on this mount.

At the same time, however, Jahve is believed to have dwelt in the temple of Jerusalem, in which the ark was placed, as is apparent from 1 Kings viii. The ark is the symbol of His presence. Wherever the ark is, Jahve Himself is present (1 Sam. iv. 3 ff.; v. 1 ff.; 2 Sam. vi. 1 ff.; xi. 10 f.; Num. x. 35 f.). This is explained by B. Stade

and others, by the theory that the ark contained some object that was worshipped as a fetish, otherwise it could not have been regarded as the dwelling-place of a god. This conception of the ark, however, is considered by Stade to be inconsistent with the theory that Jahve is the Lord of Mount Sinai (*Geschichte d. V. Isr.* i. 458 ; Kraetzschmar. *Bundesvorstellung*, p. 213).

We easily understand that this theory was contradicted by J. Meinhold, L. Couard (*Z.A.T.W.*, 1892, p. 79 f.) and others. Meinhold tried to show that the ark was a portable throne and held the view that the Israelites carried this throne with them in order to make themselves sure of the presence of Jahve, when they were moving from Mount Sinai. Every religion teaches us that no god ever was regarded as confined to a fixed abode. The Babylonian goddess Ishtar, e.g., is worshipped in various temples in Babylonia, at the same time, however, she is with her image, that was carried by one of the Babylonian princesses to Egypt, and in one of the Amarna-letters the Babylonian king asks the Pharaoh of Egypt not to neglect her. The spiritual nature of the gods implies the possibility of their presence at various places. The ancient conception still survives in the Roman Catholic ideas of the present time. The saints and their images are worshipped in all lands, and there is no doubt about the possibility of their presence in any of those lands. They even possess different qualities in various places and are believed to heal certain diseases in some place which they do not heal in other places. But a saint is never identified with his image. The image always is only the symbol of his presence. So the image of a god was never fully identified with the god himself. The god may dwell in heaven, at the same time, however, he may be present at any place where an image or some other object that is believed to be his symbol, stands.

Therefore, the problem is to explain in which way the ark was a symbol of Jahve. If this can be made clear there is no further ground for the theory that the ark is of non-Jahvistic origin.

The various ways in which scholars have tried to explain how the ark was the abode of Jahve seem to be insufficient.

Reference has been made to the portable sanctuaries of the Egyptians and Assyrians. The ark was supposed to be an imitation of the Egyptian sacred boats. The holy barges of the Egyptian gods, however, were carried about in processions by the priests of the god. A small chapel containing an image of the god was placed in the barge. The Babylonian gods also had their means of conveyance. On the great feast of Zakmuk, the New Year's feast, the gods of Borsippa were brought to Babel for the great meeting of the gods on New Year's Day. There seems to be some resemblance between these sanctuaries and the ark, but closer investigation shows that there is still greater difference. The Egyptian shrines or chapels are small houses with doors and windows. Inside the chapel is the image of the god. The ark, however, is a square wooden chest without any resemblance to a shrine. There is not the least indication that it was ever believed to contain an image. We only know that it sometimes was carried with the army (2 Sam. xi 10 ff.), but there is not a single instance of its being carried about in holy processions. It stood in the temple since the days of Solomon. It was quite an exception when it was taken from the temple at Silo into the encampment of the Israelites. (1 Sam. iv. 3-7, "The Philistines said: God is come into the camp; and they said, Woe unto us, for there has not been such a thing heretofore.")

Even if the statement of the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, i, 307, "Within the best-known historical periods it was in simple arks or coffers that the images of the gods were borne

in procession at the Babylonian (and Assyrian) festivals" were correct these coffers would differ from the ark, as the ark did not contain an image. The arks to which the *Encycl. Bibl.* refers are, however, not wooden coffers, but small houses, as may be seen from the boundary stones, on which several gods are represented looking out of their shrines as a dog looks out of his kennel (III. *Rawl.* 45 ; IV. *Rawl.* 43).

Reichel (*Ueber die vorhellenische Götterkulte*, Wien, 1897) referred to the empty throne that accompanied the army of Xerxes (Herodotus vii. 40) and to other empty thrones. He supposes these thrones to be of Asiatic origin and holds the view that the terrace-towers of the Babylonian temples are artificial thrones. J. Meinhold has taken up this view and supposes the ark to be a portable throne of Jahve, that was to represent His real throne, Mount Sinai. He assumed that the Israelites believed that Jahve sat on the ark. This view was criticised by K. Budde (*Theol. Stud. und Krit.*, 1906, p. 489 ff. ; *War die Lade Jahves ein leerer Thron?*). Budde's criticism is perfectly justified. He argues that the Hebrew word Aron (ark) always means box or chest, that there is not a single trace of the supposed belief that Jahve sat on the ark. On the contrary, the common view is that Jahve rides on the Kherubim and under the wings of those Kherubim the ark was placed in the temple of Solomon. This implies that Jahve would have dwelt under the Kherubim instead of to ride upon them. Furthermore, the Holy of Holies was lower than the temple, it was a cube of 20 cubits on each side. The height of the temple was 30 cubits. We cannot assume that a lower ceiling would have been made in this place if Jahve was believed to sit upon the ark. We may add to this argument that the ark, a square wooden box, can hardly be supposed to be the imitation of the throne of solid rock, Mount Sinai.

We therefore understand, that E. Kautzsch (*Bibl. Theol. des A.T.*, Tübingen, 1911, p. 53) says that a sufficient explanation of the holy nature of the ark has not yet been offered, and that S. A. Cook in the *Encycl. Britannica* (s.v. Ark) refers to the various theories that were brought forward without deciding in favour of one of them.

The solution of the problem is at hand if we only trust in the historical value of Exodus xxxii. There we are told that Moses delayed to come down from Mount Sinai. Then the people gathered themselves together unto Aaron and said to him, "Up, make us a god, which shall go before us ; for as for Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we know not what is become of him." Thereupon Aaron made the golden calf, the image of Jahve, and the Israelites brought offerings to it. The people that is to move from Mount Sinai evidently wishes to be guided by their god. The calf was the image of Jahve worshipped in the temples of Bethel and Dan. This popular conception of Jahve fully agrees with the fact that there is a close connexion between Jahve and thunderstorm and rain. The thunderstorm is the natural phenomenon, in which Jahve reveals Himself unto mankind (Exod. xix., 1 Kings xix., Psalm xviii. etc.). The bullock was the animal that was held to be a symbol of the thunder-god, Hadad or Ramman. So we perfectly understand that Aaron made a bullock, as the people demanded from him a god, that might go before them.

From Exod. xxxii. 1 it follows that the god that might go before them would not have been desired by the people if Moses had come back. Moses himself was but a mere man ; in the eyes of the people he cannot have ranked with a god. Consequently, he must have been expected to bring the god, whom the people wanted, with him. As he did not return the people supposed that he had met with an accident and desired Aaron to procure them the necessary holy symbol

that might assure them of the presence of Jahve, when they were moving from Mount Sinai.

Now Exodus xxxii. tells us that Moses came down with the two tables of the law in his hand. As soon as he saw the bullock "his anger waxed hot" and he demolished the image. The tables of the law, therefore, seem to have the significance ascribed by the Israelites to the bullock. There is one instance in the Old Testament which proves that they might really have this significance in the belief of the old Israelitic tribes, viz., 2 Kings v. 17. Naaman desires to worship Jahve, but, living in Damascus, he is unable to do so, as Jahve is the God of Israel. In order to be sure of the presence of Jahve at Damascus he carries two mules' burden of earth from Samària to Damascus, "for he will henceforth offer neither burnt-offering nor sacrifice unto other gods, but unto Jahve." The earth of Israel, taken to Damascus makes Naaman feel sure that Jahve will be where this part of His soil is. In the same way may the stone tablets, taken from Mount Sinai, make Moses feel sure that Jahve, the Lord of Mount Sinai, will be wherever this part of His abode is transported. According to Exodus xxiv. 12 Jahve Himself has taken those tables and has written upon them the laws and the commandments. Exodus xxxii. 16 says, "The tables were the work of God and the writing was the writing of God." We are perfectly in harmony with ancient religious ideas if we assume that those tablets must have been holy in a double sense. Firstly, because they were taken from Mount Sinai, the sacred abode of Jahve, and secondly, because the writing on it was the writing of God. So we fully understand that a wooden chest that was made for the transport of these tablets was regarded in the same way as the Egyptian shrines on barges, etc. These were holy because the image of a god stood in them; the ark was holy, for the tablets were brought down from Jahve's abode.

Perhaps the objection may be made that Exodus xxxii. is of late origin. The school of Wellhausen assigns it to E, at least the main part of it. It would be of no use to discuss here the construction of Exodus xxxii. I refer for this to *Altest. Stud.*, p. 72, where I tried to show that this chapter cannot be divided into a Jahvistic and an Elohist narrative. For our present purpose this question is of little importance. We have, however, to deal with another theory of the same school regarding this chapter. Exodus xxxii. is supposed to combat the worship of Jahve in the temples of Dan and Bethel (see, e.g., Bāntsch, *Exodus*, p. 269). This explanation is part of the theory that the narratives are reflections from a later period. I criticised this theory in the *EXPOSITOR* for October, 1908, p. 358 ff. In Exodus xxxii. is not the slightest hint about a later worship of Jahve in the form of a bullock. Hosea viii. 5, 6, x. 5 speaks about the "calf of Samaria" and the calf of Bethaven without any reference to this chapter. Amos prophesies in the temple of Bethel, but he does not even allude to the image in that temple. If Exodus xxxii. combats the cult of North-Israel we should certainly expect that the cult of Jerusalem at the same time would be glorified. This is not the case. The tablets, the contents of the holy sanctuary at Jerusalem, are broken by Moses and must be replaced by duplicates. According to the priests of Jerusalem the cult of Bethel was an innovation of Jeroboam I. It is very improbable that a narrative intended to expose the cult of a competing temple would make the ancestor of its own priesthood responsible for the origin of this cult. Therefore, we cannot agree with those scholars who suppose that Exodus xxxii. is a reflection from the ninth or eighth century B.C. But in this case it is reasonable to assume that it is part of the old tradition about the Exodus. The chapter is in perfect harmony with the historical circumstances. If the Israelitic tribes worshipped

Jahve at Mount Sinai, because they assigned their deliverance from the oppression of the Egyptians to His divine power it is to be expected that they will try to make sure themselves of His protection when moving on to Canaan. If there is no reason to deny that the narrative of the events at Mount Sinai must have some historical background, we also must admit that the events of Exodus xxxii. perfectly suit the circumstances.

It is a common view that the contents of the ark cannot have consisted of the tables of the law. We should never expect to find the tables of the law hidden in a chest in the Holy of Holies. We are told in 2 Sam. vi. 6 f. that Uzza was killed as he touched the ark. It seems perfectly incredible that the law of Jahve would have been placed in an ark that was never to be opened. Therefore it seems advisable to assume that the contents originally consisted of pieces of stone, that were taken from Mount Sinai with the same purpose that induced Naaman to take two mules' burden of earth to Damascus. But then it remains to explain in what way the rough-hewn stones were transformed into the tables of the law.

It is generally accepted by those who assume that the ark was an old Josephitic sanctuary adopted by Jahvism, that this transformation took place when the ark was accepted by the priests of Jahve as the symbol of His divine presence. But if we cannot admit that the ark is of pre-Jahvistic origin we do not see why the present form of the tradition should have taken the place of an older form, as the religious feeling of the pre-exilic period (cf. 2 Kings v. 17) obviously had no serious objection against the conception of Jahve found in that supposed old form of the narrative of the events at Mount Sinai. Moreover it cannot be said that the Jahvistic theory about the contents of the ark would have been a probable one, especially not if we remember that Exodus tells us

that the laws written upon these tablets were of considerable length (Exod. xxiv. 12 ; xxxii. 15 f.), and if we therefore are compelled to assume that the view of Deuteronomy (that the Decalogue was written upon the tablets) is to be rejected. I tried to show in my article on the Book of the Covenant and the Decalogue (see EXPOSITOR for August, 1909, p. 158) that it is reasonable to assume that the Book of the Covenant represents the old Mosaic legislation, that was inscribed upon the tables, as Exodus xxiv. 12, "I will give thee . . . the law and the commandment, that thou mayest teach them," cannot refer to the Decalogue. I pointed out (l.c., p. 165) that the term, "Tables of Eduth" may be an old one. If this is right we should have to assume that the Israelitic priests had invented the theory that the legislation of the Book of the Covenant, that was to be applied in every day life, was hidden in a sacred chest that was never to be touched. We can hardly make them responsible for so improbable a suggestion.

So the only way I see is that the study of the problems of the contents of the tables and of the origin of the ark leads to the conclusion that the narrative of Exodus about the contents of the ark after all is to be accepted in its present form. We are used to suppose that the ark was never to be opened and that it should not even be touched. But in reality no sufficient proofs of this could be given. It is true that "Uzzah is killed" (2 Sam. vi. 4), but it is not justifiable to derive from the fact that a man was killed in transporting the ark the conclusion that it was not to be touched. The ark was set upon a new cart. This cannot have been done without touching it. After the death of Uzzah David would not take the ark into Jerusalem. We do not know in what way Uzzah was killed, but the religious feeling of those days could only explain this accident as a deed of Jahve. If David had known that it was not allowed to touch the ark he would

not have refused to bring the ark to Jerusalem and he would have understood that Uzzah died by his own fault.

In 1 Samuel vi. 18 several of the people of Beth Shemesh are killed because they looked into the ark. The consequence is that they do not wish to have the ark any longer with them. This does not prove that nobody was allowed to open the holy chest. It is obvious that only sacred men are entitled to approach the sanctuary. Therefore, Abinadab sanctified his son Eleazar (1 Sam. vii. 1) to keep the ark. If common people are punished for approaching the ark or for looking in it we are not justified to conclude that the priests also had no right of opening it.

Furthermore, the existence of laws written on tables of stone demands a receptacle in which they might be conveyed. We know very little of the history of the ark. It is not probable that it was opened at certain times when it once was placed in the Holy of Holies of the Jerusalem temple. There were of course sufficient copies of the laws of Jahve at hand for the priests (Hos. viii. 12). When manuscripts may be consulted there is no need for the more difficult handling of stone tablets. So we perfectly understand that the ark practically became the holy sanctuary that remained in the untroubled silence of the Holy of Holies.

The name of the ark remains to be discussed. The name Ark of the Covenant of Jahve is quoted as proof for the late origin of the conception of the ark as the receptacle of the tablets of the law. In some places the Hebrew word Covenant, ברית, means "law" (Deut. iv. 13, "He declared to you His covenant which He commanded you to perform," and 1 Kings viii. 21, Solomon "set a place for the ark wherein is the covenant of the Lord"). Now it is supposed that the name Ark of the Covenant depends upon this meaning of "Berith"; and as the word in this sense is used in Deuteronomy it is supposed that this name arose in the seventh

century B.C. under the influence of the religious ideas of the prophets.

An inquiry into the curious names of the ark seems to prove that the name Ark of the Covenant is late. The old name was Ark of Jahve. Wellhausen (*Text d. Bücher Samuelis*, p. 55; cf. Driver, *Notes on the Hebr. Text of the Books of Samuel*, p. 36) observed that the name Ark of the Covenant of Jahve is used in 1 Samuel iv. only in verses 3, 4 and 5. In other verses of the same chapter it is called Ark of Jahve or Ark of God. The text of the LXX omits the word covenant in these verses. A Redactor is supposed to have corrected the Hebrew text, but to have stopped his emendations after verse 4 as they became too numerous. It is possible that this is the right explanation. LXX reads also Ark of the Covenant of Jahve, 1 Samuel v. 4, 2 Samuel vi. 10 (where the Hebrew text omits Berith). So there is room for doubt. In Joshua iii., however, it is obvious that the word Berith is of later origin in the verses 11, 14, 17, where the Hebrew construction is an impossible one. The fact that the word Berith was inserted in some verses of 1 Samuel iv. and Joshua iii. is no sufficient proof for the late origin of the title "Ark of the Covenant of Jahve." It only proves that in later times there was a predilection for this name, but it does not show that it originated in a later period.

In Num. x. 33, xiv. 44, the ark is called Ark of the Covenant of Jahve. These parts of Numbers are assigned by Wellhausen to the Elohist. Many scholars assume that the word covenant is a later insertion. But this admits of no proof. It is only assumed in order to be in harmony with the common theory. We do not see why the ark could not have been called the Ark of the Covenant of Jahve if the historical events show that this name may have a perfectly good sense in the Israelitic tradition.

There is no reason to doubt that the various tribes of Israel

made a covenant at Mount Sinai. It also is beyond reasonable doubt that the Lord of Mount Sinai was invoked as the God protecting this covenant. The tribes promised to obey His laws and commandments. But in this case there is no sufficient ground for denying that the holy chest, which contained the sacred laws of this God, might not have been called the Ark of the Covenant of Jahve.

The fact that centuries afterwards this old name was understood in another way and therefore was beloved by the Soferim, does not prove that the name itself is a title of later invention. If we penetrate into the religious thought of old Israel we do not find any feature in the conception of the nature of the ark that cannot be explained by the historical situation and the religious ideas of that period.

Thus we need not accept the view that the ark was a sanctuary to be used in the holy war, nor that it was an old Josephitic fetish; we have only to interpret the text of Exodus in the light of the history of religion.

B. D. EERDMANS.

ST. PAUL AND THE MYSTERY-RELIGIONS.

II.

JEWISH AFFINITIES WITH THE MYSTERY-RELIGIONS.

It is a custom almost universal among writers on the religion of the New Testament to speak of the "Mysticism" or "Faith-Mysticism" of St. Paul. Now "Mysticism" is one of the most elastic terms in the religious vocabulary. Hence, when it is used to designate an important element in the complex of Paul's religious experience, its precise significance in this connexion must be as clearly defined as possible. It is not our purpose at the present stage to