

CHARACTERISTICS
OF THE
INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY
IN THE BOOKS OF
JUDGES, SAMUEL, AND KINGS .

-James G. Heller.

mic. 9/78

(1).

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.....	Page 1.
CHAPTER 1,The General Plan of the Books.....	Page 8.
CHAPTER 2,The Covenant Idea.....	Page 25.
CHAPTER 3,The People of the Land and Idolatry.....	Page 36.
CHAPTER 4,The Central Sanctuary and the Priesthood..	Page 48.
CHAPTER 5,Politics and Material Power.....	Page 58.
CHAPTER 6,Faithfulness and Unfaithfulness.....	Page 71.
CHAPTER 7,The Compilers and Their Material.....	Page 84.
CHAPTER 8,The Deuteronomic School and the Prophets..	Page 98.
APPENDICES.	
I.Characteristics of Deuteronomy.....	Page 108.
II.The Relation of the Books of Samuel	
to Judges and Kings.....	Page 115.
III.The Use of Formulae in Judges,Samuel,& Kings.	Page 118.

(2).

NOTE.

Citations from Biblical Passages are indicated as follows:

15:1 means Chapter Fifteen, verse 1.

2:1-3;15; means Chapter Two, verses one through three;
and Chapter Fifteen.

4:2,6 means Chapter Four, verse two, and verse six.

Etc.

(3).

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- Benzinger, I.
Die Buecher der Koenige, Marti's Commentary.
Freiburg, 1899.
- Buttenwieser, M.
The Prophets of Israel.
New York, 1914.
- Driver, S.R.
Deuteronomy, International Critical Commentary.
New York, 1895.
- Giesebrecht, Fr.
Die Geschichtlichkeit des Sinaibundes.
Koenigsberg, 1900.
- Gunkel, R.
Geschichtsschreibung, Judaeische, Israelitische.
in Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart.
- Kittel, Rud.
Die Anfaenge der Hebraeischen Geschichtsschreibung im
Alten Testament.
Leipzig, 1896.
- Kittel, Rud.
Die Buecher der Koenige, Nowack's Commentary.
Goettingen, 1900.
- Kuenen, A.
National Religions and Universal Religions.
New York, 1882.
- Moore, G.F.
Judges, International Critical Commentary.
New York, 1895.
- Procksch, O.
Geschichtsbetrachtung und Geschichtliche Ueberlieferung
bei den Vorexilischen Propheten.
Leipzig, 1902.
- Schmidt, Hans.
Die Geschichtsschreibung im Alten Testament.
Tuebingen, 1911.
- ~~Bredt, D. Land~~
~~Schmidt,~~
Samuel, Marti's Commentary. Tuebingen, 1900.
- Smith, H.P.
Samuel, International Critical Commentary.
New York, 1896.

(4).

BIBLIOGRAPHY(Cont'd).

Smith, W. Robertson.
The Old Testament in the Jewish Church.
New York, 1900.

Wellhausen, J.
Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels.
Berlin, 1899.

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY IN THE
BOOKS OF JUDGES, SAMUEL, AND
KINGS.

INTRODUCTION.

Before setting out upon the task we have assigned ourselves in the space of this thesis, let us for a few moments state what is assumed for the work and what is omitted. For this to be a complete and thorough study of the subject, to delve into every crack and cranny of the subject, it would be necessary first of all to enter into an analysis of the three books in question, and possibly of the Book of Deuteronomy also. No one can doubt that there has been much work already done in this direction, and that the generations of scholars that have labored to uncover and to characterize the various strata that are to be found in these works have produced results incommensurable in their influence. Probably the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings have been of the greatest service of all the canonical works in the task of analytical criticism. They have furnished the standards of the growth of history and civilization, which might be applied as a test, a touchstone, to the customs and laws cited in works ostensibly earlier, and specifically in the criticism of the laws and narratives of the Hexateuch. Certain it is that the criticism based on the aforementioned books has been of greater value than textual analysis, and of greater reliability, for the deductions drawn from comparison of language, phrase and construction, are far more likely to

#2.

go astray than are those which spring from cultural grounds.

However, it becomes evident from a most cursory glance over these books, Judges, Samuel and Kings, that, although they contain the record of ancient events and antique customs, the material presented to us has not all its origin in the same stage of society, and that the impression it creates in us is by no means the same in the various sections, especially in matters of style and of viewpoint. This fact was recognized at an early date, and the task that had first been undertaken in the case of the Hexateuch--because of the greater religious interest involved--was also pursued with these books. By the present time the scholars are in comparative unanimity as to the analysis of these works, and also as to the placing of the sources which are discovered as a result of the analysis. For the purposes of this treatise it will not be necessary, except perhaps in isolated instances, to discuss the text, or to argue as to the authenticity of specific portions. True it is that there are still many questions in connection with the textual criticism of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, which merit our attention. For example, the analysis of the books of Samuel might be pursued with profit, and the question of the placing specifically of the source in that book which glorifies the prophet and makes of the state a theocracy,--a source that seems to have preceded the Deuteronomic compilation by some time--be considered. It would also be valuable to attempt to trace the connection of the sources in the historical books with

#3.

the Elohist and Jahvist sources in the Hexateuch; such an attempt has been made repeatedly, with varying success.

But this treatise is not intended to be a discussion of these questions. Its sole purpose is to describe, on the basis of the work that has already been done, following in the main the lines laid down by the consensus of opinion of the scholars, the viewpoint of the compilers of the books in question. For the purpose of our treatise, we shall assume that the books have already been analyzed. In our passages we shall follow George Foote Moore's Commentary to the Book of Judges, in the International Critical Commentary, - Henry Preserved Smith to Samuel, in the same series, also Budde to Samuel, Benzinger to Kings, in Marti's series, and also Rudolf Kittel to Kings, in Nowack's series, - and finally S.R. Driver to Deuteronomy, also in the International. We shall also assume with these gentlemen, and with practically all other critics, that the work of the compilers of the historical books may be characterized as Deuteronomic. It has been remarked that the only quotation from the Hexateuch in the historical books is from Deuteronomy*. By calling the work

*Dt. 2 Kings 14:6 -Dt. 24:16, cf. Wellhausen, p. 283.
of the authors Deuteronomic we mean only that its general

philosophy is practically identical, that it must have been have been written after Deuteronomy, and under the same influences, and that most probably this compilation was first completed in the Babylonian Exile*, and perhaps added to after the Exile.
*Wellhausen, p. 283: "Wenn man darnach in vollem Maasse berechtigt ist, die Bearbeitung deuteronomisch zu nennen, so darf man damit doch keinen anderen Sinn verbinden als

#4.

den, dass dieselbe unter dem Einfluss des Deuteronomiums entstanden ist, unter dem Das ganze Jahrhundert des Exils steht".

As some of these points are of direct value in their bearing upon our subject, we shall take them up later. In our discussion

of the viewpoint of the compilers* of the books, we shall

*We use the word compilers advisedly, in place of the current term, "redactor". The latter seems to imply a re-editing, a modification of the text to suit the changed conditions. Our conception is that the selections were taken from the sources and combined into the historical works almost without change, and that therefore the men who accomplished this work are called "compilers" more fittingly than "redactors".

continually compare their views with those set forth in Deuteronomy, and show clearly thereby the intimate connection between the two. However, the negative evidence of the Deuteronomic character of the work of the compilers is even stronger than the positive. A comparison of the work of our authors with the work of earlier writers will show at once the tremendous strides made in the interpretation of history, and in the whole attitude with which history was approached. It was in Deuteronomy for the first time that this change appeared, and unless some exceedingly remote hypothesis be advanced to explain the change, it would be fair to assume on this ground alone that there is an intimate connection between Deuteronomy and the compilers of Judges, Samuel and Kings. However, the connection between these works is not merely spiritual and cultural, but also literary, and the idiosyncrasies of the style of the Deuteronomic sections of our books justify us in ascribing them to a connection with the Deuteronomic school of

writers.*

*For detailed discussion of the stylistic similarities see the Introduction to Driver's Deuteronomy, pages lxxvii-xcv, especially page xci.

For greater convenience in the comparison of the works, we have added at the end of the thesis a list of the most salient views of the Book of Deuteronomy, with a brief enumeration of the passages. See Appendix I.

Another question of prime importance for our subject is whether the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings were all compiled by the same hand, or by the same school of writers. This is an exceedingly complex and difficult question. Especially in the case of the books of Samuel do we meet with difficulties in the way of demonstrating the connection. Various hypotheses have been advanced. Briefly, G.F. Moore is of the opinion that the compiler of Judges cannot be identified with that of Deuteronomy, Joshua, or Kings*. H.P. Smith says that Samuel is more closely connected with Kings than with Judges*, and adds that Judges and Kings are edited by an author of the Deuteronomic school, and that by analogy (sic) Samuel also, - and that, though the formulae for the beginning and closing of periods are not so sharp or frequent in the books of Samuel, this is because of the more determined progress of the narrative, and the smaller number of its sections. He quotes three sections of Samuel as evidently Deuteronomic*. Kittel says in his Commentary to Kings that the *I Sam. 7:13-17; 14:47-51; and 2 Sam 8, also I Sam 4:18b. Compare Jud. 16:31b; 15:20; and 13:6a. Cf. Budde, Samuel, ix-x.

#6.

first sign of R. is formulae, that all formulae are according to the Deuteronomic viewpoint, because of their reference to "high-places", and because of their style. He says that there are many proofs that this work is by the same author or school as are Judges and Samuel, because the interest of the compilers is not political but religious and conventual, stressing the history

of the worship of Jahve and also idolatry*. It seems to be the

*Cf. Kittel, Kings, vii, also Geschichte der Hebraer, II 50.

Cf. Wellhausen, p. 280, "Dass diese Bearbeitung unseres Buches mit derjenigen der beiden vorangehenden Geschichtsbücher im wesentlichen gleichartig ist, bedarf keines Nachweises".

accepted viewpoint that these books are by the same school; for our purposes it is not necessary to demonstrate that they are from the same hand. Our task is only to describe the characteristics of the school, which followed the ideas of Deuteronomy, and it will be admitted that in each of these books the viewpoint is Deuteronomic, and that the interpretation of history is practically the same. In addition to this the task of determining the exact relationship of these three works, one to another, would necessitate a separate study of considerable length*.

*However we have appended a short note on it to this treatise; cf. Appendix II.

In connection with our subject and of great importance for a proper understanding of the philosophy of history of the compilers of these historical works is a comparison of his viewpoint with that of the prophets, and also with the other Biblical books, as well as with the cultural and religious content of the sources they utilize. An adequate treatment of this would

#7.

require quite a space. I wish to reserve the complete study of this for a future date. However, to round out this treatise, I have added a short chapter, explaining in as concise a way as possible what the position of the view of the compilers is in the history of the religious evolution of Israel.

#8.

CHAPTER 1.

The General Plan of the Books.

Although the prophets had little or no influence upon the politics of the Jewish state before the Exile, and although their teachings had no appreciable effect upon the cult that was practically universal at their time, yet we know that they must have had around them a band of disciples, such as Baruch to Jeremiah, or as Isaiah mentions in 8:16. That these disciples were thoroughly imbued with the spirit of their teachers, the great literary prophets, and that they carried on the message, is testified to both by the preservation of the prophetic literature, despite the indifference of the great mass of the nation, -by the spread of the doctrine during and after the Exile, and most forcibly by the book of Deuteronomy. Whether the book of Deuteronomy owes anything to the prophet Jeremiah or not, it is certain that the impetus that brought ^{it} into being had its source in the prophetic preachments, and that it was an attempt to reform the popular religion along the lines of prophetic idealism. To be sure, it was a compromise, -but yet with much of the monotheism and the humanitarianism of the prophets.

When the time came, then, that Nebuchadnezzar captured the city of Jerusalem, and after the second deportation laid waste the proud daughter of Zion, it was inevitable that many of those carried to Babylon would see in it a confirmation of the truths which the prophets had been hurling at the people for over

#9.

two hundred years. The disciples were strengthened in their conviction, and undoubtedly spurred to renewed vigor in their efforts to spread the prophetic word. This is shown by the great literary activity which arose surely not only for the purpose of holding together the remnant of the nation by encouraging and admonishing them, but also because for the first time the people were to some extent open to the lessons of the prophets. With the great lesson of the destruction of their homes before them, and with the problem of accommodating their religious practice to a situation in which Jahve could not be worshipped because they were upon "foreign soil", is it any wonder that this attitude of the people caused numerous books to be written so as to drive home the true conception of man's relation to God? And in order to sear the lesson into the very souls of the people, it was necessary not only to repeat and to promulgate the lessons of the prophets by word and letter, by exhortation and instruction, but also to show them wherein they had erred, to illustrate from the course of their history the operation of the same principles which according to the prophets and their disciples had caused the downfall of the Israelitish and Judaic kingdoms. It was in this spirit that the work of composition of the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings was undertaken; it was an attempt to apply the great prophetic principle that God reveals himself in history. Of course, as we shall see later, this concept was applied in a manner too mechanical to merit the sanction or the name of the prophetic idea, -

and yet back of it seems to be a sincere and earnest desire to teach the people the lesson of their own history. This emphasis of the fact that the prophetic ideas are to be proved by the fall of Jerusalem is to be found in Deuteronomy, especially Chapters 1-11, and 27-33 (cf. particularly 4:15-40; ch. 38; and 29:10-28), which passages may come from practically the same time. The entire history in Judges, Samuel and Kings seems to be shaped so as to work up to the great climaxes, the goal of the whole narrative, 2 Kings 17:22-23, the exile of the Northern Kingdom, as it is said, "And the children of Israel did according to all the sins of Jeroboam, which he did; they did not depart from them. Until the Lord removed Israel from before Him, as he spake through His servants the prophets, and Israel was exiled from its land to Assyria, to this very day". The same holds true of 2 Kings 25:31b, where the same fate meets Judah*.

*Kuenen, p. 80.

That these books, Judges, Samuel and Kings, were written during the Exile, or rather compiled at this time, is shown by the fact that the material reaches down to the Exile itself, practically up to the deportation of the young king Jehoiachin, - and also because of numerous passages in the books themselves. Solomon's prayer, 1 Kings 8, 9, is throughout an apocalyptic prophecy of the exile, a "Vorausschau auf die Zukunft"*. On the other hand, in 2 Kings 17, we have a panorama of the past, a "Rueckblick auf die Vergangenheit". The entire theory of the compilers, and the mechanical way in which it is worked out, could only come from a time when there was no longer a

*Wellhausen, p. 377.

#11.

nation, when the perspective had become sufficiently wide to render judgments. However, it is probable that there were two (or) exilic redactions, or compilations, the second of which is also within the space of the Exile, a decade or so after the first. The chief reason given by the first compiler for the downfall of each separate king and for the kingdoms as a whole is the fact that he followed the "sin of Jeroboam", which means that he continued to permit the calves at Dan and Beth-el to exist. But this view is supplemented by another*, seen

*Kittel, vii-viii.

most clearly in 2 Kings 17:7ff, in which the accusation is supplemented by that of the observance of Canaanitish idolatry in general*. Probably the first redactor lived in the beginning

*Cf. also 2 Kings 21:7ff, and 2 Kings 23:26f.

of the Exile. Both are Deuteronomic *, and look on Deuteronomy

*Cf. Benzinger xiii-xiv.

as not only valid for their own day, but as having authority for Israel even from the ancient days, -also that it has been transgressed from of old, and that these defections are the real cause of the destruction of the two kingdoms. Most

of the work belongs to the first compiler, or compilers, the application of Deuteronomy as a standard, the selection and arrangement of the material. The second compiler, or compilers made a few minor changes to make the work harmonize with the fact of the Exile, and also for the purpose of synchronism.

The parenetic speeches belong to the first, -the speeches with which he loves to accompany portions of the History*. This

*Cf. I Kings 2:1ff; 3:14; 8:14ff; 11:29ff, and others.

redactor made few changes in the text, but contented himself

in the main with putting his sources side by side, -that is those

#12.

sources which contained some element of religious or church history which he desired for his purposes. The second compiler tried to make the book harmonize more nearly with the fact of the Exile, and to add a history of the deportations, -also to superimpose the exilic idea of chronology. Probable passages to be referred to the second are I Kings 8;9:1ff; 2 Kings 21:7ff; 2 Kings 17:7ff; 23:15ff; 13:4ff, 23ff). Probably we should include also I Kings 5:4; 9:22; 10:21. There are also a few interpolations by P in the three books*. In
*Cf. I Kings 6:16; 8:1ff; 18:31, etc.
general it may be said that the first of these two sources is more concerned with the compilation of the book and the structural details, while the second adds touches that will particularly impress the people of the Exile, or inserts a few harmonizing passages here and there.

The important fact to be established, however, and which seems clear, is that the compilation of the books as a whole took place during the Exile, and is tinged with the purpose which we had set forth above, that is, of presenting to the people of the day a systematic historical lesson, showing how the ideals of the prophets, according to the conception of this school of their disciples, were put into practice throughout the history of their fathers. The compilers look upon the period of the kingdom as closed and judged, condemned because of unfaithfulness to the God of their fathers, whom Israel was in covenant bound to obey and to worship. It thus becomes a great "confession of sin on the part of the exiled nation"; and
*Wellhausen, p. 281, "Die Darstellung wird gewissermassen zu "

#13.

einige grossen Suendenbekenntnis der exilirten Nation ueber ihre Vergangenheit".

as a confessional was it intended to be used by the exiled nation.

In general it may be said that the books are Deuteronomic, and that they try to read history by the Deuteronomic standard. In calling the book Deuteronomic we use it in the sense of Wellhausen*. However, whatever may have been the connection between the compilers of these books and Deuteronomy, it is certain that they interpreted history in accordance not merely with the ideas of the book of Deuteronomy, but as though Deuteronomy had been known to previous generations as a written book. This gives rise to a whole horde of contradictions between the standard of the sources from which the compilers themselves have arranged their works, and between the passages from their own pen. On the one hand the original sources show that the predecessors of Josiah had no knowledge of Deuteronomy, and on the other that nevertheless the compilers judge all these generations by it as a norm*. And the norm by which they are

*Cf. W. R. Smith, p. 396. Kuenen 78-79.

judged is not only the same ideas of Deuteronomy, but the very form and content of the law-book of Josiah. As Wellhausen* says very directly, "Laesst sich bei den Buechern der Richter und Samuelis vielleicht nicht mit voelliger Bestimmtheit entscheiden, welches die Norm sei, wonach der letzte Verfasser die Vergangenheit beurtheilt, so ist beim Buche der Koenige kein Zweifel moeglich. Hier wird nicht bloss in unbestimmten

#14.

Andeutungen von dem Willen Jahves geredet, dem Israel gehorchen soll und widerstrebt, sondern auch hin und wieder* von der geschriebenen Thora, worin seine Rechte und Satzungen enthalten sind - eine Unterscheidung, worin sich immerhin ein geschichtliches Gefuehl ausspricht".

The purpose of the compilers is fundamentally a religious one. They have not the least intention of writing a history in the modern sense of the word. Before their time had already been compiled and completed the Jahvist and Elohist accounts, and their stories probably reached far into the time of the kings. Even these were not histories, but merely collections of folk-tales, without regard to authenticity or probability. Our compilers had before them these and several other sources from which to draw. Some they mention and refer to them the reader who wishes to learn more of the facts*. But these histories

* Such as the Annals of the Kings of Judah and Israel, the Book of Yashar, etc. For further discussion of the relation of the compilers to their material, cf. Chap. 7.

are not to be records of all the accomplishments of the kings of Judah and Israel, a court-history, such as the potentates of the Orient loved to keep, such a one as is mentioned in the Book of Esther, - this is to be a "religious history", a book which selects from the material at hand sufficient to show the continuity of the history of the Israelites, and to prove that in every period faithfulness meant prosperity and unfaithfulness the disfavor of Jahve. The compilers wish to picture the Jews as a nation, and as having periods of national backslidings.

#15.

It is inevitable that they should do this, if they wished to bring home to the people of the Exile their relation to God as a nation, their mission as a chosen people, which is to last even beyond their present misfortunes. Even the prophets picture a special relation between Israel and Jahve, a "marriage" as in Hosea, or a bond of holiness as in Isaiah. Therefore, in their interpretation of the past, the compilers of Judges, Samuel, and Kings try even in the period of the Judges to picture every calamity as a national one, and every victory as affecting the entire people of Israel. This is a most difficult task, as some of the sources distinctly state that specific tribes refused to join in the enterprises in which most of the others cooperated*.

*Cf. Jud 5:16-17, 23, significantly not mentioned in Ch. 4, or also Jud. 8:1, 6.

The fact of the matter most probably is that the original sources of the book of Judges merely contained a number of stories about heroes of single tribes, not stating the exact time of each. But the compilers of the present book of Judges had to make their sources conform to their scheme of having a national sin and a national guilt, and it is therefore that they represent each Judge as though he were the sole commanding figure of his time among all the tribes of Israel, and as though the fate of all the tribes depended upon this one man*.

*Cf. Wellhausen, p. 233.

The view of the compilers is then usually characterized as "religious pragmatism", a method which sees in every event in history a judgment of God, which reads its own notions into the

#16.

customs and usages of other times, which works out a scheme for its history, a kind of cycle of reward and punishment, of faith and backsliding. This system runs throughout the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings. A little later we shall see the exact structure according to which the compilers have built these works, so as to conform to the religious views they wish the history of former times to teach. The view of the compilers may be expressed briefly by quoting H.P. Smith*, "This (religious *Smith, Samuel, pp. xxxv-xxxvii. pragmatism) is a philosophy of history, according to which when Israel was faithful to Jahve it was prospered and kept in safety. When it forgot Him it was delivered over to the power of its enemies. Thus the Philistine oppression comes because the people have forsaken Jahve and served Baal and Astarte. When they repent and seek their God, He delivers them by the hand of Samuel. As an expression of belief in the justice of God in dealing with the nations, this view deserves all respect. The mechanical way in which it is carried out, however, gives a one-sided view of the course of Israel's history". These points, as to the exact standard by which the compilers judge previous generations will be discussed in detail in the following chapters. The tendency to condemn previous generations and to read into history the ideas of the compilers is also illustrated in Jer. 2:1ff; 4:3. *

*Cf. Wellhausen, p. 282.

It may be said also that naturally enough the histories are written from a Judaic standpoint throughout, so far as

#17.

the work of the compilers is concerned. All worship outside of Jerusalem, according to orthodox Deuteronomic doctrine, is considered heretical, and the entire religion of the Northern kingdom from its very inception is looked upon as godless, despite the evident fact that so far as precedent and sanction are concerned Jeroboam was more within his rights and in accordance with the spirit of the people and the religion of the time in setting up his so-called golden calves at Dan and Bethel,--shrines hallowed by centuries of pilgrimages, and by the tales of the patriarchs, whereas Jerusalem had been a Canaanite stronghold, the citadel of the Jebusites, the last stand of the "people of the land", and with no claim to sanctity beyond the fact that it was the city of David, the residence of the kings of the Davidic line. But, because the compilers are Judaic and also Davidic in their sympathies, with a very considerable bias for both, and because they accept unconditionally the authority of the Deuteronomic laws as to the central sanctuary, they must put Jeroboam in a bad light. Israelitish sentiment, however, creeps in, as most of the early sources are from the Northern Kingdom*. Othniel is the only Judaic Judge in the

*E.g. the Song of Deborah, where Judah is not even counted with Israel; cf. Wellhausen, p. 233.

entire book, and almost certainly his name is an interpolation by the Deuteronomic compilers to round out the number, and perhaps also that there might be lent a more national tinge to the book, according to the principle of the compilers described above, and finally as a result of the hint which the compilers

#18.

got in Jud.1:12-15.

Another feature of the compilers' method is that they love to voice their approval or condemnation,--much oftener the latter, through the mouth of a prophet, or occasionally an angel, whom they introduce into the narrative for that purpose. It relieves the monotony of their schematic appraisals of the kings or people, and also gives them an opportunity for a more eloquent use of the Deuteronomic diction, and a chance to dramatize their admiration for the great literary prophets, whose disciples they feel themselves to be. Let me cite the important instances. In Jud.2:1-4 the compilers introduce an angel, who reproves the Israelites for not having uprooted the Canaanites, the penalty of which is that they have not been

exterminated, and thus form a snare to the Israelites#. There

#Cf. Ex.34:11-16; 23:31b-33; Dt.7:1-5, etc. Cf. also Jud.6:11. is no doubt that like earlier sources the "Malach" here is

synonymous with Jahve himself. In Jud.6:7 Jahve speaks

through an anonymous prophet. In I Sam.2:27-36 an unnamed

prophet appears to rebuke Eli and his sons*. In I Sam7:2-17 is

*Cf. I Kings 13:1ff.

a striking example, where Samuel is pictured as a theocratic

ruler, the people are saved by faith, prayer, and a miracle. In

I Kings 11:29-39 Achijah is introduced at a crucial point in the history to announce the future and to pass judgment upon

the past. In I Kings 12:33-13:34 a prophet predicts Jeroboam's

end*. In 14:1-13 Achijah again appears, this time to predict the

* Vs.22ff are an interesting instance of the mechanical conception of prophecy.

death of Jeroboam's son, because of his unfaithfulness; and in

#19.

15:29-30 we have the fulfillment of the prediction. In this instance we have the complete cycle of warning as a result of apostasy, continued evil, and then the relation of the consummation which has already been foretold. In 2 Kings 15:12 we have the verification of the prophecy to Jehu,--seemingly an interpolation for the sake of harmonization. Three important passages showing how the compilers use this method are 2 Kings 17:13-14, warning Judah and Israel of their fate,--21:10-12, in which Jahve announces by his servants, the prophets, the destruction of Judah and Jerusalem,--and 24:2*, where the destruction occurs even as

*Cf. also 23:26.

predicted. Note also 2 Kings 14:25. It is evident that the conception of prophecy as a message from Jahve is thoroughly in consonance with the laws and stories of Deuteronomy. In Dt. 18:9-22 we are given the picture of the prophet as an official, in place of the diviners, magicians, sorcerers, etc.* In verse 15 it is

*Cf. I Sam 28:5f.

stated that Jahve will at the proper occasion raise up a prophet, evidently to carry out His work among the people, exactly as is represented throughout Judges, Samuel, and Kings*. And in v. 20 a

*Cf. Jud. 2:16, 18, where almost the same words are used. false prophet is defined as one "who may presume to speak a

word in My name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or who

may speak in the name of other gods".*

*See particularly, in addition to these passages, I Kings 22:11f, 23. Note also Dt. 30:14, where it says that the word of God has been "made near",--by prophets and other teachers, as Driver explains, ad. loc.

We proceed now to a brief consideration of the structure of the books, as showing the purpose of the compilers. This will be treated at greater length in Chapter 7, in connection with

the manner in which the compilers handle their material.

The most noticable feature of the structure of the books, more so in Judges than in Samuel, and most so in Kings, is the way in which the compilers try to shape the religious history of Israel into a cycle, a mechanical sequence of sin and punishment, obedience and prosperity, then again sin and punishment, obedience and prosperity, and so on. It is easy to see that the compilers had no conception of history in the sense that we now use the term, nor had they any idea of the great complexity and heterogeneity of social causation. To them there were but two causes in the entire history of Israel, Jahve and His people: when Israel sinned, then Jahve punished them, and in the end they became humbled and repented of their evil ways*, -and then

*Though later on the compilers can account for the Exile only by the fact that in the latter part of their history they did not repent, but sinned for many generations.

when they have been restored to favor they forget Jahve's mercy and off they go again on their career of idolatry and vice. In Judges 2:6-16:31 the scheme is applied throughout, and excludes both 1:1-2:5 and 17:1-21:25. All the middle section is presented as a proof of Israel's sins and Jahve's gracious mercy. Let us examine one or two instances in detail, to see exactly the method according to which the compilers work*. In Jud. 2:6-3:5 we have

*Moore quotes Vatke, *Biblische Theologie*, 1835, p. 181: "an almost rhythmical alternation of idolatry and subjugation, return to Jahve and liberation".

the general introduction to the Deuteronomic parts of the book. In verse 2:7 we are told that the people are faithful to Jahve in the lifetime of the elders and Joshua. But in 2:10 immediate-

#21.

ly after the death of Joshua and the elders begins the defection of the people, who-according to the compilers-"did not know Jahve nor His 'Ma'ase'". In 2:16 we are told that then Jahve raised up Judges in the hope of teaching the people faithfulness, but-v.17-it was of no avail. However-v.17-the people remained faithful during the lifetime of the Judge*.

*Cf. Jud.3:11; 4:1; 8:28b; 1 Sam.12:10-11, especially the last passage. -3:12,15-is also highly typical. Here in 3:12 Eglon,

king of Moab, is given supremacy over Israel for eighteen years because of their evil-doing*. Then the Israelites repent, and

*Cf. 4:2; 6:1; 10:7; 13:1.

pray to Jahve to deliver them from their servitude. And He

raised up Ehud ben Gera, the Benjamite. Exactly the same

scheme is to be found in 3:7-11, in the case of Othniel, in 4:1-3

in the case of Deborah, 13:1 as to Samson, and at greater length

in 6:1-6, 7-10 about Gideon, -and in 10:6-16 as to Jephthah.*

*For the idea that the people go astray after the death of the Judge, compare 8:33; 2:19; 2:9f, 11-13; 3:11, 12; 4:1, 27b; 2:17; Ex.34:15f; Dt.31:16; and Jud.10:6. For the subjugation of the people for their sins, cf. also 10:7; 3:12; 2:14, 20; 3:8; 4:2; 1 Sam.12:9. For the repentance of Israel after prolonged servitude, cf. 3:9, 15; 4:3; 6:6, 7; 1 Sam.12:10.

1 Sam.7:2-17 has the same plan as the book of Judges. Here

the people turn from their evil ways and follow Samuel. As a

result of this and of Samuel's prayer and sacrifice Jahve

defeats the Philistines, who have selected this very dramatically

appropriate moment to attack the Israelites, and therefore during

the lifetime*, of Samuel, Israel has peace and plenty.* 1 Sam.12

*Cf. Jud.2:19.

**H.P.Smith, p.50, "The author's theory of history is like that of the Deuteronomistic editor of the Book of Judges-if possible more mechanical than his". But it goes even further, since here the deliverance comes by a miraculous

#22.

intervention, not by raising up a Judge. This would seem to place this source in Samuel at a later time than similar episodes in Judges.

is of great importance, as a kind of retrospect over the period of Judges. H.P. Smith-p. 82-proves in detail that its style is Deuteronomic, and then shows that it may well be that the book of Judges originally extended this far and that this was the closing address, just as Joshua 24. "The thought and language remind us of the framework of the Book of Judges, and there is no violence in the supposition that this address once closed the account of the period of the judges, as Joshua's farewell address closed the account of the conquest of Canaan. In this case the author who set forth his scheme of history in Jud. 2:11-3:6, and repeated it in Jud. 10:6-18, closed his book (or this section of the history of Israel) with this chapter as a retrospect".* In the book of Kings the Deuteronomic compilers devote themselves mainly to rounding out the reign of each king, and making the chain continuous. This they accomplish by means of formulae. These will be considered and enumerated in detail in Appendix III. In the books of Kings the succession is not exactly the same as in Judges or Samuel, in the sections indicated, no cycle of good and evil. Each king is judged separately according to the Deuteronomic standard. In these books the desire of the compilers is not so much to show the succession of rewards and punishments as to pile accusation upon accusation, Ossa upon Pelion, so as to climb to the great mountain-catastrophe of the Exile. The exact

grounds for the condemnation of each king will be considered elsewhere. We have seen that one of the main general characteristics of the books is a regular succession of good and evil, a kind of mechanistic moral theory, a tidal regularity of religious evolutions. After all the authors had before them a task of some difficulty, to interpret the history in a religious way, and yet to account for the comparative monotony of the progress of the narrative. They therefore invented this method of introducing a modicum of variety into the material.

We cannot consider the chronology of the books in detail. This is a subject which presents some difficulties, and must be worked out in detail. As mentioned above-p.11-, this harmonization, or rather this attempt at harmonization, comes from the latest set of compilers. They seem to have had a general scheme to fit in with the mechanical conception of the periodicity of Jewish history. The attempt seems to be to have an interval of 480 years from the deliverance from Egypt to the building of the Solomonic Temple, and of another 480 years to the end of the Exile. Forty is the favorite number of the compilers and wherever possible in Judges and Kings they conform to it. It seems evident that the compilers simply took their material and artificially distributed a number of years* among the men, particularly in the case of Judges, where it seems certain that the original sources had many of the Judges living contemporaneously in different parts of the country. See supra, p.15.

in the attempt to fix twelve generations of forty years each from

#24.

Egypt to Solomon*.

*For greater details see commentaries to Judges-Moore,
and to Kings-Benzinger and Kite~~l~~; also Wellhausen, 275ff.

CHAPTER 2.

The Covenant Idea.

In a very illuminating pamphlet on the historicity of the covenant at Sinai Giesebrecht claims that the reason so little reference is made to this event in the history of Israel in the various sources, either historical or in the earlier codes of the Hexateuch, is because, to use his own words: "Je laenger das durch den Bund begruendete Verhaeltniss bestand, je intimer sich Jahve und Israel, im Laufe der Zeit so zu sagen mit einander eingelebt hatten, um so ferner lag eine Erinnerung an den Act selbst, durch den das Verhaeltniss begruendet worden war".*

*cf. Giesebrecht, p. 62.

The whole religion of the early times was founded upon a belief in this covenant; every law which concerned sacrifice, every warning delivered to the people because of their treachery carries with it the implication of that first agreement, the first contractual relationship between the god and His worshippers. Not only in the two early books of the Covenant is it assumed that there has been a specific act which has committed Israel to the service of Jahve, and which therefore makes the law binding upon it, - but also in the later codes the setting is given to what was before merely a necessary postulate of the primitive religion. According to the sources of the Hexateuch God concluded many covenants even before that on Sinai. There was, for instance, the Noachian covenant, and that of the circumcision made with Abraham. The description of the event itself on Mt. Sinai naturally varies as to the various sources, and has occasioned a whole

literature of discussion as to whether it was Mt. Sinai or Mt. Horeb or Kadesh Barnea which was the site of the ceremony, and as to whether it was one tribe or all the tribes that concluded the pact, and as to the exact nature of the transaction, whether it was in reality the establishment of some code of laws, or whether it was not merely that one of the Israelitish tribes while wandering through the desert made a bond with a desert god there. That Jahve is a desert god is abundantly proved by the song of Deborah and the story of Elijah on Mt. Horeb, -and . by numerous other passages. However for our purposes it is not necessary that we go any deeper into these questions, except to say that the covenant idea was universal among the Semites and in fact among all primitive peoples. We might cite briefly in our sources that the most binding covenant is that made before Jahve*. The name Baal-berith seems to be the result of a covenant
 *Cf. I Sam. 23:18.
 made with some Baal of the land, perhaps that of Shechem.*
 *Cf. Jud. 8:33; 9:4, 46.

In the course of time, when the nation had been taken into exile, just like most other historico-religious concepts the idea of the covenant became greatly strengthened and emphasized. As Giesebrecht says-p. 63-, "Ist es nicht auch so bei menschlichen Beziehungen der Liebe oder der Freundschaft? Sind die Freunde bestaendig vereint, leben sie in ihrer Freundschaft und durch sie, so denkt man nicht alle Tage an die Zeit, da man sich kennen lernte und den Bund der Liebe schloss. Das wird anders, wenn die Freunde getrennt sind oder sich entfremdet haben und doch gern wieder

#27.

beisammen waeren, und so wurde es anders mit Israel und Jahve in exilischer und nachexilischer Zeit. Da beginnt die Erinnerung an die fruheren Zeiten, an die Tage der ersten Liebe, eine Rolle zu spielen, wie es Jeremia und so manche Psalmen bezeugen".

Although the idea of the covenant relationship is first used in its theocratic meaning in JE; it is first used with full signifi-

*Cf. Ex.19:5a;24:7,8;34:10,27;19:5b-6;23:22-33.
cance in Deuteronomy. To quote Driver-p.68-, "(Besides 4:13) the other references in Deuteronomy to the covenant of Horeb are: (as imposing obligations upon Israel)4:23;5:2,3(followed by the Decalogue)17:2;29:1b;31:16,20;cf.33:9;(as involving on Jehovah's part the observance of his promise)7:9;in4:31;7:12;8:18 the covenant with Abraham(Gen.15:18),extended,on the basis of Gen. 22:16f;26:3f,etc.,to the other patriarchs,is appealed to as a guarantee of God's faithfulness. In 29:1a,9,12,14,20 the legislation of Deuteronomy is made the basis of a covenant,entered into by Jehovah with Israel in the land of Moab, a renewal,as it were, of that concluded at Horeb. The particular duty on which the observance or neglect of the covenant is made to turn, is (in accordance with what is a primary aim of the book)loyalty to Jehovah, as opposed to all false gods(notice the context of the passages cited)". Working on the basis of the Deuteronomic law and the conception it emphasized, the compilers of the books of Judges,Samuel,and Kings read into the history of previous generations obedience or disobedience, faith or defection,reward or punishment, in accordance with a covenant made with Israel, which it had sworn to obey. There can be no doubt that in the

#28.

books of Kings, this covenant is the book of Deuteronomy itself*.

*Cf. supra pp.13-14.

In the other books it is not so easy to tell what the exact norm is by which the periods are judged. But, despite this, it is clear that the Deuteronomic compilers throughout utilized the idea that there was an original covenant with Jahve, and that the defection of the people is doubly despicable because of their pledge, and also because of all the wonders Jahve has worked on Israel's behalf. Again and again the compilers thunder into the dead ears of previous generations that their entire history is but a glaring contrast between Jahve's grace and their own faithlessness and ingratitude. This idea is emphasized either by reference to the fact that the people have broken the bond of their covenant with Jahve, or by a mention of the fact that Jahve's promises to the patriarchs or ancestors are binding upon himself as well as upon the people, or lastly by recalling the deliverance from Egypt as a motive for gratitude.

In Judges 2:1b we are told that God has said that He will never break His covenant with Israel. This is combined with a corresponding promise on the part of the people not to "cut a covenant" with the inhabitants of the land. When the Israelites, however, violated this agreement, Jahve then did not drive out the Canaanites from before them. From this it is clear that the covenant referred to must have been a promise of the land, and also that Jahve pledged Himself to win it for them by driving out its inhabitants from before them. When, therefore, the Israelites failed to keep their side of the compact, and make

#39.

a compromise with the "inhabitants of the land", Jahve ceases expelling their enemies, and leaves them there as a "thorn" in their sides, as a "snare". This whole passage is a most striking reference to Dt. 7:1-11, as well as to many other similar passages in Deuteronomy*. The philosophy of the compilers of Judges is

*Cf. also Dt. 12:30.

exactly that of Deuteronomy, namely, that from the very beginning the Israelites are commanded to destroy the Canaanites and to have no intercourse with them. If they obey this commandment, then Jahve will do His part, and give them the power to prevail and to tear down the heathen altars. It is clear that this is a very late view, not at all consistent with the picture given elsewhere in Judges of the two nations as living side by side, as "clients" one of the other, and - it is to be assumed - not forever engaged in implacable and savage warfare. Whether by this passage, beginning with Jud. 2:1b the authors mean to refer directly to Deuteronomy as the basis of the covenant is doubtful, and yet probable. Throughout Deuteronomy reference is made to Israel's choice, and to the revelation as the proof of Jahve's power and protection*. In Jud. 2:12 reference is again made to a

*Cf. Dt. 4:32 seq.; 5:2; 6:21, the covenant is for all posterity also.

violation of the covenant concluded by Jahve with the fathers. A significant passage is I Kings 8:57, 58 in the midst of the Deuteronomic speech of Solomon. Here again reference is made to a set of laws given to their fathers, which it is incumbent upon them to keep, if they wish to prosper. This passage refers, by its enumeration of וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמְרוּ אֶת הַבְּרִית הַזֶּה directly to

#30.

Deuteronomy, and necessarily assumes that the Deuteronomic covenant was known to Solomon, - as is indeed assumed throughout the books of Kings. In another Deuteronomic passage, giving the reasons for the downfall of the Northern kingdom, the compilers again* speak of the covenant of Jahve as the basis for its rejection, especially for the sins of idolatry with which the kings of Israel are continually charged. That the covenant upon which the compilers lean as the proof of the defection of Israel is Deuteronomy cannot be doubted, because of the use of the word "Torah" in v. 13, in connection with the expression "beritho" in v. 15. Other passages in Deuteronomy which throw some light on the conception of the covenant in Judges, Samuel, and Kings, as outlined partly above, are Dt. 7:12, - "And it shall come to pass that as a reward for your keeping these commandments, and for hearkening unto and doing them, then will Jahve, thy God, keep unto thee the covenant and the love which He swore to thy fathers"; also Dt. 26:16-19, the mutual pledge between God and Israel*; and also a most important passage, Dt. 31:16, *Cf. also Dt. 29:12; compare Dt. 26:17 with I Kings 8:57, 58 mentioned above.

where it is predicted that after the death of Moses rebellion and disobedience will be the rule, thus breaking the covenant with Jahve. It is then evident that in the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings there is a distinct idea of a covenant relationship between Jahve and Israel as the basis for the criticism of the compilers, and that in the books of Kings at the very least that covenant is taken to be the book of Deuteronomy.

#31.

The covenant to which reference is thus made in the historical books is naturally supposed to have been made with the ancestors of the generations of which the works treat. We have already quoted a passage from Dt.-5:2-which states clearly that the covenant is made with those present at Horeb and also with all their descendants. The many references made in the historical books to the covenant made with the "fathers" seem to go back to such a passage as the present, meaning their fathers who stood at Horeb(or Sinai). However, there seem to be some passages which refer more specifically to the patriarchs and to the promise of the land to them, mentioned so often in the narrative of JE. The phraseology in Jud.2:1b seems to refer to the patriarchs, and might have been followed logically by the customary enumeration, "Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob", as, for instance, we find in Dt.1:8*.
*Cf. also Dt. 6:18.
Reference might be made also to Jud. 2:12 where the allusion is not so definite*. In 2 Kings 13:23 we have a direct reference to
*Cf. 1 Kings.14:15.
the patriarchs and the statement that it was because of them, their merit, and because of Jahve's covenant with them that He did not wish to let Hazahel destroy Israel, but had pity upon them. Compare this with Dt. 9:5, where we are told that Israel is to possess the land not because of its own righteousness but because of the wickedness of the nations which Jahve is to drive out, and so as "to bring to pass the thing which Jahve swore to thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob". In both passages it is the merit of the patriarchs, not that of the descendants, and the promises Jahve made to the former that induce His help.

#32.

But it is not only the covenant on Mt. Sinai, or Horeb, as related in JE and Deuteronomy, and the promise to the patriarchs that constitute the ties that should bind Israel to Jahve. Throughout history, from the very beginning has Jahve showered blessings upon Israel, and done His utmost to aid and assist it. Gratitude, if no more, should command the allegiance of Israel. Particularly compelling, in the opinion of the compilers, should be the memory of the deliverance from Egypt. It is the starting-point in the history of Israel as a nation; This is an idea which is emphatically stated by Deuteronomy, -as Wellhausen says-p.90-: "Im Deuteronomium sieht man die ersten staerkeren Spuren einer Vergeschichtlichung der Religion und des Kultus, die sich aber noch in bescheidenen Grenzen haelt. Das historische Ereignis, worauf zurueckgegangen wird, ist immer die Ausfuehrung aus Aegypten, und dies ist insofern bezeichnend, als die Ausfuehrung aus Aegypten zusammenfaellt mit der Einfuehrung in Kanaan, d.h. mit der Landgabe, und also die geschichtliche Motivierung doch wieder einmuedet in die natuerliche" (referring to the two aspects of the Pesach). There are many passages in the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings which have the same motivation as Deuteronomy. We shall enumerate them briefly, dwelling only upon those that have some particular point of interest. Dt. 11:3-7 gives the setting for all these passages both as to phraseology and as to content. In Jud. 2:1b, and 2:12* the deliverance is cited as a proof of Jahve's

*Cf. 1 Kings 9:8,9.

#33.

protection and love. 2:7 tells us that the faithfulness of J^oshua and the elders is to be accounted for, at least partly, because they were privileged to witness Jahve's "Ma'ase", meaning evidently the deliverance, exodus, wandering through the wilderness, and the invasion of Canaan. In 6:8b-9 a prophet appears to accuse the people, who have been under the rule of Midian and have cried to the Lord in their distress. The passage seems to be cut off abruptly in midcourse, but its reference to the deliverance from Egypt is still clear; the deliverance from Egypt is cited as a reason for gratitude to jahve and for cleaving to His covenant, not turning to the gods of the Amorites and supposedly the other Canaanitish deities. G.F. Moore says-p.181-, "This deliverance is the origin of the peculiar relationship between Jahve and Israel and the ground of its obligation to keep itself to him only. It is therefore constantly recalled as the prime motive to faith in Jahve and faithfulness to him alone, or to aggravate the guilt of unfaithfulness by exposing its folly and baseness and justify the extreme severity of judgment". The prophet who appears to Eli* cites at the very beginning the choice of
*cf. 1 Sam.2:27,28.
the ancestor or ancestors of Eli from the time that they lived in Egypt. When the elders of Israel come to Samuel and ask for a king, the anger of Jahve is kindled against them, and, in this distinctly deuteronomic passage, the demand is characterized as unfaithfulness, disloyalty to Jahve, as lack of belief in His power. Even from the day when Jahve delivered

#34.

them from Egypt* they have rebelled against and deserted Him**.

*Cf. 1 Sam. 8:8.

**Cf. also 1 Sam.10:18 and Dt.4:20, where Israel is enjoined to be grateful, for Jahve took them from the "iron-furnace" of Egypt; also Dt.6:12; 7:17-19; 8:14-16; 13:6 - the deliverance from Egypt should help to keep the people faithful to Jahve - 30:1; and 26:6-9.

In 1 Sam.12:6 Samuel swears by the God "who appointed Moses and Aaron, and who brought up your fathers from the land of Egypt" - evidently a generally recognized proof of Jahve's existence and power. In 1 Kings 8:9 mention is made of the two tablets of stone in the Ark, in accordance with the covenant which Jahve concluded with Israel when they went forth out of Egypt. In 1 Kings 12:28 Jeroboam I. sets up two golden calves and says: "Behold thy gods, O Israel, who have brought thee up from the land of Egypt". The Deuteronomic compilers simply wish to emphasize the sin of Jeroboam, upon which so much stress is laid in the judgments of the succeeding kings of Israel. It is to be condemned not merely as a piece of idolatry, a defection from the worship of Jahve as outlined in Deuteronomy, without images and a pure monotheism, but because it is a gross piece of ingratitude, trying to rob Jahve of the glory of just the greatest miracle He had worked in behalf of Israel. And, finally, in 2 Kings 17:7, in the panorama of the past, condemning all the sins of the nation, at its very beginning Jahve is called the "Deliverer from Egypt, from the hand of Pharaoh", to

emphasize the faithlessness of the people.*

*One more point that might be mentioned is that in Deuteronomy remembrance of the servitude in the land of Egypt is made a motive for liberality and humanitarianism. Cf. 16:12; 24:18, 22;

#35.

also 5:15;10:19.

To sum up, Israel is under obligation to be faithful to Jahve, first because it is bound to Him by a covenant, - a covenant which is also not only the old traditional revelation and bond on Sinai or Horeb, but also specifically the book of the Covenant, Deuteronomy; second, because of the promises which Jahve made even earlier to the patriarchs, and which He still keeps and remembers; and lastly, because of gratitude for the great miracle of Israel's past, the first chapter in its history as a nation, the deliverance from Egypt.

#36.

CHAPTER 3.

The People of the Land and Idolatry.

We have said above-pp.28-29-that there is an intimate connection between the covenant idea ^{as} set forth in the passages concerning it which come from the hand of the compilers and the conception of the relation of Israel to the people of the land. In fact the covenant with Jahve seems to have been in their minds, as it is also in Deuteronomy, not merely a pledge on the part of the people to worship Jahve by appropriate ceremonies and symbols, but also to refrain from worship of the gods of the peoples around them, and also to aid in the extermination of these people from the land. If the people of Israel remain faithful to Jahve, then He will permit them to stay in the land -that is, the Canaanites- as a snare to the Israelites and also as an instrument of punishment in the early days, because of the fact that when the Israelites sinned - according to the schematic religious pragmatism of the compilers - they were made subservient to their Canaanitish neighbors.

There can be no doubt but that this attitude toward the Canaanites is a reflex of the harsh position of Deuteronomy. As Driver says -p.xxxii- , "The injunctions for the extirpation of the Canaanites * * * * are included in Deuteronomy partly, no doubt, because they formed an element in the older legislation*, and were ascribed traditionally to Moses, but
*cf. Ex.23:31-33.

chiefly because by the drastic completeness with which they sought to secure Israel against pernicious religious influences, they were a significant protest against the fashions of the age, and afforded the author a means of expressing indirectly his profound abhorrence of practices which he knew to be subversive of holiness(cf.12:31). In estimating these injunctions, it must be remembered that in the age when Deuteronomy was written, the time when they could be enforced had long passed away; they had consequently only an ideal value; they bear witness by their severity to the intensity of the author's convictions on the subject, and to the reality of the dangers which he felt threatened Israel's religion from this quarter". It is probable that the laws of Deuteronomy were directed originally against the heathen practices which had crept into the Jahve-cult, and which in the eyes of the prophets were making such worship of Jahve no longer acceptable. To the people, with their folk-religion, there was no harm in worshipping Jahve in the customary way, by sacrifices and oblations, and even by setting up images to Him on the high-places,--Asheras, Matzevoth, etc. But the author of Deuteronomy and the compilers of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, together with the prophets, will admit no merit in the popular religion, nor see it as a development of the times, in common with the other peoples of antiquity. The prophets and also our compilers accuse the people not merely of service of other gods, but also of service of Jahve in such a way as to be offensive to Him in the highest degree*. However, although

* Cf. Wellhausen, pp. 281, 282.

#38.

the author of Deuteronomy used the laws against the Canaanites merely to emphasize the blasphemous character of the heathenish practices which had crept into the Jahve-religion, our own compilers, of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, carried the principle much further. Especially in the book of Judges, where the sources from which the history was compiled consisted mainly of the stories of conflicts between the Canaanites and the Jews, and of the gradual conquest of the land, in contrast with the sudden and complete victories of the book of Joshua, was there an opportunity for applying this law as to the extermination of the Canaanites. The compilers seized upon this chance with avidity, as a cornerstone upon which to rear the structure of their religious pragmatism in this period. In the books of Samuel, too, although not to nearly such an extent, this scheme is applied. As said before, the relation to the Canaanites is made an integral part of the covenant with Jahve, and the heathens are used as a means for punishing the offending Israelites, as the direct agents for the actualization of Jahve's retributive justice.

In Deuteronomy, as said before, the law is emphasized again and again that it is the duty of the Israelites to root out the inhabitants of Canaan and all of their religious practices, to make no treaties with them, show no mercy, kill them without quarter. For instance, in Dt. 7:1-5 the Israelites are enjoined not to mingle nor intermarry with the Canaanites, but to extirpate them and their religious symbols. In vs. 17-24 of the same chapter we are told that Jahve will aid in destroying them,

#39.

and that the Israelites should show no pity. V.22 is a very significant and strange addition, namely that the Canaanites will be destroyed little by little, so that the wild-beasts will not increase in the land,-seemingly because there were not enough Israelites to settle and till the entire country. At the very beginning of the book of Judges the principle of the application of the rule of extermination is set forth. The Israelites are to make no covenant with the Canaanites and are to destroy their altars. Evidently the Israelites must have disobeyed this command of Jahve, and therefore Jahve has stopped driving out the Canaanites, so that they might continue to be a snare to the Israelites. This is quite a different view than that presented in Dt. 7:22, where the Israelites are cautioned not to destroy the Canaanites too soon. Most probably it is because of the whole tendency of the compilers of Judges to make the Canaanites the instruments of retribution. Therefore they cannot present the fact of the continuance of the heathen in the land as a merely utilitarian measure*, but must make it appear as

*Or as a result of the weakness of the Israelites.
though this too were a step in the eternal cycle of reward and punishment, following the fluctuations of faithfulness and apostasy. Practically the same idea is repeated in Jud. 2:21-22, where Jahve leaves the nations in the land so as to "try" Israel, to see whether they will remain faithful to Jahve when subjected to the continual temptation of the presence of the Canaanites. In 3:2 still another phase is added; here the purpose of leaving the Canaanites is to keep Israel in warlike

#40.

trim, so that they may, as Moore says -p.77- , "have occasion to cultivate the virtues which only war develops, and learn by experience the superiority of their god to those of the heathen".

It is clear that this statement cannot be from the same hand as 2:21-23, but comes from an earlier source of the book of Judges, most probably from J*. from a different source is probably

* Ax with Moore and E.Meyer-ZATW i.p. 145.

3:4, where again the Canaanites are said to be left in order to see whether Israel will remain faithful to the "commandments which God commanded their fathers through Moses". The Canaanites are not only left in the land to try the Israelites, but are also given supremacy whenever evil becomes predominant among the people of Israel. In Jud.3:12 Eglon, king of Moab is said to have been given power over Israel, because "they continued to do that which is evil in the eyes of Jahve".*.*

*Cf. also 4:2; 2:14, 20; 6:1; 10:7; 3:8; 1 Sam.12:9; 13:1, etc. This phase of the subject is taken up in detail in Chapter 5.

Cf. quotation from H.P.Smith on p.16 of this treatise.

*We might cite also from Dt.6:19, where the reward of faith is to be the rooting out of the Canaanites, implying the theory in Judges that Jahve leaves the Canaanites there as a punishment; and Dt.9:1-5, where the statement is made that the Canaanites are to be driven out, not because of the righteousness of Israel, but because of the promise to the patriarchs and because of the wickedness of the inhabitants, -which is still another view, and, finally, Dt.20:18, where the command to destroy the Canaanites is instituted to prevent their teaching idolatry to the Israelites.

We have then shown that according to the deuteronomic principle of our compilers, the covenant with Jahve implies the command to root out the inhabitants of Canaan, and to have nothing to do with their religious practices. The penalty for disobedience in this instance is made by the Deuteronomic

#41.

compilers to be either that Jahve will not do His share in driving out the Canaanites and in giving to Israel full possession of the promised land,--but also that the Canaanites are to be left in the land as a snare to the Israelites, so that they may lead to new unfaithfulness and apostasy. The latter view is by far the more prevalent, as it fits better into the plan of the compilers. The picture they wish to present is that the Canaanites get the Israelites to sin, and to follow their heathenish cult. The next step is that the Israelites are made subservient to the Canaanites, and remain slaves for many years, until at last self-respect begins to stir the yearning for freedom, and they cry out for help to their old covenant-God. Jahve then sends them a Judge, who delivers them, and keeps them true during his lifetime. After his death the same process starts all over again, and again the Canaanites become a snare to Israel. All this goes to prove how weak and inconstant is Israel, and how just and clement is Jahve in His treatment of His refractory people,--which is the most recurrent "leit-motiv" in Judges, as also Samuel and Kings.

We have already cited a number of passages containing this view, that is, of the Canaanites as a snare*. In Jud. 8:27b the
*Jud. 2:1-4; 2:14, 22; cf. 3:12; 4:2; 6:1, 10.
the Ephod which Gideon made in Ophrah becomes a snare to the whole people. This must be a very late view, which is certainly Deuteronomic in character,--as the Ephod is not looked upon as idolatrous until very late in history before the Exile. It is not mentioned in Deuteronomy, but might be included with the

#42.

Ashera and Matzevah. Here it is one of the practices of the Canaanites that lead Israel astray. In Jud.8:33-35 Israel follows after Baal-berith after the death of Gideon. I⁴ Jud. 10:6 in the usual introductory phrase we have added an enumeration of the nations all around Israel, in addition to the mention of the Be'alim and the Ashteroth, -then Syria, Sidon, Moab, Ammon, and Philistia, the gods of all of which the Israelites were following, according to the compilers, and by whom they had been ensnared. To forget Jahve is synonymous with worshipping the gods of the surrounding nations*. In 1 Kings 11:2-4 we are told that Solomon was lead astray into the service of foreign gods by his marriages with foreign women, who induced him to serve their idols*.

*Cf. 1 Sam.7:4.
*Cf. Dt.23:4-7. Also 1 Kings 14:24; 21:26; and 2 Kings 17:8; 21:9. As Solomon was mislead, so also Ahab, cf. 1 Kings 16:31.

We have thus seen that the Canaanites are a means of testing Israel's faithfulness. The method is to be by determining whether Israel remains faithful to the Jahve-cult or follows after the "abominations" of the surrounding nations, whether Israel cleaves to the pure worship of Jahve without image -the deuteronomic standard- , or takes over all the abhorrent practices of the heathens. Exactly what the pure Jahve-cult is that the compilers wish to contrast with the idolatry of the heathen is not so clear. It is certain that it is given no definite formulation in the earlier books. That it included sacrifice may be inferred from the picture of Samuel, who is highly acceptable to the compilers. In other respects all that we can

#43.

say of it is that it had prophets, believed in angels, had a high regard for the central sanctuary and the ceremonies connected therewith according to the Deuteronomic Code, accepted the Levites as set apart, had no idea of a specially-sanctified Aaronic or Sadokite priesthood, accepted the festivals as outlined in Deuteronomy*, and was staunchly monotheistic. The

*As shown especially by Josiah's Pesach celebration. compilers were much more impressed, however, with the monotheistic emphasis of Deuteronomy than with its humanitarian laws, and the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings may be said from this aspect to be a great campaign against the practices which in the time shortly before the Exile, and also in the earlier days, caused so much wavering from the worship of Jahve and so much pluralism. According to the compilers monotheism is and always was the only true Jahve-worship, and all foreign importations of gods and practices are alien to its principles. This view gives rise to the most obvious discrepancies between the viewpoint of the sources from which the compilers arranged their books - and which for the most part they leave untouched in the portions they select- and between their own judgments as to the moral degeneration of all such religion. In the sources themselves there can be no doubt that as late as Hosea the Matzevah was considered a legitimate appurtenance of the Jahve-sanctuary, and all the other practices that came to be tabooed later on were a natural and inalienable part of the primitive religion. It has been repeated by every Biblical scholar that it was one of the postulates of primitive religions that the god has a fundamental

connection with the country, and that it was the most natural thing in the world for the Israelites to adopt the worship of the Canaanite deities and ceremonies - particularly those connected with agricultural life - without any suspicion as to disloyalty to Jahve, who represented the desert stage of their career*. But our compilers unhesitatingly and practically without

* See Rekabites, Elijah on Mt. Horeb, also the Song of Deborah. exception damn all that seems idolatry and worship of strange

gods. This is due to the fact that one of the main purposes of the books is to make a plea for the worship of Jahve as outlined in Deuteronomy. Our compilers are interested primarily in the religion, and they select their material so as to give us in every case a judgment of the man; especially is this true in the books of Kings, where the compilers, handling a period closer to their own day and with a larger number of changes and men, can apply their standard with greater frequency and exactitude*.

*Uf. Kittel, p. vii, "So kommt es, dass wir bei jedem Koenige, auch wenn wir sonst gar nichts ueber ihn mitgeteilt werden soll, wenigstens erfahren, wie er sich zum Hoehendienste stellte".

The compilers wish to show that all the things against which the prophets inveighed are and were abominable and have lead at all times to apostasy and then to the retribution of Jahve. Idolatry and worship of strange gods it is, then, that continually lead the Israelites astray, by following the "people of the land" and by breaking their covenant of faith and trust in Jahve, the God of their fathers.

The standard by which the compilers render their verdicts may be well illustrated by Dt. 4:12, where we are told that there

#45.

was no material presence of Jahve at Horeb, and that it is therefore that the people should make no physical representation of Him. On this basis all the "tree-stumps" and "pillars" are condemned.

There is so much material in regard to idolatry in the period of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, that it is difficult to quote all the instances. However we have probably succeeded in mentioning all in the following pages, with emphasis on those of some unusual importance.

In Jud.2:11-12 we are given the two typical phrases by which the compilers characterize idolatry and apostasy throughout the three books,--first in v.11, and in v.12. We have already cited Jud.8:27b where the Ephod misleads Gideon and his house*
*Cf. 2:17; 2:3; also 3:12; 4:1,2; 3:8; 6:1,10; 10:6,7,13; 13:1;
1 Sam.12:9. For the phrase וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁכַּח cf. Dt.6:14;
17:3; 1 Sam.26:19; 1 Kings 9:6, etc. etc.

In 1 Sam.7:3f Samuel tells the people that the only true sign of repentance and the only way to win the favor of Jahve is to remove the strange gods from their midst*. "And the children of Israel removed the Be'alim and the Ashteroth from their midst, and served Jahve alone",--the ideal of the compilers.

1 Sam.8:8 tells us that since the deliverance from Egypt Israel has served other gods. In 1 Sam.28:3 we are told that Saul had removed all the talismans and necromancers, which were also made taboo by Deuteronomy*. Instances of idolatry in the books of Kings are 1 Kings 11:2-6; 12:28-29,31; 13:33b-34; 14:22-24; 14:7-11; 16:31; 12:47; 21:25-26; 2 Kings 3:2; 10:23,26; 13:6; 16:3; 17:9,16,17,31; 21:3-7. In addition to these where it is mentioned that a certain king went astray by worshipping idols or other

#46.

gods, we have also the following instances of specific punishments: 1 Kings 11:9-13, where the punishment for Solomon's idolatry is to be that the kingdom will be split up, and that only "one" tribe will be left to his son*. In 1 Kings 14:15-16, *Cf. also 11:33 and Dt. 4:3 where the punishment for idolatry is to be destruction.

22-24 we are told that Israel is to go into exile because of the sin of Jeroboam*, and because of the Asheras. We are also told

Cf. Dt. 4:25 and 6:18, exile for idolatry. of some of the efforts at purification that were made: in 1 Kings 15:11, where Asa removed the idols of his father and mother, but not the Bamoth and Asheras. In 2 Kings 18:1-8 we are told of Hezekiah's reforms, and how he removed the Bamoth, Matzevoth, Asheras, and the brazen serpent. And, finally, -and the most important, -the narrative tells us of how Josiah "cut a covenant with Jahve", and proceeded to carry out the laws of Deuteronomy, destroying -v. 4. all, the instruments of Baal, the Asheras, the "host of heaven", in v. 7 the ^eHirodules, in v. 8a the Bamoth, in v. 10 Tofet and child-sacrifice, in v. 11 sun-worship, in v. 13 the altars erected by Solomon to foreign gods, and in vs. 24-25 the scrocerers, Teraphim, Gillulim and Shikutzim.*
*Cf. also Dt. 13:10; 27:15; 31:16.

In this chapter, then, we have shown that the philosophy of history which our compilers are applying to the story of Israel involves as a corollary both of the general idea of faithfulness to Jahve, and of the covenant He has made with the children of Israel, that He should look upon it as the duty of the people to exterminate the inhabitants of Canaan, and that these idolaters then prove a snare to their feet, - and lastly that the history

#47.

of idolatry and worship of other gods -which begins as a result of Israel's failure to obey these commands as to the Canaanites - becomes the touchstone of their moral backslidings and their relation to Jahve, and the great reason for the Exile.

It is to be noted also that, as said above, this is at great variance with the actual history, and is an application of the stringent laws of Deuteronomy, which were themselves intended only as an object-lesson to the people at a time when the Canaanites had already ceased to be a problem. The viewpoint of the compilers as to idolatry, although in consonance with the strict Deuteronomic interpretation of monotheism, and also with the prophetic ideas on this subject, still falls considerably below the prophetic standard in that it makes this the sole criterion of the moral worth of each individual concerning whom it renders a verdict, or of each generation,- whereas the prophets regard idolatry and syncretism only as an evidence of religious degeneracy, but point to moral failings, violations of the laws of humanity, oppression of the poor, reliance upon material safeguards, and lack of faith in Jahve, as the really efficient causes. This will be treated in greater detail in Chapter 8.

#48.

CHAPTER 4.

The Central Sanctuary and the Priesthood.

There can be no doubt that the book of Deuteronomy was written as an attempt to read into the popular religion of sacrifice and ceremonial a deeper meaning, to make it express as nearly as possible, as nearly as consonant with practice, the ideals of the prophets. That this necessarily resulted in a compromise goes without saying; but that it also gave rise to most of the innovations of Deuteronomy towards the centralization of the religion is equally self-understood. Deuteronomy was opposed unalterably to the syncretistic cults of the nation, it saw in them a lowering of the religious standard of the people, and unfaithfulness to Jahve, the divine protector of His people Israel. Deuteronomy aimed above at all at a cult that would approach as nearly as possible the monotheistic idea. The author realized that as long as the land would be filled with shrines, as long as each one would be permitted to legislate for itself and to mould the religious practice as it wished, so long would there be confusion of Jahve with other gods and practical polytheism. The institution of the central sanctuary was thus a great effort to mould the popular religion, as it then existed, toward monotheism. But, in order to gain authority for the institution, it was necessary to project it into the past. Antiquity and reverence are two sides of the same shield. It is therefore that Deuteronomy pictures the central sanctuary

as having existed from the time of Solomon. This seems to be clear from Dt. 12:10f, where it is implied that the sanctuary will come into being only when Israel will have rest*.

*Compare 2 Sam. 7:11; 1 Kings 5:18. The time of David and Solomon seems to be the first time when Israel had peace, and seems to have been intended by the author of Deuteronomy. Cf. Wellhausen, p. 20, note.

That the central sanctuary was not an actuality even in the time of Solomon and thence onward, much less before his time, is evidenced by many passages from the sources from which the compilers drew their material, where it is represented that even those whom the Deuteronomic compilers approve of most highly, such as Samuel, sacrifice at other places. Of course it might be said that Samuel came before the period of Solomon, and that therefore his sacrifice is not a violation of the rule laid down by Deuteronomy and the compilers. But Solomon himself

sacrifices elsewhere *than in the central sanctuary. Deuteronomy

*At Gibeon, 1 Kings 3:1-4.

For the erection of altars in other places than Jerusalem, cf. Jud. 2:5; 6:26; 13:16, 19; 3 Sam. 24:25; 1 Sam. 7:9f, 17; 9:12-14; 10:3, 5, 8; 13:9f; 11:15; 14:35; 20:6; 2 Sam. 15:7b, 18, 32; 1 Kings 3:4.

1 Sam. 9:12-14; 10:3-5 shows that sacrificing in other places was a regular practice and not against the law. Wherever the Ark was became preeminent, cf. Jud. 21:9; 1 Sam. 1:3, 7, 21. During the time of the books of Kings the local sanctuaries continued to exist, and without arousing any suspicion in the breasts of the rulers that they were offending Jahve. "The Deuteronomic compiler of the Books of Kings notes repeatedly how the people continued to sacrifice at them, and even the good kings did not remove them"-Driver, p. 137. Cf. 1 Kings 3:2, 3; 14:23; 15:14; 22:43; 2 Kings 12:4; 14:4; 15:4, 35; 16:4. Compare also 1 Kings 18:30b; 19:10, 14. Time showed that it was impossible to keep the local altars from being sullied with Canaanitish practices, cf. 1 Kings 14:23f; 11:7; 2 Kings 23:13. Hezekiah tried to abolish the local sanctuaries but failed, cf. 2 Kings 18:4, 22; 21:3. Josiah went about it in a more determined way

#50.

and succeeded in accomplishing much, though even this was not permanent, cf. 2 Kings 23:5,8.

was then written to cure a condition which it considered to be inconsistent with purely monotheistic Jahve-worship, but yet it could not possibly have been the law-book of Israel from the days of Solomon, as it pretends or purports to be. None had the idea in earlier times that it is wrong to sacrifice in other places

than Jerusalem. All Palestine was Jahve's home*. To quote

*Cf. 2 Kings 5:17. Wellhausen, p. 22.

Wellhausen-p. 57-, "Abgesehen von der exilischen Bearbeitung

des Buchs der Koenige, welche den Kultus ausserhalb Jerusalems

fuer ketzerisch haelt, trifft man nirgend die Vorstellung an,

dass ein Opfer dem Gotte Israels geweiht und doch illegitim

sein koenne". The idea that in only one place are sacrifices

acceptable to Jahve is absolutely unknown to the kings, and

they feel no guilt whatsoever in sacrificing elsewhere. It is

true that there seem to have been times when a tendency towards

centralization appeared*, for instance in the later times the

*Or perhaps these are only the interpretation of the compilers.

sanctuary at Shiloh had a wide influence*, and also the Ark

*Cf. Jud. 7:13; 1 Sam. 3:27-36.

itself seems to have had some national significance*.

*Again discounting the fact that this may be the work of the compilers. For full discussion, cf. Wellhausen 17-53, W.R. Smith 342, 353ff. and Driver.

However this may be, the compilers of the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings had before them the ideas of Deuteronomy and it was these that they accepted implicitly. But the compilers accept not merely the idea of Deuteronomy that the central sanctuary has the stamp of Mosaic authority, and that the central

#51.

sanctuary was actually a fact at the time of Solomon, when first the Israelites were blessed with the peace that was a necessity for placing this capstone of the Mosaic legislation,-but goes even further, and assumes that all the kings from Solomon's time onward knew of the law as to the central sanctuary, and knew that in building Bamoth, or worshipping and sacrificing at Dan and Bethel, etc. they were violating consciously the decree of Jahve, and that therefore their reign is to be condemned, and misfortune overtook them, one and all. In other words, the compilers make this view, which originated shortly before the Exile, apply to Solomon also, and to all the succeeding rulers, both Israelitish and Judaic,- in fact, make disobedience to it the essential reason for the final destruction of both kingdoms. Naturally, then, to the compilers the story of the building of the Temple, and the relation as to the character of all its appurtenances, as well as the part which the sanctuary plays in the history of the southern Kingdom, is the most important single event in the entire history, and it is for this reason that they draw at such great length from the source that provides them with their material as to the Temple*.

*Which may well have been a separate source in itself. Significant is the way that Wellhausen puts it -284-,"An der Spitze des ganzen Buches steht der Tempelbau, fast alles was von Salomo erzahlt wird steht dazu in Beziehung. Damit ist zugleich der Gesichtspunkt angegeben, der auch die uebrige judaeische Geschichte beherrscht; sie ist mehr eine Geschichte des Tempels als des Reiches". we shall see later in Chapter

7 the way in which the compilers arrange their material and select the portions which they utilize for their didactic purpose. At any rate, the result of this narrowing of their interest to prove the Deuteronomic viewpoint makes the history of Judah seem more like an annal of the Temple than of the nation. It is probable also that the great stress that the compilers lay upon the importance of Jerusalem as the only proper center of Jahve-worship is accounted for also by the messianic hopes of the Exile as to the Davidic line.

The passages which concern directly the question of the central sanctuary are not numerous. The most extensive is naturally 2 Kings 22-23, where Josiah undertakes the establishment of the law. In 1 Sam. 2:36 the degradation of the house of Eli is foretold, so that in the future they shall come to the ruling priesthood and pray for a position and a "crumb of bread"; this reflects conditions after Josiah, when the priests of the Bamoth had to take subordinate positions in Jerusalem*.

*Cf. H.P. Smith, ad.loc.

In 1 Sam. 7:17 we see a distinct reflection of the Deuteronomic idea of a central sanctuary. "The author does not take the view of the Priest Code as to the legitimacy of one sole altar. To the Deuteronomic view the one legitimate sanctuary was not chosen until the time of Solomon*". 2 Sam. 7:1-29 is important as a

*H.P. Smith, ad.loc.

whole, especially v. 7, where it is said, "In all the places where I moved about among the children of Israel, did I speak a word to any one of the tribes of Israel, saying, Why have ye not built for me a house of cedar?". This confirms the idea, that

#53.

according to Deuteronomy* the temple is not supposed to have

*This passage is evidently exilic.
been built before David and Solomon, when the Israelites had

"rest"*. Up to this time Jahve had dwelt only in a tent or taber-

*Cf. Dt.12:10f.
nacle. In 1 Kings 3:2-3 we can see clearly the process of redac-
tion, which was pursued so as to make the passage consonant with
Deuteronomic ideas. V.2 is an evident interpolation and breaks
the continuity, having no connection with v.1, especially

considering the introductory "Rak"*. It is a gloss to v.3, put

*Cf. Benzinger ad.loc.
before it for obvious reasons. Although v.3, which says that
Solomon sacrificed on the great Bama in Gibeon, bears no bad
implications to the earlier author, yet our compilers felt it
necessary to add in v.3b a specific mention of the fact that
when Solomon sacrificed in Gibeon the Temple had not yet been
built. And they add moreover the statement that all the people
were still sacrificing at the Bamoth, - further excuse. There is
felt to be some inconsistency between the action of the king
in sacrificing at Gibeon, "one thousand burnt-offerings, for
that was the great Bama", and his role as the erector of
Jahve's great and only Temple, and this probably gave rise to
v.3, also an addition by the compilers. At any rate Solomon
it is* that is to build the Temple**. In 1 Kings 8:16 we have
*Cf. 1 Kings 5:19.
**Cf. 2 Sam. 7:13, as promised to David.

practically a repetition of 2 Sam. 7:7, where we are told that
Jahve did not make choice of any city since the Exodus.

Benzinger-ad.loc-wishes, following LXX and II Chron. 6:6, to add,

"And I chose Jerusalem so that my name might be there". In 1 Kings

#54.

12:26-31 the compilers make it appear that Jeroboam I, in setting up the two calves at Dan and Bethel, did so because he feared the power of the Temple at Jerusalem over the people, and wished to divert their attention away from the Southern Kingdom. That this comes from the compilers is evident from the fact that in those days Dan and Bethel were much more sacred than was Jerusalem *.

*Cf. supra, page 17.

We must remember continually that this is a Judaic judgment,

and that it was only after the destruction of Samaria that the dicta of the compilers as to the sanctity of Jerusalem for

the whole nation could have had any meaning*. It may not be

*Cf. Dt. 33:17.

improbable that the story of the erection of the two golden calves was invented at a later time so as to detract from

the holiness of Dan and Bethel, and to strengthen that of Jerusalem in the eyes of the people*. 2 Kings 16:5-18 is an interesting

*As Amos 3:15, etc.

example of how the compilers go out of their way to tell the

story of a slight change in the Temple, the importation of a new copper altar, and give little weight, in comparison, to the

Syrio-Ephraimitic war against Judah and ensuing expedition of Tiglath-Pileser.

And yet, despite all the importance which the compilers attach to the central sanctuary, despite the manner in which they group their stories so as to emphasize its place in history, despite their utilization of the principle of exclusive worship there in their condemnation of the kings of Judah and Israel, despite all this, the compilers do not regard the Temple as inviolable, the view that is so often imputed to Isaiah. Naturally

#55.

this is because they are writing for the people of the Exile, when the Temple had already been razed to the ground, and whatever hopes may have been smouldering in the breasts of the nation, despite the approaching thunder of Assyrian storm-clouds, quenched. Therefore in 2 Kings 21:12 the "prophets" *
*The anonymity here seems to refer to the great prophets with their numerous prophecies of destruction.

predict the fall of Jerusalem because of the sins of Menasseh and his fathers.

We have then seen that the idea of a central sanctuary is one of the most fundamental in the philosophy of the compilers of the three books, and especially of the books of Kings,- that they follow Deuteronomy in almost every detail, going even further in assuming that every king in both North and South knew of the idea of a central sanctuary, and that each is to be condemned or approved on this ground,-that this view of the compilers so far influences their treatment of the subject as to induce them to place accounts connected with the Temple above all others, no matter how important may have been the latter in political results.

Closely connected with the idea of the central sanctuary in Deuteronomy is that of the Levitical priesthood. The destruction of the Bamoth involved some disposal to be made of their guardian-priests. They were to be permitted to come to the Temple and to take a certain part in the services*. In the course of time it became evident that many of them would not come, but preferred to remain among the people eating "unleavened

*cf. Dt. 18:6-8.

#56.

bread". It will not be possible to go into an exposition of the
*Cf. 2 Kings 33:9.
development of the priesthood in Israel, from the time when
a layman might sacrifice and it was not necessary even to
have the presence of a priest, up through the stage when it
was considered desirable but not imperative to have a priest
in the house, as in the story of the Levite in Jud. 17-18,
through the time when the appointment and disposal of priests
was in the hands of the monarch, up to the development in Deuter-
onomy, when all priests are Levites, but not all Levites are
priests. This does not mean that the priests belonged to a
special family of Levites, as in the Priestly Code, but merely
that at that time these special Levites were chosen to serve
at the altar. The privilege was a prerogative of all Levites.*
*For the process of the development of the priesthood in
Israel, see. W.R. Smith, index; Wellhausen, 118-149, et. al.

In Judges, Samuel, and Kings, although the general idea
seems to be consonant with Deuteronomy, it is so obscure, and
we get such infrequent glimpses of the priesthood, that we hardly
are in a position to judge as to the exact nature and function of
the priesthood according to the compilers*. All the records

*Cf. W.R. Smith, p. 359.
testify that the priesthood was of the house of Levi, "the
kinsmen or descendants of Moses" (himself a priest. Eli's family
is chosen from all Israel to be the priests, to bear the Ephod,
and to conduct the sacrifices*. The primacy is, however, taken
*Cf. 1 Sam. 2:27-28.

away from them because of their sins, and is to be given to a
faithful priest*, most probably a direct reference to Zadok, who
*Cf. 1 Sam. 2:35.
is put into Abiathar's place by Solomon*. W.R. Smith says that
*Cf. 1 Kings 2:27.

#57.

also another "Levitical family which claimed direct descent from Moses held the priesthood of the sanctuary of Dan, and in the later times of the kingdom all the priests of local sanctuaries were viewed as Levites. Whether this implies that they were all lineal descendants of the old house of Levi may well be doubted. But in early times guilds are hereditary bodies, modified by a right of adoption, and it was understood that the priesthood ran in the family to which Moses belonged". In 1 sam.7:9 we see that Samuel is not only a prophet but a priest also, although not a Levite but an Ephraimite. In 1 Sam.13:14 we have practically the first intimation of a specialized priesthood, where Saul is deposed both for his disobedience to Samuel's orders and for his presumptuousness in taking Samuel's place at the sacrifice. In 2 Sam.6:18 David acts as a priest, and in 8:18 we learn that David's sons were permitted to perform the same office. In 1 Kings 12:31 we are told that Jeroboam I "made priests of the lowest of the people, who were not of the sons of Levi",* and that for this sin - and for others - his line is doomed, and that he has also brought disaster upon Israel. We cannot, however, avoid remembering that David's priests were not all Levites*.

*Cf. Benzinger ad.loc.

With these few references it is difficult to make out clearly exactly what the view of the compilers was as to the priesthood. However, it seems clear that they are in consonance with the Deuteronomic idea that Levites and priests are practically synonymous terms.

#58.

CHAPTER 5.

Politics and Material Power.

It has been intimated before that the interest of the compilers of the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings lay in the religious direction, that they were not concerned with writing a political review, giving a glowing vista of the military prowess of the monarchs of Israel, describing their family squabbles in the usual oriental vein, or drawing a varicolored picture of the regal luxury of their courts and harems, the wealth of their sycophants and slaves, the buildings erected by the ant-like struggle of their ²³² fiefs and vassals. Our authors assume the same stern and uncompromising attitude toward political and material power as did the prophets. And, although it was their aim to write a religious history of Israel, they could clearly not do this merely by taking up the various changes in the cult as it developed from the time of the Conquest until the Exile. Such a history might have been written indeed, but would have been ineffective so far as the people of the compilers' day were concerned, would have taught little lesson to them - and we must remember that the aim of the work is distinctly didactic-, and would never have succeeded in ~~in~~convincing the people of the Exile of the error of the ways of their fathers. What was needed was an actual judgment upon their ancestors, verdicts upon men, upon each one of them, upon their lives and works. It seems to be for this reason that the compilers are so careful to arrange the kings in strict order, and to show not merely

#59.

that both kingdoms were doomed because of their general defections from the religion of Jahve, but also that each king, except for a few exceptions, was guilty of the specific acts the sum of which forms the charge against the whole nation, and that each of them led the people of his time astray. In fact, we may say that the political history is introduced only for the purpose of rationalizing this plan, to drive home the lesson with greater force and persuasiveness, and also to give a setting for the moralizing of the compilers. We have seen -p.54- how, at the time of the Syrio-Ephraimitic Campaign and the subsequent expedition of Tiglath-Pileser, the compilers give but cursory mention to the former, and none at all to the latter, sidetracking them for the story of how Ahaz secured possession of a copper-altar, or rather its plan, for the Temple. It seems that the only reason the compilers mention the Syrio-Ephraimitic Campaign at all, despite its momentous consequences, is for the sake of this little tale connected with the temple-cult. In v.9 we have the most cursory mention of the conquest of Damascus by Tiglath-Pileser, as though only to show why Ahaz went to Damascus to propitiate the king of Assyria, and how he found there the copper altar, and sent a description of it to Uriah, the priest, "its pattern and all its workmanship". All else but the story of this altar is treated as an introduction. We learn absolutely nothing about the expedition of Tiglath-Pileser against Israel, nothing about how or why the Great King came to Damascus; it suffices for the purpose merely to

#60.

say that the king of Assyria was in Damascus, and that that was the reason Ahaz went there and thus fell in love with the famed copper altar. This is, of course, an extreme ^{or}example, and usually the compilers draw more upon their sources, so as to round out the stories and to give them a more harmonious setting. And yet it is representative of the line by which the compilers are measuring off history. It has often been noted that the two kings of Israel who were greatest in power, Ahab *
*Cf. 1 Kings 16:31, etc.
and Jeroboam II *, occupy a very insignificant place in the
*2 Kings 14:23-27.
esteem of the compilers, and we are told comparatively little about them, especially the latter. In the case of the former the only reason we learn anything is in connection with the doings of the prophet Elijah. To the latter and to his reign which was surely the most glorious of that kingdom, when the territory was expanded further than it had been since Solomon, and when -as the prophets testify- wealth and luxury were supreme, our compilers devote seven verses and refer the reader for the remainder to the "Book of Chronicles of the Kings of Israel". It may be that the suppression of the description in the case of Jeroboam II is not merely because he had no direct bearing upon the history of the cult and did not therefore fit directly into the compilers' plan, but also because he must have been a sort of popular idol, as he was without doubt a great general and administrator. Perhaps the compilers, in teaching their lesson, wish thus to form a new perspective in the minds of the people*.

*Cf. Kittel, p.vi. "Dabei wird der Stoff nicht gleichmaessig

#61.

behandelt. Der eine Koenig wird ausfuehrlich dargestellt, der andere - und darunter auch bedeutende Herrscher wie Jeroboam II - ganz kurz abgehandelt".

It is then evident throughout that the compilers have no regard for political power or material prosperity ~~perse~~. No matter how glorious may have been the reign of a king, no matter how consistent he may have been in the observance of the religious notions of his own day, the compilers are inexorable as fate, and unless the king has conformed to the Deuteronomic standard, built no altars of his own, lived a life that can be accused only of such royal peccadillos as that of adultery - as David -, his prowess and power are not only condemned, but-even worse - ignored. Naturally, our compilers - like most - cannot be accused of entire consistency in their philosophy of history. In the case of kings, who have in some way earned their approbation, they do not scorn to go into occasional enthusiastic descriptions of their wealth and power, or rather to select from the sources passages serving the purpose. In fact it seems that in such cases they purposely exaggerate the number of the troops of the king, and in any other way that comes to hand make their reign appear glorious, -so that glory may lend its luster to virtue. But, otherwise, it is evident that the compilers render their decisions not by this method, but on the basis of the religion alone. Whether there is an actual reason for their verdict upon each king, and whether each can ^{be} substantiated, especially where there are variations from father to son, as in Judah, may well be doubted. The author's whole system seems

#62.

entirely too mechanical and too fixed to have been a dispassionate judgment on the conditions as he found them, considered from the Deuteronomic standpoint. Consider for a moment the judgment on Zimri, king of Israel for seven days*; and yet as all the others he is condemned for following the sin of Jeroboam, and for causing the people to ~~sin~~ after him. What a power must have resided in the man to change the whole course of a nation's history within seven days, and to induce them to add an extra burden^{of} guilt to the Atlas-load already upon their shoulders! The mere statement of it is absurd! Does this not prove sufficiently the mechanical nature of the compilers' method?

All this may be taken to show that the purpose of the compilers was to show to the people the way of Jahve's justice, as interpreted by the prophets -and as in great measure misinterpreted by the compilers-, in Israel's history. And yet, we must remember, as we have said -pp. 9-10-, that the primary purpose of the compilers is to write for the people of the Exile, to interpret for them the history of the nation, in the light of the fall of Jerusalem, and the confirmation this was of the prophetic preachments. They must show not only that the separate kings sinned, but that the total was sufficient to cause the downfall of both kingdoms. This led ~~them~~ to the idea that the kingdom in itself was sinful and opposed to the idea of a theocratic state, which they represent by their picture of the prophet Samuel. And, secondly, the sin of the nation as a whole is depicted by the prophecies and

#63.

retrospects which form the final judgment upon the nations as a whole. However, this view is combined also with a belief in a Messianic kingdom, in which the throne will be occupied by a descendant of the Davidic dynasty. This inconsistency may be discovered throughout the books of Kings, and also of parts of Samuel. And, although David is himself convicted of sin and disobedience, he is represented as the type of ruler who is acceptable to Jahve, and whose seed will occupy the future throne. This can hardly be reconciled with the view that the kingdom as a whole is distasteful to God, and constitutes an insult to Him. It may be that it is a result of the Messianic hopes of the prophets, expressed in passages such as Is., ch. 11. We shall discuss this question in detail in connection with the various passages later on in this chapter, as also in Chapter 8 in connection with the prophets.

Closely related to the subject of this chapter are those of Chapters 1, 3, 3, and 6. The basis on which each of the kings or judges is criticized by the compilers has already been indicated in these chapters, and will be considered fully in Chapter 6, where we shall try to define exactly the method that constitutes the compilers' so-called "religious pragmatism", exactly what to them is the criterion of loyalty or disloyalty to Jahve, what is the real basis for their seemingly arbitrary and sudden judgments.

The compilers have in the first place incorporated in their work in Samuel a source the entire standpoint of which is opposed

#64.

to the kingdom. It presents to us a picture of Samuel as the theocratic ruler of the people, judging them and defending them, even trying to rear his own sons to take his place when he dies. He is at the same time a priest as well as prophet, and represents the community before Jahve very much like M^oses. He is the instrument of Jahve's wrath, and reproves the people for their lack of faith in Jahve by their demand for a ruler. He opposes the selection of a king, and yields only at the bidding of Jahve himself. But he warns the people that the penalty is to be that the king will lord it over the people and will force their sons into servitude. Moreover, Jahve will hold them to strict accountability for the deeds of the king and will no longer keep watch over them with His servants, as He has done during the period represented in Judges and the first part of Samuel. 1 Sam.8:8 is an important expression of this general principle. The kingdom is here interpreted to be apostasy, rebellion against Jahve; it is almost synonymous with idolatry. This certainly accords well with the verdicts pronounced by the compilers in the books of Kings. In the case of David, however, the narrative wishes to present to us a real theocratic ruler, an ideal combination of Saul and Samuel. Samuel has already retired and it has become necessary to choose someone to take his place as well as that of Saul whom he has already decided to depose at the behest of Jahve; and therefore Jahve makes choice of David and causes His spirit to rest upon him. David is the chosen of the Lord, the patriarch of the dynasty that is to be

Messianic, and which is to persist even despite his own mortal sin in the case of Bath-Sheba. In fact David himself receives the promise from Jahve that his line will last forever*.**.

*Cf. 1 Kings 9:4-6; 15:4; 11:36; 2 Kings 8:16-19.

**For the various passages concerned in this aspect of Samuel, cf. 1 Sam. 7:17 for the picture of Samuel as the theocratic ruler of Israel; 8:5-8 for the view of the kingdom as a rebellion; also as to the penalties that will accompany its adoption; cf. also 10:1, 19; 12:12, 15-17, where Samuel sets forth the standard by which the kingdom is to be judged by Jahve; in 12:19 the people themselves acknowledge their sin in having insisted on the selection of a king; 13:14, where Saul is deposed for having taken Samuel's place; 15:2, Saul is accused of disobedience in the case of Amalek - cf. 30:17; 16:1-13 for the choice of David; Ch. 18, a glorification of David; 2 Sam. 7:28-29, the promise of a Messianic line; also 2 Sam. 6:21; 1 Sam. 9:16f; 10:1; 2 Sam. 7:8.

Compare Dt. 17:14 with 1 Sam. 8:5-8; 10:19; 16:1-13.

There are several other passages that have a bearing on the subject. Jud. 8:23 tells us that Gideon refuses the offer of a hereditary kingship, and says: "I will not rule over you, neither shall my son rule over you: but Jahve shall rule over you". This seems to be an evident preparation for Samuel's contrast between the theocracy and the kingdom.

That the compilers feared the luxury and wealth of the kingdom in itself is evidenced by many stories. In 1 Kings 10:26-29 we have an account of the purchase of many horses by Solomon, which is specially cautioned against in Dt. 17:16-17.

The division of the kingdom comes because of the sins of Solomon*, and only because of the merit of David and because of

*Cf. 1 Kings 11:9-13.

the sanctity of Jerusalem will Jahve save "one" tribe for Solomon's son. In 12:1-24 it is Rehoboam that is to blame for the division*. However that may be, the whole idea seems to

*Cf. Benzinger, ad. loc.

#66.

imply again another corollary as to the Messianic times, especially with Ezekiel, that the unity of both kingdoms is the real sign of Jahve's favor, and their division is a divine punishment.

That the compilers have set out with the idea that the whole kingdom as a unit is irreligious and is distasteful to Jahve - with the exception of the Davidic line - appears clearly from the manner in which they treat Josiah. Although Josiah is represented as living up to all the laws of Deuteronomy, and although he does much to change the worship of the people to conform to its standard, yet that does not swerve the compilers from their decree as to the kingdom and the threat of the Exile. In the prophecy of Huldah Josiah is told* that for his righteousness he will be permitted to be gathered to his fathers before the storm-cloud bursts over Israel; and in 23:26-27 we are told that, despite the fact that there was no king before Josiah that could be compared to him, yet Jahve turned not from His anger, and was still firm in His resolve to "cast off this city which I have chosen, even Jerusalem, and the house of which I have said, My name shall be there".*

*Compare with the above passage Dt.8:7-20, an interesting warning to the Israelites against letting material inducements, wealth or power, tempt them to forget Jahve, and to act as do the nations. The penalty will be national destruction. Compare also Dt.17:14-20 * Driver says that the provisions of the laws about the king here are entirely "theocratic; they do not define a political constitution, or limit the autocracy of the king in civil matters". 1 Sam.8:5;10:24 are reminiscences of the law here in Deuteronomy. Note also Dt.32:15-18, which is however late.

As we have intimated in Chapter 3, there is a close relation

#67.

between the covenant idea and that of the relation of the Israelites to the Canaanites, who are to be both the tempters of Israel, the instrument of probing, and also to serve as a means of punishment. Especially throughout the period of the Judges is subservience to the Canaanites looked upon as the greatest evil that Jahve could visit upon His people, as a punishment only for the prolonged and extreme defection of the people. This binding together of religious with national terms reflects the view of the prophets, that only by faith in Jahve, faith in the most thoroughgoing sense of the term, only by spiritual sanctity could the nation be saved from the fate that was brewing. And at the same time one cannot avoid seeing that the prophets were intense patriots and that their words were to them as a hair-shirt, which tortured them day and night. Even when they rebuked and accused and indicted, they were lovers of their country, and that love which they would not permit to warp their judgments or to detract from the severity of their justice transfigured the future which was to come beyond the vale of tears through which the nation must first pass. And, yet, even in the most visionary glimpses of that future, they see the Jewish nation in its old land, revitalized, the spiritual center of the earth*.

*We shall treat this at length in Chapter 8.
This view is reflected in the exilic writings in general, and also in these historical works, bearing the stamp of the exilic time and philosophy. Drawing up their accusation against the nation as a whole, making out this historical brief in

#68.

favor of Jahve's scheme of justice, our compilers see that even in that which was dearest to the Israelite, that which lay at the root of his life as well as of his national religion before the Exile, was he punished, was the judgment of Jahve visited upon him. To our compilers, then, there is an intimate connection between national prosperity and religious merit. In judges especially, when there was more of an opportunity because of the nature of the material which represented a time when Israel lived in constant contact and continual struggle with the Canaanites, do the compilers use this opportunity to connect the relation of Israel with the surrounding nations, their victory or defeat, their supremacy or subjugation, with the state of the religion at the time. In Jud.2:14 we are told that because of unfaithfulness Israel is delivered into the hands of the nations whose gods it has strayed after*. In 3:12, because of the

Cf. also Jud.2:31.

evil of the children of Israel, Jahve sends against them Eglon, king of Moab, who conquers them and rules over them for ~~at~~eighteen years*. In 10:11,12 we see this same connection, where^{the} text tells

*Cf. also Jud.3:8;4:2;6:1;10:7;13:1;1 Sam.12:9.

us that Jahve has subdued all the nations but it has not sufficed

to keep Israel faithful*. In 1 Kings 11:14 we are taken even closer

*Cf. Jud.6:8-10;1 Sam.7:3b;10:17-19;12:6ff.

into the plans of the compilers. Here, as a result of the wickedness of Solomon, Jahve stirs up against him Hadad the Edomite, Rezon in v.23, and Jeroboam in v.26. Jahve, then, does not merely give the surrounding nations power to conquer Israel, to keep it subservient and subjugated until it shall come to repent and pray again to Jahve for help, as is said so frequently in

the book of Judges, but He even stirs up the kings of the surrounding nations, so as to punish His people. It is evident that our writers had absorbed completely the prophetic universalism first voiced by Amos in those immortal first two chapters, where the prophet shows how all the nations are equally under the sway of Jahve's laws of morality and humanity. Certainly there is a tremendous contrast between the God-conception of our compilers, mechanical and unnatural as may be the application of their theories, and that of the Elohist and Jahvist codes, - not to mention the sources of the historical books, especially such as the song of Deborah, where Jahve is almost a tribal god, just beginning to be the god of the whole nation, who comes from his mountain in the desert and by a timely rain secures the victory for his outnumbered worshippers. We have here a monotheism which is also a decided universalism. Whether the viewpoint of the compilers is exactly that of the prophets, and whether they too can be said, as do most scholars, to have a universalism that is strongly tinged with nationalism - and hence not complete - are questions that would require a much more adequate treatment than can be undertaken in connection with the present treatise. However, these questions are of essential importance to a full understanding of the philosophy of the compilers, and are therefore at least touched upon in Chapter 8.

In regard to the general political plan of the three books, and the impression that the compilers desire to give us as to the course of the history as a whole, it is necessary to add that

#70.

most probably they also shared the views of the prophets as to the wilderness-period, and that they wish to give a picture of a fall from an ideal time under Moses and Joshua, going down and ever down under the Judges and Kings, and finally culminating in the two goals toward which the entire history moves, the final exhibit in the great historical object-lesson, 2 Kings 17:22-23 for the ten tribes and 2 Kings 25:12b for the sister kingdom*.

*Cf. Wellhausen, p.236, "Im ganzen aber wird der geschichtliche Process, obgleich scheinbar krauser und verworrener, in Wirklichkeit doch viel begreiflicher, und obwol scheinbar zerrissener, schreitet er in Wirklichkeit zusammenhangender fort. Es geht bergauf auf das Koenigtum zu, nicht bergab von der Glanzzeit Moses und Josuas". Cf. also Kuenen, p. 80.

We thus see that in consonance with the views of the compilers as to the other phases of the history of the twelve tribes, their judgments upon the political and material power of Israel are that the kingdom as a whole was a gigantic sin, and that the whole history is therefore a justification of Jahve's decree of the Exile, that the compilers' interest in politics is decidedly secondary, and that probably they have devised an arbitrary system concerning it, that there is a close association between religious and temporal affairs, in fact that the latter is to the former as effect to cause.

CHAPTER 6.

Faithfulness and Unfaithfulness.

The compilers of the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings are, as has been said previously, primarily interested in the didactic side of their labors, in formulating their material and adding to it so that it will teach a direct and forceful lesson, so that their contemporaries, those of them who could read, would receive from it a clear-cut impression, one that would have a considerable effect upon the philosophy of the exilic Israelites. They carry out their plan in the main by making a great plea for belief in the justice of God, by shaping the whole history*

*Probably not all the books were written at once, nor in the order in which they now exist in the canon. Most likely Kings was written first as the material was most available, then Samuel, and Judges last.

into a denunciatory document, by showing that a general outlook over the course of the history of Israel proves that the people have been unfaithful to God, and that therefore they merit the punishment He has meted out to them. The whole history is one giant Shofar-blast, calling Israel to repentance before the judgment-seat of God. The penalty has already been exacted, the culprit stands abashed in the presence of his guilt; with the aid of these three books he sees wherein his fathers have proved unworthy of the grace and mercy of Jahve, how for generation after generation they wandered away to follow after other gods, how noneproof would make them ultimately see the evil of their ways, and how Jahve was at length compelled to cast them off. Such is the attitude which the compilers wish the

#72.

reader to assume, such it is that they desire to inculcate in the pious Israelite of their day.

But this is a task which cannot and must not be carried out only in the general outlines of the books. It would not have carried any conviction to the people of the day had this been the case. The compilers' theory must be applied to the individuals in the history; they must show how each one sinned against the God of his fathers, and how in earlier times there was a kind of correspondence between the relation of Israel to the surrounding nations and between its attitude toward Jahve. These two methods are necessary not merely to an adequate presentation of the history, but also subserve well the compilers' larger purpose, by showing why Israel had to^{so} into exile - because of the sins of their fathers repeated ad infinitum - and also why the Exile is the penalty for their misdemeanors, - because this is God's way of punishing them and has been for ages past. The compilers' religious pragmatism in reality is always playing upon one theme, the theme that faithfulness brings prosperity, and that unfaithfulness inevitably leads to ruin, but the variations upon this theme are numerous enough to permit the compilers a fair imitation of life's complexity and diversification. But, despite the comparative cleverness with which the compilers apply this theme, its mechanical nature is still evident. In the book of Judges it is noticeable because of the cycle of apostasy, subjugation, repentance, deliverance, that strikes our ear like the bells upon the wheel of a scissors-grinder's

#73.

cart. In the books of Kings it is shown by the offhand character of the verdicts passed upon the various kings, many of which seem at first glance to be without any foundation. And this is the great weakness of the pragmatic system of the compilers; it consists in statement entirely, and only in the rarest instances does it go into any proof of the justice of the condemnation. It seems simple to accuse a king of sacrificing on the "high-places", merely by stating it as a fact and calling upon the people therefore to believe in the divine justice of the penalty exacted from the nation as a whole, as well as from the individual who is convicted of the crime, his line, and those whom he persuaded to follow his lead. We cannot help wondering whether the people of the time of the compilers were also under the delusion that these kings were acting directly against the wishes of Jahve as expressed in the book of Deuteronomy, and that therefore the erection of the Bamoth was not Jahve-worship but idolatry. We may condemn the compilers' method as subjective and unhistorical, but certain it is, as Kittel says -p.26-, "Ihre(die Redaktoren) Verdienste sind nicht historischer, wohl aber praktisch religioser Art. Die wissenschaftliche Geschichtschreibung hat ihr unmittelbar wenig zu danken, mittelbar sehr viel, vielleicht alles. Denn ohne sie waere die Nation im Exile untergegangen. Die Erhaltung der Judentum im Exil und ihre Restauration nach demselben sind zum guten Teile ihr Werk". This was the impetus that caused this interpretation of history and that justified its method at least under the circumstances, and

#74.

upon consideration of the fact that history as such, as an exact record not merely of facts but of thought and culture was unknown.

We have thus far seen that in pursuance of the general object of the history, which is to show the evil of the history of the Israelites as a whole, the compilers have evolved the method in the case of the period of Judges of a cycle of rescue and defection, and in the case of the kings of a very casual, mechanical method of judgment. In both cases, however, the compilers have a specific number of sins, the commission of which constitutes sufficient ground for the imposition of the penalties which Jahve holds over the heads of the people. These sins naturally rest upon the fundamental religious ideas of the compilers, which they have for the most part taken straight from Deuteronomy. We have already shown that the compilers' philosophy includes a belief in a covenant with jahve, a deliverance from Egypt, of specific provisions against idolatry or of mixing with the Canaanites, of a belief in the Solomonic central sanctuary, and of a Levitical priesthood. It will be noticed at once that these standards of judgment are all part of the cult, and do not rest upon the general principles of morality and humanity which are emphasized by the prophets as the only proper foot-rule, and even by Deuteronomy made coequal with the religious or formal side. Our compilers do not seem to be very much interested in moral faithfulness or unfaithfulness - meaning thereby the relation of man to man. They are concerned with the relation

#75.

of man to God alone. When we do have stories relating the commission of some sin of the flesh, as with Bath-Sheba, or the rape of Naboth's vineyard, they are told either as a part of the history of the hero, about whom the compilers print everything, or, as in the latter case, so as to emphasize the influence of the prophets. In all such cases the sources quoting sins of this character do not belong to the hand of the compilers, and are comparatively little changed by them. Such incidents do not come within their plan, nor are they a part of their religious method, nor of their indictment which is being drawn up against the people of Israel.

What, then, are the exact grounds on which the compilers judge as to the faithfulness or unfaithfulness of the people and the individuals? In their philosophy of history on what basis does Jahve inflict His punishments; what qualities secure Jahve's favor, and what are the results of His regard; and similarly, what sins bring about Jahve's disfavor, and what are the results of His antagonism?

Let us consider the former first, namely, what are the criteria, the causes, and the rewards of faith in the opinion of the compilers. The first basis of judgments, most consonant with the views of the compilers as to the covenant with the Godhead, idolatry and the intercourse with the "people of the land", is that to be faithful the people must put away the foreign gods among them, must believe in and worship Jahve alone. In Jud. 10:16 we are told that because Israel put away

#76.

strange, foreign gods and served Jahve, therefore He became concerned because of their suffering and raised up Jephthah as a leader -Ch.11*. We see in the cases of Samuel - and his advice
*Cf. for the same idea 1 Sam.7:3; 1 Kings 15:12-13; 2 Kings 18:1-8; 23:1-27.

to the people -, Asa, Hezekiah, and Josiah that the chiefest criterion of their faith, that which at once distinguished them from their contemporaries and predecessors was their removal of the idols, all the heathenish practices that had become syncretized with the Jahve-cult, and especially the removal of the Bamoth -which, together with the Asheras, was the only thing Asa did not do -. And throughout the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings this forms almost the sole criterion of faithfulness, of return to Jahve. We have also, - and shall enumerate , the causes of return, and the rewards. But the sole basis for judging the faithfulness of a Judge or a king is his removal of the idolatrous practices and his worship of Jahve alone, according to the instruction of Deuteronomy. A rather negative standard, is it not? In the case of most of the kings, whom the compilers approve, they make the reservation that his purification of the cult was not complete, and that he still persisted in allowing the Bamoth to exist - mostly in the case of the kings of Judah - or, in Israel, followed "the sin of Jeroboam ". But when the phrase, "And he did what is right in the eyes of Jahve" is used, it seems always, in every instance, to mean that this king abolished some of the heathenish practices.*

*This can be seen from a multitude of illustrations, in

#77.

addition to those already cited. Cf. 1 Kings 22:41-45;
2 Kings 3:1-3; 12:1-4; 14:1-4; 15:1-4, 32-35; 16:1-4; 17:17;
21:6; 23:10.

Now as to the causes of faithfulness on the part of the people, so far as the compilers see them to arise from the circumstances of history. Leaders are supposed - in the philosophy of history of the compilers - to have a very great influence upon the people in keeping them faithful to Jahve. In Jud.2:7 we are told that the people were faithful to Jahve during the lifetime of Joshua and the elders, and in v.19 that while a Judge lived the people remained faithful to Jahve, who had rescued them from their oppressors through his instrumentality*. We are also told that, as a second cause for faithfulness, the oppression of the surrounding nations, to whom Jahve had delivered them, caused the Israelites to repent and return. The typical phrase for this is, "And the children of Israel cried unto Jahve". In 1 Sam. 12:10, in the speech which the compilers have put into the mouth of Samuel, as a review and also as a kind of epilogue to the whole period of the Judges, this idea is put into its fullest form. "And they cried unto Jahve, and said, We have sinned, because we have forsaken Jahve, and have served the Be'alim and the Ashteroth; and now deliver us out of the hands of our enemies and we will serve Thee". This is the latter half of the cycle of religious pragmatism, the repentance and deliverance which invariably succeed the apostasy and subjugation*.

*For other passages see Jud.10:10; 3:9,15; 4:3; 6:6,7.

The results or rewards for faithfulness are prosperity, the privilege of handing down the kingship to a long posterity, and

#78.

also length of days for the faithful individual. In addition to this we are told that it secures jahve's favor, and even - in a late passage* - that it will secure and ensure a return from the

*Cf. 1 Kings 8:46-51.

Exile. In 2 Kings 18:7-8 we are told that Hezekiah is given victory and prosperity because of his faithfulness. In 1 Kings 2:2-4 David repeats Jahve's promises that if his descendant will remain faithful, they will be rewarded by the eternal kingship.

The idea of a long line of descendants being the reward for faithfulness is more or less confined to the Davidic line*.

*Cf. 1 Kings 9:4,5; 11:38; 15:41; 2 Kings 8:16-19.

In 1 Kings 3:14a Solomon is promised length of days if he will obey the laws of Jahve. And, lastly, we are told that as a general moral law, faithfulness secures the favor of Jahve.

"If ye will fear Jahve, and serve Him, and obey His voice, and will not rebel against the will of Jahve: then shall both ye and the king that reigneth over you continue following Jahve, your God. But, if ye will not hearken to the voice of Jahve, and rebel against the will of Jahve: then will the hand of Jahve be against you, as it was against your fathers" *. And in 1 Kings 3:6

*1 Sam. 13:14-15.

Solomon thanks Jahve for His kindness shown to David, because of his righteousness and uprightness and faithfulness.

Naturally the criteria, causes, and results of unfaithfulness present practically only the other side of the shield. But since the general purpose of the compilers is to condemn the kingdom, not to laud it, to account for its destruction, not to make excuses for its follies, the emphasis is laid on unfaithfulness rather than on faithfulness, and our sources for judging this

#79.

aspect are much more adequate. The whole period was looked upon as closed and judged because of its unfaithfulness to Jahve*. The
*Cf. Wellhausen, p. 281, "Vom Ende aus wird hier auf die Königsperiode zurueckgeschaut wie auf eine abgeschlossene Vergangenheit, ueber welche das Urtheil gesprochen ist".

primary lesson of the books is to teach that "unfaithfulness to Jahve is always punished" *.

*Cf. Moore, Judges, p. xvi.

The first criterion, and the most important, of unfaithfulness is that of idolatry, worship of other gods, syncretism. This is the great sin in the eyes of the compilers, and is the real basis for all other criteria. It is impossible to take up all the instances in detail as they occur wherever a king is denounced, - and that means practically seven-eighths of the rulers of the two kingdoms. We may, however, outline the general features of what constitutes idolatry. As we have noted before, it is judged not on the basis of the people's idea of Jahvism, but of the much later development in Deuteronomy*. Any image, or any place outside

*Cf. Kuenen, pp 78-79.

the Temple in Jerusalem is - at least after Solomon - looked upon as heretical and idolatrous. The practices against which the compilers fulminate are: worshipping the gods of other peoples, that is, the Canaanites in earlier history, later on the surrounding nations in general, Baal and Ashteroth, Baal-berith, the golden calves which Jeroboam I set up at Dan and Bethel, Bamoth, "other gods", or false gods, Massechoth, Matzevoth, Asherim, Kedeshim, the "cult of the Amorites", child-sacrifice, or Moloch-worship, worship of the "host of heaven", and lastly the placing of heathen altars - or an Ashera - within the temple itself. The two

sins that are emphasized the most in the books of Kings are

that of Jeroboam, and the Bamoth*. Another kind of unfaithfulness

*We may cite as references, first for the general idolatrous practices: Jud. 2:12-13; 6:8-9; 8:33-35; 1 Kings 11:33; 12:28-29; 12:31; 13:33b-34; 14:22-24; 16:31; 21:25-26; 2 Kings 17:21-23, 16-17; 21:3; 22:14-20. For the sin of following the cult of Jeroboam, cf. 1 Kings 14:15-16; 16:19; 22:52-54; 2 Kings 10:28-31; 13:6, 10-11; 14:23-24; 15:8-9, 17-18, 23-24, 27-28; 17:21. For following the abominations of the Canaanites, cf. 1 Kings 14:22-24; 2 Kings 17:8b; 17:9-10.

is defined as ingratitude, desertion, forgetfulness of all that Jahve has done for Israel in the past, the covenant with the fathers and the deliverance from Egypt, - or in the case of an individual who is not duly thankful to Jahve for having put him upon the throne*. Since the deliverance from Egypt have the

Cf. Jud. 2:12; 6:8-9; 1 Kings 16:1-5. Israelites been unfaithful. Another sin for which the nation is

*Cf. 1 Sam. 8:8; 1 Kings 12:28; 2 Kings 21:14; also Jud. 2:13; 10:13; 1 Kings 9:9.

doomed is that ascribed to Jeroboam also, the sin of appointing priests illegally, priests who were not Levites but came from the very lowest of the people*.

*Cf. 1 Kings 12:31.

The causes of unfaithfulness are usually either disregard for the covenant with Jahve, or lack of obedience to the leaders, mingling with the surrounding nations and their gods. In Jud. 2:10 we are told that the reason for the unfaithfulness of the people was because they had not seen the miracles which the Lord had worked during previous generations. In the same way, after the death of the Judges, the people revert to idolatry, either because they are no longer under the personal influence and direction of the Judge, or because, as said, they no longer see the miracles which Jahve worked during the lifetime of the Judge.

#81.

But there is little use in rationalizing the scheme in this way; the author had merely developed this cycle and it was necessary for him to get back from its end to the beginning again, by inserting a new defection of the people*. Intermarriage is a
*Cf. Jud. 2:17; 8:33-35; 3:7; 1 Sam. 2:11; 10:18, also Jud. 10:6, etc.
cause of unfaithfulness to the God of Israel, and brings in foreign gods, thus causing syncretism*. Because the people and the rulers
*Cf. 1 Kings 16:26, 31.
did not heed the warnings of the prophets, they came to be unfaithful*. And, lastly, the covenant which Jahve concluded with the
*Cf. 2 Kings 17:7-18, etc.
fathers was of no avail in keeping the people faithful*.
*Cf. 2 Kings 17:15; 18:12.

The penalties to be inflicted upon the rulers and people are in the main that they should be given over into the power of their enemies. We have already discussed this in connection with the conception of the compilers as to political and material power. We have seen that they look upon the State as an instrument for the operation of the moral law, as a kind of index of the religious condition of the people. Servitude is an indication not of the rise of some world-power, or of the intellectual weakness of the ruler, but of the unfaithfulness of Israel. Subjugation by a foreign power, both in the days of the Judges and the Kings is a sign of the displeasure of Jahve, and in the plan of the compilers comes after some flagrant violation of the Deuteronomic principles for which they stand above all else. In Jud. 3:12 Jahve gives Israel into the power of Eglon.* The
*Cf. for other instances Jud. 2:14, 20; 3:8; 4:2; 6:1; 10:7; 13:1; 1 Sam. 13:9; 7:13, 14; 2 Kings 17:7.
sons are punished for the sins of the fathers in the philosophy of the compilers, sometimes even further than the third and

#82.

fourth generations. For instance, the sins of the sons of Eli*

*Cf. 1 Sam. 2:30-33.

are to cause retribution to fall upon their house, to which the eternal priesthood had been promised. But henceforth, now that they have sinned, this honor will be taken away from them

forever and given to a "faithful" one*. Disobedience and unfaith-

*Cf. also 1 Kings 16:12, and 2 Kings 22:13, a passage that, as suggested by Dr. Battenwieser, seems to show that the part of Deuteronomy which contains the dictum that sons shall not suffer for the sins of the fathers, was not in the original book read before Josiah.

fulness bring other physical punishments. Jahve brings about a

drought so as to induce Israel to repent*. Jahve's favor will be

*Cf. 1 Kings 8:35-36.

taken away from them because of unfaithfulness*. The division of

*Cf. 1 Sam. 12:14-16; and Ch. 15.

the kingdom is a result of their defection from Jahve, and

disobedience to His commands*, also due to the commission of the

*Cf. 2 Kings 17:21.

sin of Jeroboam. And last and most important, the Exile is

the final punishment for their disobedience. If, after all

other measures have failed, the children of Israel shall

still persist in their wickedness, Jahve has no recourse but to

dismiss them from before His presence, and to send them away

from their land, from the birth-place of their fathers*.**

*Cf. 1 Kings 9:6-7; 14:15-16; 2 Kings 17:18; 17:23; 21:18; 23:26-27.

**For similarities with Deuteronomy, compare Jud. 2:22 with Dt. 6:19; Jud. 6:8-10 with Dt. 6:12-15; 1 Sam. 12:14-15 with Dt. 6:24 and Driver's comment, and also with Dt. 7:12-16; 1 Kings 2:2-4 with Dt. 11:18-25; 6:6-9; 1 Kings 11:33 with Dt. 4:3; 1 Kings 14:15-16 with Dt. 28:36, 37, 41, 63-68; 1 Kings 16:12 with Dt. 24:16; and with Dt. 7:10; 2 Kings 17:7-18, 21-23; 23:8; 23:26-27 with Dt. 28:36, 37, 41, 63-68; 2 Kings 17:13 with Dt. 9:6 and 31:27; 2 Kings 22:11-13 with Dt. 24:16; 7:10; and 2 Kings 23:26-27 with Dt. 28:36, 37, 41, 63-68. Compare also in general for the ideas Dt. 8:5 where the wilderness period is for the purpose of disciplining Israel; Dt. 8:7-20, where the Israelites are warned against forgetting the Giver of all good and ascribing their wealth to their own powers, which will inevitably

#83.

lead to desertion and destruction; Dt.11:10-17, God's control over the reain should keep them faithful; Dt.19:9, expansion of territory depends upon obedience to the laws of Jahve; Dt.26:5, "A perishing Aramean was my father", Israel owed all to Jahve, who has raised it from its low estate; Dt.31:16, rebellion and disobedience after Moses' death are to consist in idolatry, thus breaking the covenant with Jahve; Dt.32:15-18, luxury brings ruin; Dt. 32:37-39, a moral change will be wrought in Israel by its great need.

We have thus seen that the reasons for the specific application of the compilers' religious pragmatism are a result of the general purpose of the work, and that the compilers have a large number of criteria, causes, and penalties for unfaithfulness and faithfulness.

CHAPTER 7.

The Compilers and Their Material.

Throughout the previous chapters of this treatise, we have, as stated in the introduction, assumed that the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings have already been analyzed into the various sources, and that from these we had selected exclusively those belonging to the Deuteronomic compilers, and from them drawn our deductions as to the philosophy of this literary stratum. In using the word "compilers" we have explained that we meant that they were the men, using the plural advisedly as there were at least two periods of compilation and we do not know how many writers took part in each, who gathered the material from the various sources, taking some, omitting much, and grouped it all together into a fairly consistent work, adding also occasional judgments of their own, and inserting periodically parennetic speeches so as to emphasize and crystallize the interpretation they wish to be put upon the course of history. But it is not difficult to see that the viewpoint of the compilers is to be determined not only from the sections of the works which come directly from their own pens, but also from the manner and matter of the sections they have selected from the various sources. We can without error leap to the conclusion that their viewpoint, or philosophy of history - to dignify it by an anachronistic term - , as we have described it in the foregoing chapters, gives us an insight into the method of selection from their sources, the idea which governed their procedure. But we should know

#85.

more than this. We should also see exactly what the sources were from which the compilers gathered their material, in how far they were changed in the process of incorporation, what the system was by which the compilers arranged their sources into a book, and finally what conclusions we can draw as to our subject by this brief view of the way in which the compilers handled their materials. A book is a work of art, and just as we can judge of the personality and character of an artist from a finished painting, by noticing the use of the colors and the general plan and arrangement of the figures, that is, the composition, or similarly in the case of a really fine piece of architecture, perhaps we can also pursue this same process in the case of the historical books written under the influence of the Deuteronomic Reformation.

It must be remarked in the first place that the treatment of this very important subject will be necessarily brief and rather inconclusive and unconvincing. A proper consideration would necessitate a treatise of as great length again, and also a much more careful analysis of the books into the various sources and a characterization of each of these sources, than we are able to give within the scope of the present work. The object of this chapter is no more than to give an idea of the field of this part of our subject, mention and explanation of which cannot be omitted without very considerable damage to a complete understanding of the nature of the work of the compilers and the full extent of their views on the religion and history of the Jews in pre-Exilic times.

#86.

The best way in which to give an idea of the various sources upon which the compilers drew without going into an individual analysis of the works in question will be to follow briefly the conclusions of the authorities on this subject, and to accept that which appears best to account for the facts as we find them. W.R. Smith remarks that the historical books are compilations, and that authority is given for very small parts of the sources only*. In reference to Kings he says that it is *W.R. Smith, cf. Bibl. -p.93ff. evidently not a homogeneous literary document. Samuel also* is *Op.cit.pp.113ff. composed of two main sources, -outside of that the compilers have written -, one of which is by a student of human nature, who has no interest in foreign wars, and the second by one fascinated by the glories of David's reign. Kittel says that the earliest source from which history is drawn is the "Song", of which there were probably at least two books, #The Book of the Wars of Jahve", and the "Book of Heroes"*. Schmidt-p.42-merely *Cf. Kittel, p.6f. remarks that these were the first histories which depended upon sources, and then describes how the sources were handled by the compilers. Moore *gives a careful analysis of the sources from *Cf. Moore, Judges, pp.xix-xxxiii. which the material used by the compilers in this book were drawn. First of all it is remarked that no story except that of Othniel shows traces of the compilers' conceptions or expressions; indeed some have a character that is quite the opposite of the idea with which the compilers present them - such as the tales about Samson, for instance*. The question is *Compare Ehud 3:12-30 with Othniel 3:7-11. did the compilers take from several or from one collection.

#87.

The probability seems to be that it was only from one, as this explains the inclusion of the Samson stories more satisfactorily. Discrepancies even in the earlier collection seem, according to Moore, to point to the fact that even in this earlier collection "The varying fortunes of Israel in those troublous times were already made to point the moral that unfaithfulness to Jahve was the prime cause of all the evils that befell the people,-- a pre-Deuteronomic Book of the Histories of the Judges". *

We shall consider the ~~value~~ of this view later. probably Chaps. 17-31 were included in the older work, but rejected by the compilers as unsuited to their purpose. The early collection, from which the compilers drew probably came from two sources at least, since several of the narratives are composite. One of these sources seems to be of considerably greater worth. Moore inclines to the hypothesis that in the older source it is Rje, the same author and combination as in the Hexateuch. The Redactor who combined these two sources which
*Cf. p xxv, discussion as to Schrader, Boehme, Stade, Budde, Kuenen, etc.

may be designated by J and E, was one of the prophetic historians, whose work however differed from that of the Hexateuch, in so far as he makes excerpts from his sources, instead merely of combining and harmonizing. The age of the J part seems to be before the eighth century; E is somewhat younger, having more of the prophetic tinge, and may come from the end of the eighth century or the first half of the seventh. Chapter 5 is the oldest part of the book of Judges, and may come from some older collection such as the "Book

#38.

of Yashar", or of the "Wars of Jahve". It seems that some

Judges are inserted so as to make the number twelve*. we next

*We need not consider Judges 1-3:5, nor 17-21, since they are not a part of the book of the Deuteronomic compilers.

turn to Benzinger's explanation of the sources of the books

of Kings*. The sources from which the compilers drew their

*Cf. Benzinger, Kings, vii-xii.

material were already worked over. Leaving the compilers out

of consideration the books have two kinds of component parts,

first a list of short notices, which are very much to the

point*, and are analistic in character. On the other hand there

*E.g. 1 Kings 8:1,12;9:11;11:7;4:1ff,7ff;14:25ff;16:31f,24.

is a series of wonderful narratives, sometimes in popular vein, and sometimes in a more cultured style,- and of extremely diverse

historical worth. These narratives are in groups which revolve

around a certain man, and are therefore mainly biographical in

character. We may enumerate such narratives as to Solomon,

Jeroboam, Ahab, Jehu, Elijah, Elisha, and Isaiah. There are,

however, other narratives which are much more closely connected

and which have a special relation to the Temple. The compilers

drew from all these sources, most fully from the narratives about

Elijah and Elisha, and least as to Isaiah and Ahab. In the

history of Solomon, the compilers used three sources, analistic

notices*, narratives of legendary character **, and a report of

*E.g. 1 Kings 8:1,12;9:11;11:7, etc.

**Cf. 3:16ff;10:1ff.

the building of the Temple, which has itself added to it an

embroidery of a legendary character. Benzinger thinks that

the combination of these sources was not done by the compilers,

but by a predecessor, and that the compilers only retouched,

#89.

but did not rearrange nor combine, but left the selections in their former relation, as they are now*. Wellhausen also considers

*The worth of this theory will be considered later.
the question as to the sources from which the books were drawn with great care. He notes interpretations before the compilers, as Jud. 6:35-33, and then from pp. 289-295 gives the subject detailed attention. He too gives a list of the brief notices, which are to be ascribed to the Deuteronomic compilers, and notes every mention of the word "X" in this connection. According to him these brief notices may come originally from the priests - p. 290-*. But here they come from a secondary source, perhaps a

*Cf. 2 Kings 16:10f; 12:22.
chronicle of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. There are also excerpts from the annals, which are in turn interrupted by long tales or narratives, many more of which come from Israel-
itish history than Judaic, the best instance of which is the tales about Elijah. 1 Kings 19:17 is the Deuteronomic interpretation of the story which is given in original form in 1 Kings 20, 22, 2 Kings 7, 9.* Gunkel -cf. Bibl.-divides the sources into
*Great group of popular tales, 1 Kings 20, 22, 2 Kings 3, 6:24-7:20; 9:1-10:27.

1st Lists, 2nd Annals, 3rd Legends, and 4th Songs* **. It is

*Cf. 1 Sam. 18:7; 2 Sam. 1:17ff; 3:33ff; 20:1; 1 Kings 12:16.

**He also designates as old portions Jud. 9; 1 Sam. 13f; 2 Sam. 1-5; 13-20; 1 Kings 1f; 2 Kings 9f, etc.; Chs. 11; 12:5; 22f.

universally admitted, that the books are drawn from various sources. These would seem to be Songs, Lists, Annals, narratives, and perhaps also a Temple-history. It is, however, claimed that these were already selected before the compilers read into them their own particular brand of philosophy, and that they had already some of the prophetic views contained in them.

#90.

The difficulties in this view in the case of the books of Kings are many, and are disposed of much more easily by the hypothesis that there were two Deuteronomic compilations, or rather, that the first was already Deuteronomic and that the second was a later Exilic work,- as we have already postulated in Chapter 1. This explains all the composite narratives, and also the fact that in the books of Judges the stories appended, after Chapter 17, do not have the stamp of Deuteronomic thought, although undoubtedly drawn from the same original source as the other stories in the Deuteronomic book of Judges. That there may have been a redaction of the sources which go to make up the narratives, which the compilers select for their sources, and that this may be identical with that designated as Rje in the Hexateuch is not impossible,- but has little bearing upon our own question, which concerns only the selection of these stories from whatever source they may be taken, whether this was by Rje or by some entirely different writer of the same period. The fact remains that the stories in the order and application that we have them here were selected by the compilers, probably the first, and then given their present coloring. That some were omitted from the original collection in the process of selection is proved by the addition of the stories in Chaps. 17-21 of Judges.

The next question which presents itself is: in how far did the compilers modify the stories as they originally drew them from their sources? As mentioned above, according to Moore,

#91.

no story in Judges but that of Othniel shows traces of the compilers' conceptions or expressions. certainly the story of Samson, the most folk-like of the stories, is far removed from the viewpoint of the compilers in its spirit and age. It seems probable then that in the book of Judges, beginning at 2:6, the author has simply strung together these stories which he took from his own source, except to interpolate the speech of an angel or prophet, or to precede and succeed them by a critical formula, but otherwise has left them as he found them. ~~Schmidt~~ says-p.42- that it is the characteristic of this style of history that it takes its account literally from its sources and only puts a verdict at the beginning or end. According to Benzinger the compilers only retouched the stories but left them otherwise in their former relation in the collection from which he took them. Wellhausen, however, -page 287-says, in regard to the books of Kings, "Wir wissen, es ist das Gesetzbuch Josias; wir sehen aber, wie die Tatsachen darnach nicht bloss beurtheilt, sondern auch gemodelt werden". It is probable that many of the stories, for instance the narratives as to Elijah were formulated at rather a late date in the shape in which the compilers took them, and that it is for this reason that there is such a contrast between the picture of Ahab given in these stories and that taken from the annals, as to the Syrian war. Wellhausen says in another place, -p.298-, "In den Buechern der Richter Samuelis und der Koenige wird die Tatsache des radikalen Abstandes der alten

Praxis vom Gesetz im ganzen nicht in Abrede gestellt. In einzelnen Faellen zwar wird die vergangenheit auch hier auf grund des Ideals umgedichtet, in der Regel aber doch nur verurteilt". It seems then that although some of the stories are worked over so as to give the impression that they involve a knowledge of the deuteronomic laws, yet for the most part they are taken straight from their sources without any change by the compilers beyond the verdicts at the beginning and end, the occasional parenetic speeches for the further emphasis of the course of history and the position assigned to them in the work as a whole.

The arrangement of the works as a whole seems to be according to a distinct plan. As stated above, the desire seems to be to present a picture of a religious decline, from the time of the ideal wilderness-period, or of the giving of the Law, down to the Exile. The periods of faithfulness are certainly much less frequent in Kings than in Judges or Samuel, and the impression given much more powerful as to the guilt of the people. The book of Judges is meant to give the impression of historical continuity, that there was a regular succession of Judges, just as there were later Kings. Probably the original source presented the Judges as tribal heroes, not affecting the nation as a whole*, and many of them contemporaneous. But, since the compilers of the Book wished to present the events as national and continuous, they changed this. In the books of Kings, it is interesting to note how the histories of the kingdoms of Judah

*Wellhausen, p233-234.

#93.

and Israel are alternated. Each king of Judah or Israel is taken, up, as he comes to the throne, and his reign is narrated to the end. Then, after the story of his reign, come the tales of the reigns of all the kings of the other kingdom, during that time. Each reign is set off by formulae* **.The history as a

*Cf. W.R. Smith, p.115.

**Cf. Appendix III, Formulae.

whole moves toward the prediction of the Exile, the condemnation of the two kingdoms* **.

*Cf. 2 Kings 17:22-23, and 2 Kings 25:21b.

**Cf. page 70.

In the ^{compilers'} treatment of the kings there seems to be favoritism not merely on the ground of their connection with the cult and the influence they had in the growth of the religion, although this does play the greatest part in their judgments, but as said above, ~~their~~ system seems artificial, as though the compilers had purposely condemned a certain number of kings with the object of adding to the wickedness of the nation as a whole, and thus justifying the final judgment. In addition to this it may be that the compilers intentionally say little of kings such as Jeroboam, because although mighty rulers and perhaps popular idols, they did not fit into ~~their~~ scheme, and they, therefore tried to belittle their importance and this to turn the reader more readily toward their point of view.

Can we, then, draw any conclusions from the method in which the compilers selected ~~their~~ material? Can we deduce from it anything that bears out our conclusions drawn from an examination of the passages that come directly from the compilers' hands?

The attitude of the compilers is, as Kittel* puts it, "um die Tatsachen der Vergessenheit zu entreissen, beziehungsweise die Vergangenheit fuer das gegenwaertige Geschlecht ins richtige Licht zu setzen". Whether the latter is the less important is however unlikely. It seems probable that the compilers' selection of material is naturally in consonance with the general tenor of their own philosophy of history. What we cannot reconcile with our own views of history is the fact that they select stories which evidently contradict their own viewpoint and present a view of ancient conditions that seems much more life-like. For instance, the story of Samson, as often noted, bears no trace of a story with a moral, and fits very poorly into the scheme of the compilers. Rather it is the tale of a rollicking hero of folklore, whose exploits, with all their marks of the extravaganza type of literature, must have warmed the cockles of the hearts of the old Israelites. We might say the same of the stories of David's family life, his quarrel with Michal, and all the intrigues of Solomon and Adonijah. However, it seems that the compilers had this problem before them, to construct a history from the sources before them with as little insertion and redaction as possible, so as to present the idea they were striving for. Naturally with the conception of history at that day, and the lack of critical insight, combined with the fact that these were very probably the first histories with a purpose ever written, there is a great deal of internal inconsistency and many of the stories contradict the aim of the compilers,

rather than demonstrate it. We may infer from the references to the sources from which many of the stories were drawn that the compilers omitted a great deal more, which must have been of value in the secular history of the Israelites, but which was of no use to them. There is a purpose, a reason, in the use of every story. That of Samson seems to be inserted, because the compilers wish to account for the presence of the Philistines before the time of Saul, and for the necessity for a kingdom, and the unifying of the tribes under the pressure of common calamity. The stories of Solomon and Adonijah are included because it is necessary to give some tale of how Solomon ascended the throne, in order to connect Solomon's reign with that of David. The compilers simply use what comes to hand from the court-chronicles, without looking into its fitness. And, similarly, in the case of the story of Ahab's struggle with Syria, the story is accepted by the compilers, despite the fact that the picture it presents is quite different from that in the Elijah stories, because they must in some way give the fulfillment of the prophecy of Ahab's punishment. It is clear, also, that the compilers drew most heavily upon those sources which contained stories consonant with their purpose. The excisions from the biographies of Elijah and Elisha seem to include almost all that was before the compilers, and wherever there is an opportunity they quote from the source which seems to contain a history of the Central Sanctuary. Naturally it is impossible to ascribe to the compilers all the views that

#96.

are voiced in the sources from which they draw. The method of their authorship does not mean that they stand sponsor for their citations and for all contained in them. It is a slipshod kind of history, and therefore cannot be interpreted by the rules of modern logic.

In general, we may repeat that the main object of the entire history is religious, and it is this object that governs the selection of the sections from the various sources. The political framework is decidedly secondary in the interest of the compilers and serves as a framework for the lesson, to give it a setting. As W.R. Smith says-p.139-, "The history of the Old Testament, taken as a whole, forms so remarkable a chain of evidence establishing the truth of what the prophets taught as to the laws of God's government on earth, that we cannot be surprised to find that in the circles influenced by prophetic ideals all parts of the historical tradition came to be studied mainly in a spirit of religious pragmatism". Wellhausen-p.284-thinks that the history of Judah is more a history of the Temple than of the kingdom, and that in the history of Israel the prophetic narratives are in the foreground of interest. That this, the religious pragmatism of the compilers, is the basis of selection from their sources cannot be doubted, from a cursory examination of the books as a whole, and the picture they present of the nation, not as a commonwealth with economic and political interests, but as a community the concern of which is religious in great proportion, and

#97.

the religious concern of which forms the main stuff of its history.

we have thus seen how and what sources the compilers of the books drew from, in how far these sources were changed, what the plan of arrangement of the three works was, and how far it was applied.

I wish to repeat that this chapter is not intended to be technical nor exhaustive, but supplementary, alone. The same may be said of the next.

#98.

CHAPTER 8.

The Deuteronomistic School and the Prophets.

For a proper treatment of the relation of the religious and moral concepts of the Deuteronomistic School - especially as expressed in Judges, Samuel, and Kings - to the ideas and ideals of the great prophets much more space and time would be required than can be given in this treatise. It would be necessary to trace the development of prophetic doctrine beginning with Amos, and to show the comparative time at which each of the ideas arose that later became partly or wholly embodied in the Deuteronomistic "Weltanschauung". This is impossible. And the sole purpose of this chapter is to serve as a supplement to the description of the views of the compilers of the historical books, so that this angle may not be lacking entirely. The purpose is not to exhaust the subject, nor to attempt even a minute analysis of a part thereof.

There can be no doubt that the book of Deuteronomy itself and the works written under its influence are the result of the prophetic impulse, and that the spirit of the prophets caused all this reinterpretation of the past of the people of Israel. Although the prophets themselves were interested in the history of Israel and make frequent references to it to substantiate their claims, although they look upon history as the most direct revelation of God's glory and His principles of justice and love in dealing with mankind, yet they did not undertake the composition

of a systematic history that would present their views in literary form. Partly this was because the prophets were not so concerned with the writing of books, and partly because their interpretations of history were much more natural, and not mechanical enough to lend themselves to the composition of a whole series of histories. Their chief purpose was direct preaching to the people of God's message, not the embodiment of that message in a form that was bound to be a compromise. It was only after the composition of Deuteronomy with its application of many of the prophetic principles to the early history of Israel and with its presentation of a norm, a criterion by which history could be judged mechanically, that the time was ripe for the composition of the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings. It is moreover possible that not until the time of Deuteronomy was the prophetic preaching available to the general mass of the people. These considerations, in addition to the undoubted impetus given to writings of this character by the confirmation of all the prophecies of destruction, account for the fact that these books were written during the Exile and after the prophetic movement had practically attained its zenith.

The relation of the views of the works in question with those of the prophets is closely, nay inseparably connected with the question of the relation between the latter and those of Deuteronomy. Just as it becomes evident from a cursory glance that, although Deuteronomy adopted many of the prophetic doctrines, such as monotheism, humanitarianism, opposition to idolatry, yet

#100.

because of its very nature it was a compromise, and fell short of the complete indifference(not to say opposition)to the sacrificial cult and the Temple, that characterized the great prophets. The differences between the Deuteronomic views and those of the prophets are emphasized rather than softened in the historical books. Whereas Deuteronomy at least devotes a great space to laws and exhortations to encourage the ideal and practice of humanitarianism, mercy and charity, these are entirely overlooked in the historical works, and only the monotheistic and formal sides stressed. Idolatry is the great sin, unfaithfulness, nonconformity with the worship of Jahve as set forth in the Deuteronomic code; sins such as adultery - in the case of David - are treated as grave, but still insignificant compared with sacrifice upon the Bamoth. It is then evident that the prophetic opposition to the current system of sacrifice on the basis of the injury it wrought to the morals of the people, and to the fact that it prevented their realizing that their relation to Jahve was moral and moral alone, had become changed first in Deuteronomy by a compromise in which the attempt was made to accomplish a moral transition by improving the cult, by working from within rather than from without, and had then in the philosophy of the writers of the historical books given way to the conception that the cult, - established by Deuteronomy as a makeshift, - was an end in itself, and that conformity to the cult was the chiefest criterion of religious intent. The question has been much discussed as to whether the author or authors of Deuteronomy belonged to the

#101.

circle of Isaiah, or whether they came later. Kuenen -p.153- thinks the former probable. This is a question we shall have to pass over.

Our compilers are in almost complete accord with the prophets so far as their opposition to reliance upon political and material power is concerned. As said above -p.60-, they practically disregard political power in their judgments of the various rulers, although a slight inconsistency arises from the fact that they do not hesitate to describe wealth and luxury, or to select such passages from their sources, when it reflects to the credit of a ruler who has already been approved on the customary grounds.

It has already been said a number of times, and need not be repeated in detail here, that the main impetus for the books was the fact that the Exile had become the great confirmation of the prophetic preachments and had inclined the the people toward respect for the prophets. The prophetic predictions of the destruction of the state were in part also the models of the same in the historical books, although here, too, the grounds are made formal rather than moral as in the prophets.

The condemnation of the kingdom as opposed to the will of Jahve has also strong precedent in the prophets. Hosea especially in his historical retrospects seems to be the spiritual father

of this view. Let me quote here Wellhausen on this point*: "Nur
*Wellhausen, p.282, Note.
Hosea verfolgt allerdings die Schule der gegenwart hinauf bis in den Anfang - aber er exemplifiziert (wie Mich.6) vorzugsweise an der Urgeschichte Jakobs und Moses, in der eigentlich geschichtlichen

#103.

Zeit steckt er doch noch zu sehr darin um sie von so hohem Standpunkte aus zu ueberschauen. Auch darin ist er der Vorlaefer der Spaeteren, dass er das menschliche Koenigtum fuer einen Hauptschaden Israels ansieht: er hatte dazu in den Verhaeltnissen seiner Gegenwart allerdings dringende Veranlassung".

The view of the compilers of the historical books as to the interdependence of the religion and the political power has also much precedent in the prophets. Isaiah especially emphasizes this point, and thunders out again and again that no alliances with Egypt or Assyria, no strengthening of the defences of the city, will avail in the final test, because of the lack of faith on the part of the people. It is because of lack of "knowledge", of spiritual insight, that they are to go into exile. Naturally here again, it must be remarked that while the prophets base their conclusions on the general moral and human grounds, the compilers of the historical books are thinking of violations of the cult, as stated in Deuteronomy.

Love of the nation is one of the incentives for the composition of the books, and love of the nation is also the passion that is played upon most strongly and intentionally in the form of retribution that is visited upon the people from the time of the Judges and of the subjection of the surrounding nations, until the Exile itself. And love of country was also strong in the prophets, despite their fearless and unflinching denunciations of king and people, despite their predictions of its doom, - even with Amos, who saw no ray of hope, - (at least none can be discovered in his writings). Hosea especially, with his allegory of the

#103.

marriage of Jahve and Israel, from his own life-experience, voiced a passionate love for his people, even while he admonished them most severely*.

*Cf. Procksch, pp 14ff.

Another similarity is the fact that in the historical books, although Jahve is especially the God of Israel, still He has power with the surrounding nations, and at times even spurs them against the Israelites, as a means of punishment. This universalism is closely related to that voiced in the first two chapters of the prophet Amos, and numerous other passages scattered throughout all the pre-Exilic prophets.

The prophets, too, look back upon the wilderness-period as ideal in the history of Israel,--a period, when, according to them, there was no idolatry (and no sacrifice), but perfect trust and confidence. Just as the general plan of the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings as composed and arranged by the compilers, is to represent Israel's history as a great retrogression spiritually from the time of Moses on, so do the prophets in general consider it*. According to Jeremiah the people were good during the wilderness-period, and that immediately after that Baal-worship began.*

*Cf. Amos 5:25, etc. Hosea 9:10.

*In general, cf. Procksch, pp. 70-81.
The ideal period to Isaiah was also the wilderness, but still more the first kingdom under David*.

*Cf. Procksch, p. 31.

It is claimed by many that Isaiah had the idea of the indestructibility of the Temple at Jerusalem and that it was this that lent to it its sanctity so that it became the center of the Deuteronomic cult*. It will not be necessary to discuss this

*Cf. Wellhausen, p. 25.

#104.

view here, as it has no direct bearing on our subject. The destruction of the Temple was already an accomplished fact, and the prediction of it, whether by Isaiah or another, formed the main testimony on which the compilers relied for authority*.The

*For a discussion of this question, cf. Battenwieser, The prophets of Israel, 280f, 293f.

Temple in Jerusalem is not looked upon nor discussed in the historical books as a place any more under the protection of Jahve than the rest of the land, but only as the recognized center of the cult.

In the prophets there are a certain number of references to the events of history, which give a fair idea of the extent to which they treat it, and which form a basis of comparison with the historical books. These are not always in absolute accord with the facts as given in Judges, Samuel, and Kings, and are most of them mentioned in such a way that it is not possible to identify them with specific stories.*

*Cf. Procksch, pp. 134 seq. Most of the references are from Isaiah. Among the references are to the "Day of Midian," Is. 9:3; 10:26, which is to be compared with Jud. 6-8. It does not seem though that Isaiah used this source. As to Samuel, cf. Jer. 15:1; 14:2-9; 11; compare Num. 21:4-9; 1 Sam. 7. Probably Jeremiah knew this passage. The glorification of Samuel is Deuteronomic. For Jeremiah and Deuteronomy cf. as to Shiloh, 1 Sam. 1-3; 2 Sam. 6; Jer. 7:12; 14; 26:6. As to Gibeah, see Hosea 10:9, referring to Saul's kingdom. Cf. also 1 Sam. 11:4; 14:2; 15:34; 22:6; 23:19; 26:1; Is. 10:29. Hosea names it as the residence, but nothing can be proved from it. David's descent from Jesse is mentioned in Is. 11:1; Mic. 5:1. Micah seems to depend on Isaiah. For David as Jesse's son, cf. 1 Sam. 16:1, 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11; 17:12, 13, 17, 58; 20:6. No connection between the prophets and the following passages is demonstrable. David as a player of the harp, Am. 6:5, cf. 1 Sam. 16+2 Sam. 8. Amos lays no stress on it, and does not even use the expressions which is recurrent in Samuel. David's battles are named by Isaiah as Baal Perasim and Gibeon, cf. Is. 28:21, and the siege of Jerusalem, Is. 29:1. Cf. 2 Sam. 5. The names are

#105.

not identical. It seems that Isaiah did not have the book before him, but that the traditions from which they were drawn were similar. The separation of the kingdoms is mentioned in Is. 7:17, cf. 1 Kings 12:1-20, which is by a Judean. As Omri and Ahab, cf. Mic. 6:16, where the injustice in trade and court is spoken of, 1 Kings 21. Jezreel-2 Kings 9, where it appears that Hosea is acquainted with this account; Hos. 1:4, 1 Kings 21. Saul-Hos. 10:9, etc.

The prophets were the first to try to seek the cause for the conditions among the Jews*, especially as to religion, and the low state of morality among the people. It was for this reason that more and more they went into the past and saw God working in and through the history of mankind, and of the Israelites in particular. The application of religious interpretation to history undoubtedly has its source in their work.

The attitude of the prophets to the popular, national religion is somewhat different than that of the compilers of the historical books. To the latter there was only one true religion from the very beginning, and it was consistently violated by the people. The prophets recognize the popular, national worship, and realize that it is the best that the people know, and yet they condemn it on the ground of its worthlessness. It is then evident that their verdict comes from a very different process of reasoning than does that in Judges, Samuel, and Kings. Because of the postulate of universal justice the prophets can see no other fate but the destruction of the present kingdom, and therefore they condemn the religion.

We have already stated that the moral connection between political and religious conditions is a postulate of both the prophetic and the historical schools, though from different

#106.

methods of reasoning. Hosea's idea of national "prostitution" is found also in Jud.2:17; 8:27,33, cf. also Jer.15; 2 Kings 22:15-20; Ez.16,20,23. Israel's sins are based on ingratitude by Hosea, and God's grace has been of no avail.

It is unnecessary to discuss in detail the prophetic view of sacrifice. It is even stronger than that in the historical books*, but is based on moral grounds, whereas the latter has formal reasons, resting on the Deuteronomic reformation*.

*Cf. Wellhausen, p.58. Cf. Amos 4:4f; 5:21ff; Hos.4:6ff; 8:11ff; Is.3:10ff; Mic.6; Jer.7:2ff.

There are a few passages that it may be of value to compare with the prophets as to similarity of views. The idea of Jahve putting a stumbling-block in the way of Israel, to test them, is in Jud. 3:3, where the Canaanites are left to ensnare the people, also

Isaiah 8:14,15. In Jud.3:12 we see that Jahve "strengthens" a neighbouring power so that it may conquer Israel as a punishment for its sins. This has a universalistic tinge which may be compared with Ez. 30:24; Jer.27:5-8; Is.45:1ff. The deliverance from Egypt, often spoken of as the origin of the relation between God and Israel, for instance Jud.6:8, may be found also in Amos 3:1b; Hos.13:4, etc. The condemnation of the kingdom, as Jud.8:23, probably comes from the time of Hosea; Hos.13:10f; 9:9; 10:9. For Jud.16:15, where Israel asks to be punished but saved, and numerous other passages of the same tenor*, see Hos.

Cf. 2 Sam.24:14; 1 Sam.3:18; 23; 15:26; Jud.19:24; 1 Sam.1:23; 11:10; 14:40; 2 Sam.10:12.

11:8. A typically prophetic passage is 1 Sam.15:22-23, where we are told that God desires obedience more than sacrifice. 1 Kings

#107.

8:46-51 where in Solomon's speech the people are told that repentance in exile will ensure a return, is to be compared to the prophets from Hosea on. In 1 Kings 14:23 we are presented with a picture of Baal-worship in the name of Jahve; this is the thing that the prophets object to continuously and strenuously, cf. Am. 2:7; Hos. 4:13ff. Contrast 2 Kings 10:28-31, where the murders of Jehu are looked upon as pleasing to Jahve with Hos. 1:4. Compare 2 Kings 21:12-13, where Jahve is to destroy Judah and Jerusalem with the current view as to the inviolable sanctity of the Temple at Jerusalem.

In general we may repeat that, although it would be an interesting and very useful task to trace the exact development of the ideas of the compilers through the prophetic school, beginning with Amos, it is impossible within the compass of this treatise. There are many similarities between the two and also some striking differences. The general relation can be stated as to the fundamentals, in that the prophets stood for morality alone, ritual only in the most insignificant degree; Deuteronomy stood for ritual as a means of preserving and improving morality; the compilers of Judges, Samuel, and Kings interpreted history by the Deuteronomic ritual, without special regard for the humanitarian lessons it was really intended to teach.

#108.

APPENDIX I.

Characteristics of Deuteronomy.

It has been said time and time again in the course of this treatise that the compilers are of the Deuteronomic school and that their views are affected in the main by the views of Deuteronomy. We have also said that the book of Deuteronomy and the practices it attempts to establish are the norm by which history is judged. We have incidentally compared the specific views of the compilers with those of Deuteronomy in the course of the treatise. But it may be convenient and of value to the reader to have in addition a comprehensive presentation of the Deuteronomic standpoint in a more connected fashion. For this reason we append here a list of the main principles of Deuteronomy with the more important passages in the book, for purposes of reference. This material is taken almost bodily from Driver's Commentary-pp.xix.seq.

The Book of Deuteronomy may be divided into three elements, the historical, the legislative, and the parenetic, of which the last is the most important and most characteristic. Its history, like that of the books we have reviewed, is didactic in purpose. Its legislation is calculated to embody principles, religious and moral, which are the main object of the work as a whole. The author has a keen sense of the perils of idolatry, and tries to guard against it by insisting upon the debt of gratitude which Israel owes to Jahve. He dwells on the sole Godhead of Jahve, His spirituality, His choice of Israel, His love and faithfulness, as

#109.

shown by the redemption from Egypt, His leading them through the desert, and by planting them in the promised land. As a result of all these benefits should come the realization of the duty of devotion to Jahve, of repudiation of false gods, of obedience, and of being generous to one's fellowmen.

The following is a tabulated form of the chief principles of Deuteronomy:

Jahve the Only God. 4:35, 39; 10:14, 17f; 7:10.

False Gods. Ch. 5, same as the 1st. Commandment, and chs. 5-11.

No Physical representation. 4:12, 15-24; 4:19; 29:25.

Choice of Israel. 4:37; 7:6; 10:15; 14:2; 26:18; 7:7; 9:4-6.

Love of Israel and Its Evidences. 7:8; 23:6 (on account of the promise to the forefathers) 1:8; 4:31, 37; 7:12; 8:18; 9:7-10:11.

Deliverance from Egypt. 4:32-38; 6:21-23; 7:18f; 8:2ff; 11:2-6, etc.

Through the wilderness. 1:19; 2:7; 8:15.

Giving the Land. 6:10f; 8:7-10, 12f, etc.

God is a Loving Father. 8:23, 16. Discipline, 8:5.

Duty to Fear Jahve. 4:10; 5:26; 6:2, 13, 24; 8:6; 10:12, 20; 13:5; 14:23; 17:19 (of a king); 26:8; 28:58; 31:12, 13; 10:17; 4:32-36; 10:21; 11:2-7.

Duty to Love Jahve. 6:5; 10:12; 11:1, 13, 32; 13:4; 19:9; 30:6, 16, 20; (to cleave to Him) 10:20; 11:22; 13:5; 30:20.

Repudiation of false gods. 6:14-15; 7:4; 8:19-20; 11:16-17, 28; 30:17-18; 29:24-27; 31:16f, 20f; 4:23f, 25-28; 13:2-12.

Penalty for Idolatry. 13:7-12; 13:6, 11; 17:5; 18:20; 13:13-19.

Treatment of Canaanites. extermination-7:2-4, 16; 2-:16-18; no truce or intermarriage-7:2f. destroy their temples, never to be

#110.

used again-7:5;12:2f;7:25f; never resuscitate nor adopt
their religion-12:29-31;16:21f;18:9-12.

Authorized Prophets.18:15-19.

Central Sanctuary.12:5,11,14,18,21,26,etc.

Penalty for Disobedience.6:10-15;8:11-20;11:16f;31:29.

Reward for Obedience.26:19;28:1;15:6b;28:12b,13; (observation of
Deuteronomy.)-4:40;5:26,30;6:2,3,18,24;10:13;11:9;30:16,
19f;32:47;7:12-16;11:13-15,20-25,27;26:18f;28:1-14;29:8;
30:6,as to particular commands-5:16;12:25,28;14:29b;15:10;
15:18;16:20;17:20;19:13;22:7;23:21;24:19;25:15. (Compare
Amos 5:14;Is.;:19f;3:10f;58:6-11,etc.)

Disobedience and obedience are also treated in Ch.28,
which compare with 11:26-28;30:15-20.

But also the domestic life is included, that is, the duties
to one's neighbors,as well as to jahve.

extermination of Evil.13:6;17:7,13;19:19;21:21;22:21,22,24;

24:7. All Israel shall hear.13:12;17:13;19:20;22:21.

Judges.16:18-20;1:16f;27:19,25,25. Fathers cannot suffer for
sin of children or vice versa,24:16. Just weights,25:13-16.
Malicious testimony,19:16-21;murder and unchastity,19:11-13;
21:18-21;22:20f,22;24:7.

Humanity.As to a loan-15:7-11;23:20f; manumission of slaves-15:

13-15;neighbor-23:1-4;pledge of the poor man-24:6,12f;

fugitive slave- 24:7;hired servant-24:14f;triennial tithe-

14:28f;the Levite-13:12,18f;14:27,29;16:11,14;26:11,12f;

the stranger, fatherless, and widow-14:29;16:11,14;24:17,19,20,21;

#111.

26:12f;27:19; care of the stranger, especially at the time of the three pilgrimages to Jerusalem-12:13,18;14:27;16:11, 14;26:11.

Gratitude and Recollection as Mōtives. 10:19;23:8;15:15;16:12;24:18,22.

Forbearance, Equity, Regard for Others. 5:14b;20:5-9;24:5;20:10f,19f; 21:10-14;21:15-17;22:8;23:25f;24:19-22;25:3;22:6b;25:4.

The fundamental ideas of Deuteronomy are then(cf. also Duhm, Theologie der Propheten,1875, p.197 ff.):

1. Jahve is the only God; He is spiritual, loves Israel and should be loved in return; false gods and physical representations of Jahve must be discarded, as a corollary to this doctrine.

2. Israel is a holy nation; the servants of a holy and loving God; and love should be their attitude to God and man.

3. Central Sanctuary; local shrines abolished.

4. The Levites are confirmed as priests; they are to minister to the one sanctuary alone.

"Deuteronomy thus combines the spirit of the prophet and the spirit of the legislator; it is a prophetic law-book, a law-book in which the civil and ceremonial statutes became the expression of a great spiritual and moral ideal, which is designed to comprehend and govern the entire life of the community".

Relation to the prophets. Deuteronomy comes from the 7th Century,

Manasseh or Josiah. It is built upon the prophets*. Isaiah
*Cf. 2 Sam.12:1-6;1 Kings 21:17ff; Am.4:1-3;5:12ff; Hos.4:1-4; Is.1:16f; Mic.3:1-4.

has given birth to the concept of a holy nation; Hosea had shown

#112.

that the moral and material deterioration of the Northern Kingdom was because of the abandonment of Jahve. These principles were absorbed and embodied into Deuteronomy.

The author of Deuteronomy is especially the spiritual heir of Hosea, with his repudiation of nature-worship, and his belief in Jahve as the true Giver of all good*. The emotional side of religion is prominent in both. "This truth is equally set forth in Deuteronomy, and in the Deuteronomist's great predecessor, Hosea. The primal love of Jehovah to Israel fills the foreground of each writer's discourse, and all human relationships within the Israelitish community are rooted in this". See Hos.3:1; 9:15; 14:5; 4:1; 6:4,6; 13:7.

Monotheism of Deuteronomy. 4:35,39; 6:4; 7:9; 10:17; also note 4:19; 32:39.

Central Sanctuary may seem inconsistent with the lofty concept of the nature of the Divine(10:140, but partly it was the result of national feeling(which the prophets also felt,Is.3:2-4; 35:6; Jer.3:17; Is.56:7; 66:20,23)and partly it arose from the conditions of the time, when the "single sanctuary was a corollary of the monotheistic idea". It finally defeated its own object, as Israel came to regard it as a palladium,irrespective of morality.

The ethical qualities of Jahve are emphasized. He is a righteous God and yet merciful. Even to the heathens He keeps His word,2:5.

The author has more sympathy with the priests than have most prophets.18:1-8; 24:8; 17:10-13; 13:18,19; 14:27,39,etc.He has

#113.

no desire to abolish any ceremonies. External forms help, although real religion can only be through a "right heart", cf. 14:23; 6:8; 11:18; 14:1-21; 22:5, 13; 23:15. He emphasizes that offerings of gratitude should be made to God as the Giver of all good- 14:23-27; 15:19-23; 16:10, 15, 17; 26:10. Pilgrimages to Jerusalem- 13:7, 12, 18; 14:26b; 16:11, 14; 26:11.

Particularism toward other nations. This seems to differ from the views of the prophets, that Jahve cares for other nations. The reason seems to be that Deuteronomy is a law-book and had to discourage friendly attitude toward heathens. Religious motives are the basis for the animosity to the Canaanites, 7:3f; 20:18; the reason for hatred of Ammon and Moab is only antiquarian, 23:4-7, and of Amalek, 25:17-19. Relations with Edom and Egypt are more friendly, 23:8f. The most pressing danger of the age of Deuteronomy was heathenism and the author strives to resist it by these laws. Heathenism is subversive of holiness, 12:31. As a matter of fact these laws were only ideal; the time when they might be enforced was long past.

Retribution is frequently emphasized. "The doctrine that righteousness exalteth a nation, while wickedness is the sure prelude to national disaster, has been said truly to form the essence of his "philosophy of history", as it is also one of the motives to obedience on which he most frequently insists: that thou mayest live, etc." There is the same conviction in the promise that Israel would be set high above nations if obedient to the commands of Jahve, cf. 26:19; 28:1; 15:6b; 28:12b, 13. Also

#114.

from the other side, that destruction will come, 4:26; 30:17f; 6:14f; 8:16f; 11:16f, 28; 28:15ff; 29:17ff; 31:29.

W.R. Smith-p. 258-puts Deuteronomy in the time of Josiah, and says that the latter probably had Dt. 4:44-26:19, and perhaps also 27:9, 10 and Ch. 28. To show that the book referred to in 2 Kings is Deuteronomy he gives the following comparisons:

Compare 2 kings 23:3-6				with	Dt. 12:2.
"	"	"	23:7	"	" 23:17, 18.
"	"	"	23:8, 9	"	" 18:6-8.
"	"	"	23:10	"	" 18:10.
"	"	"	23:11	"	" 17:3.
"	"	"	23:14	"	" 16:21-22.
"	"	"	23:21	"	" 16:5.
"	"	"	23:24	"	" 18:11.

See Procksch, pp. 59-70, for comparisons of Deuteronomy with the prophets.

It is interesting to note that the only quotation from the Torah in the historical books is from Dt. Cf. 2 Kings 14:6 and Dt. 24:16.

#115.

APPENDIX II.

The Relation of the Book of Samuel to Judges and Kings.

We have mentioned in the introduction that one of the important questions that should be discussed in connection with our problem is as to whether the books of Samuel can be considered to be by the same school of compilers as are the books of Judges and Kings. This is a question which involves many difficulties. First of all, it is evident that there are many fewer formulae in Samuel than in Judges or Kings. It is usually claimed that this is because the books of Samuel cover a period the history of which is treated more intensively and which concerns only a few characters, whose careers are intertwined not separate and successive as in Judges or Kings. Whether, however, this is the cause of the infrequency of the formulae, or whether it may not be due to the fact that these books have been worked over by a school the method of which differed in this respect from that of the compilers of Judges and Kings, is a question to be determined by examination of the views expressed in the various books. Another difficulty that arises in this connection is the following. The books of Samuel are to be divided into two main sources, one of which has Saul as the central character, and which has much more the same tenor as the old J and E stories, seems to be closer to the events, and to look upon them from a more naive and natural viewpoint. The other revolves around Samuel, and is theocratic in character, opposed to the kingdom, and makes the

#116.

stories more miraculous. The second of these seems to be neuteronomic in character, and has many of the earmarks of Deuteronomic authorship. However, the question is whether we are to identify this latter source with the Deuteronomic sections in Judges and Kings, or whether we are to look upon it as an earlier source upon which the compilers drew, and then added a few sections, which will be noted later. Budde-p.ix-thinks that Samuel is a continuation of Judges, and cites the fact that the Philistine oppression ~~is~~ related in Jud.13-16 and also in Samuel. He also says that, since we have concluded that Judges and Kings are compiled by authors of the Deuteronomic school, by analogy we may assume that the books of Samuel were also. The infrequency of the formulae is to be explained by the more determined progress of the narrative, and the smaller number of its sections. He cites these three parts as evidently Deuteronomic in character: 1 Sam.7:13-17; 14:47-51; and 2 Sam.8, also 1 Sam.4:18b (to which compare Jud. 16:31b; 15:20; 12:6a). Budde also adds that 2 Sam.9-24 and 1 Kings 1; 2:1-9, 13ff are pre-Deuteronomic and were excluded by the Deuteronomic compilers because they put David in a bad light. The compilers worked over parts that interested them especially, as, e.g. 1 Sam.2:27-38; 7; 8; 10:17ff; 12; 2 Sam.5:1-3, 4f; 7. H.P. Smith too thinks that Samuel is connected with the other two books, more closely with Kings than^x with Judges. Moore thinks that Samuel and Judges are not by the same author. "The character of the two works shows conclusively that Judges was not composed by the author of Samuel; the peculiar religious interpretation of

#117.

the history which is impressed so strongly on Judges is almost entirely lacking in Samuel" -p.xiii. wellhausen-p.6-discovers the same viewpoint in all three works in regard to the heresy of the kingdom. He discovers, however, four different pictures of Samuel, in the books: 1st, 9:1-10:10, Samuel as a simple seer, patriotic, stimulating Saul, in the same relation to him as is Deborah to Barak, Achijah to Jeroboam, Elisha to Jehu; 2nd, Samuel is a prophet like Elijah or Elisha, ^{superior} to the Anointed King, Chs. 15, and 28; 3rd, Samuel anoints David in place of Saul-16:1ff, he has a magical power over men-19:18ff; 4th, Samuel opposes the kingdom, here it is a theocracy with Samuel at the head.

The question is one that we shall not attempt to solve here. We wish merely to present a few of the arguments advanced on both sides. For our treatise, wherever occasion arose, we have assumed that the compilation was done by the same school. However, this makes no very essential contribution to our work, for at best the books of Samuel exhibit less of the Deuteronomic characteristics than either of the others. With this very cursory treatment we leave the subject.

#118.

APPENDIX III.

The Use of Formulae in Judges, Samuel, and Kings.

In general we may say that the most infallible sign of the compilers in the books under consideration is the presence of formulae. In the books of kings* there are very few exceptions
*Cf. Kittel, vi-vii.
and these can all be explained. All the formulae are in accordance with the Deuteronomic viewpoint, especially as regards the attitude to high-places and as to the manners of speech. The very least we learn of a king is his attitude on the Bamoth, which is usually told in the formula. The formula usually goes as follows: "In the year _____ of King _____ of Judah(Israel)_____ became king over Israel(judah)and reigned _____ years. What is still to be said of _____ is, etc.....And he laid himself to his fathers, and his son _____ became king in his stead". The formula is naturally omitted in the cases of Hosea-2 Kings 17:6-, Jehoahaz-2 Kings 23:24, Jehoiachin-2 Kings 24:15, and Zedekiah-2 Kings 25:6. It has fallen out with Jehoram and Ahazya. The introductory formula is lacking in the case of Jehu, as it has simply fallen out, and also Jeroboam II.* as formulae in
*Where it is omitted because of 1 Kings 13:1-20.
the books of Samuel Wellhausen-p.247-cites 1 Sam.13:1; 4:18f; 7:2-4; 2 Sam.3:8-13.

We append a list of the formulae in the books.

Jud.3:12-15; 3:7-11; 4:1-3; 13:1; 6:1-6, 7-10; 10:6-16; 8:28; 3:30.

Books of Kings.

Introductory Formulae. 1 Kings. 3:2-3; 14:9a(a thoughtless application);

#119.

14:21-24; 15:1-6, 9-15, 25-26, 33-34; 16:8, 15-16a, 23-26, 29-30; 22:41-45,
52-54; 2 Kings 3:1-3(out of place); 8:16-19, 25-27; 10:28-31; 12:1-4;
13:1-2, 10-11; 14:1-4, 23-24; 15:1-4, 8-9, 13, 17-18, 23-24, 27-28, 32-35;
16:1-4; 17:1-2; 18:1-8; 21:1-16, 19-22; 22:1-2; 23:31-32, 36-37;
24:8-9, 18-20a.

Closing Formulae. 1 Kings. 2:10-12; 11:41-43; 14:29-31; 15:7-8, 23-24,
31-32; 16:5-6, 14, 20, 27-28; 22:39-40, 46-51; 2 Kings 1:17b-18; 8:23-24;
10:34-36; 12:20-22; 13:8-9, 12-13(out of place); 14:15-22, 28-29;
15:6-7, 10-12, 14-16, 21-22, 25-26, 30-31, 36-38; 16:19-20; 20:20-21;
21:17-18, 23-26; 23:28-30; 24:5-6.