

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

until he is no longer recognisable ; Luke is far from thoroughly trustworthy ; and hence, I suppose, Dr. Moffatt fails to find any individuality or personality in Peter, who to us old-fashioned people is such a vivid, powerful, real and human figure. One who set any store by the testimony of Luke in the Acts and in the Gospel could never find Peter or John so faint and unsatisfying. But it is quite natural that Dr. Moffatt should emerge from his study of Ephesians, the Pastorals, the Catholic Epistles of James, Peter and John, the Revelation, and the Fourth Gospel, "with a sense of baffled curiosity, which almost deepens into despair at some points." He has smashed up to his own complete and undoubting satisfaction the greatest epoch of literature, and he finds that there remains in it only the lay figure of a man of the province Asia named John, "whose breathing he cannot hear and whose motion he cannot see."

But those men of the later second century ! they are Dr. Moffatt's heroes. He knows them : he feels really interested in them : he finds none of the difficulties which we find in comprehending them. Take one example of the way that he handles the evidence about them.

W. M. RAMSAY.

(To be continued.)

THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.

THE day of atonement was celebrated on the 10th of Tishri and was one of the most impressive feasts of the Israelitic calendar, by reason of the severe earnest of its rites and the deep humiliation of Israelitic believers before their Creator. It is the only day on which fasting is obligatory during all the twenty-four hours of the day. On other fast days it was forbidden to eat or drink from sunrise until sunset, but on this day it was not allowed to eat or drink from sunset until sunset.

The regulations of the Law are found in Leviticus xvi. This chapter is generally assigned by critical scholars to the post-exilic period and is supposed to belong to the so-called Priestly Code. In other parts of the Pentateuch, that are not assigned to this Code, the day of atonement is not mentioned. Therefore it is supposed that this day does not belong to the old pre-exilic feasts, but is a later invention of the priests, in order to quicken the people's sense of sin. It is the keystone of the whole system, the last consequence of the principle, "Ye shall be [ceremonially] holy, for I am holy" (*Enc. Bibl.* i. 385).

According to the school of Wellhausen the exilic and post-exilic priests described sin chiefly as an offence against the ceremonial regulations of the Law. These regulations being very complicated it was necessary to open various ways for atoning for sins. Therefore, the sin offerings were classed with the offerings and sacrifices of the pre-exilic Law. Everybody, who was aware of his shortcomings, might atone for himself by a sacrifice. "The sin-offerings throughout the year, however, left many unknown or 'secret' sins. This was the reason for the institution of the Day of Atonement—that the Israelites might annually make a complete atonement for all sin, and that the sanctuary might be cleansed" (*ibid.*). This theory regards the Day of Atonement as the result of a development of religious thought, and therefore agrees with the evolutionistic tendencies of present historical research. But we cannot study the religious ideas connected with this day without discovering many facts, which show that this theory meets great difficulties, and is not satisfactory at all. It was the fault of higher criticism that it did not pay sufficient attention to the archaeological side of the question.

The Hebrew word for Day of Atonement is *Yom hakippurim*. This term not only means "day of atonement,"

but also "day of atonement-offerings." This name does not only refer to the sacrifices of the high-priest in the temple as mentioned in Leviticus xvi., but also to the many private sacrifices the Jews used to kill on this day. The Old Testament does not mention these private sacrifices, but the Rabbinical literature informs us about the custom of "beating Kapporeth," that is, of sacrificing a white cock. They used to swing it thrice round the head, proclaiming it to be an offering for atonement. Then they laid their right hand on the cock's head and killed it. Before sacrificing the cock a confession of sins was recited. For the religious life of the Jews these offerings were even more important than those that were sacrificed in the temple of Jerusalem, as only a very few of all the Jews in various lands could incidentally attend the service in the temple. If they could do so, it was perhaps only once in their lifetime, but the 10th of Tishri was to be observed every year, and the sins had to be atoned for.

According to the common belief, the 10th of Tishri is the last day of the "period of decision." The Hebrew New Year's Day is celebrated on the 1st of the seventh month Tishri. On this day God begins to consider the destiny of mankind in the coming year. The final decision is taken on the 10th of Tishri. Therefore, this day is of the utmost importance for the Israelite. If no atonement is made for his sins he can only expect to be struck by the wrath of the Lord in the year to come. The Jews used to make many vows. In all kind of circumstances a vow was supposed to be helpful. But not always the vows were fulfilled. Therefore they revoked on the eve of the Day of atonement all vows they might have made during the past year, without fulfilling them, in order not to begin the New Year burdened by the sin of unfulfilled vows. Until the present day the name of this eve is "Kol Nidre," that is "[the revoking of] all vows."

From this custom it is obvious that we cannot separate the day of atonement from the New Year's Day, both days being the beginning and the end of a holy period. On the 1st of Tishri "the books were opened." The Lord of Lords was surrounded by the holy angels, and decided about life and death of men. According to the Talmud (Rosh hashshena 16 a. b.) there were three books. In the first book the names were written of all righteous men. In the second volume the names of the wicked men were written, who were all to die in the coming year. In the third volume the names were found of all those who were neither perfectly righteous nor perfectly bad. They had a chance until the 10th of Tishri. So it is easily understood that the period from 1st until 10th Tishri was devoted to fasting and self-humiliation, and that the last day of this period was the greatest fast-day of the whole year.

It is generally assumed that these ideas are of Babylonian origin, and it is supposed that they were borrowed by the exiles from the Babylonian religion. It is quite certain that the Babylonians too believed that the god Marduk held the tables of destiny and that the destiny of mankind was decided upon in the holy council that was held in the great temple of Babylon from 8th until 11th Nisan, the first month of the year. The various gods left their own shrines and went, in holy procession, to the council that was held in the chamber of destiny. But it is also certain that not only the Babylonians believed in the importance of the first days of the year for the destiny of mankind. Moreover, we find in the Israelitic literature of the pre-exilic period the same conception of the government of God as is supposed by the customs practised on the day of atonement.

In 1 Kings xxii. 19 we are told that the prophet Micah saw the Lord sitting on His throne and all the host of heaven standing by Him on His right hand and on His left. He sent

out various spirits as his messengers and obviously is like a king, surrounded by his servants. The same conception we find in Isaiah vi. So there can be no doubt about the fact that the conception of God as found in the rabbinical literature is by no means post-exilic.

Furthermore, it is stated in Exodus xxxii. 32 (assigned by the school of Wellhausen to E) that the Lord writes down in a book the names of men. Moses says, "If thou wilt, forgive their sins; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written. And the Lord said unto Moses, Whosoever has sinned against me, him I will blot out of my book." Another pre-exilic text, mentioning this book in Isaiah iv. 3: "Every one that remains in Jerusalem shall be called holy, every one who is written down for life in Jerusalem." The same conception of the government of God we find in 1 Samuel xxv. 29, "The soul of my lord shall be bound in the bundle of life with the Lord thy God"; and in Jeremiah xxii. 30, "Thus saith the Lord, Write ye this man childless, as man that shall not prosper in his days." From these texts it is obvious that Jahve is supposed to rule Israel by means of registers and books. In Ezekiel xiii. 9 the Lord says that "the false prophets shall not be written in the register of the house of Israel." So there is no reason for assuming that the reference to the Book of Life in Psalm lxix. 29, cxxxix. 16, is to be assigned to Babylonian influence.

The date of the day of atonement is the 10th of the seventh month (Tishri). This cannot be explained by the theory that the day of atonement originated in the theological system of the post-exilic priests. In the post-exilic period the year commenced in the spring, Nisan being the first month. We expect, therefore, that the date of the sacred days invented by the priests of this period will correspond to the post-exilic calendar, but instead of this we find the astonishing fact that New Year's Day and the day of atone-

ment are celebrated in the middle of the year. We can only understand this if we admit that the Israelitic New Year's Day was an old and popular feast, that could not be removed to Nisan, as this month became the first month of the year.

We do not know when the custom arose to begin the year at the equinox of the spring instead of at the equinox in the autumn. It is generally accepted that the change of the calendar dates from the Babylonian captivity. But it is highly probable that the Israelitic year began in the spring at least a century before the exile. In the book of Jeremiah all dates refer to a year beginning in the spring. In the Hebrew text of Jeremiah xxxvi. 22 the ninth month is a winter month, the king sitting then in the winter-house, a brasier burning before him. In the time of Zechariah Israelitic tradition knew that the temple at Jerusalem was destroyed in the fifth month. In old times the various months had special names. In the Book of Kings and Jeremiah and in the later calendar, however, the months are indicated by the ordinal numerals. The reference to the fifth month therefore implies that the year began in the spring. The only instances of old names of months are found in the narrative of the building of Solomon's temple and in some old laws (1 Kings vi. 1, 37, 38; viii. 2; Exod. xiii. 4; xxiii. 15; xxxiv. 18). They obviously belong to a remote period. It is easily understood that Deuteronomy used the old term "month Abib" in Deuteronomy xvi. as it pretended to date from the times of Moses. We have no certainty at all that the dates in the books of Kings and Jeremiah are post-exilic substitutes for other pre-exilic terms. It seems far more probable that the year commenced in the spring at the time of Jeremiah. The influence of Assyria was predominating over Western Asia since the ninth century B.C. The cult of the *seba hašsamaim*

proves that Israel has felt this influence. Therefore it is quite possible that the beginning of the year was shifted to the spring season a long time before the exile. In any case there can be no doubt about the celebration of the New Year's Day in the pre-exilic period.

Obviously the way in which it is celebrated is a very old one. All over the world we find the custom of making noise on this day by yelling, ringing bells, etc. It is generally believed that the evil spirits are dangerous on this day. The gods are gathered in holy council for discussing the event of the coming year. Consequently there is a lack of control on this day and the evil spirits are ready to make use of this great opportunity. It is a common view that evil spirits may be frightened by noise of bells or other musical instruments and so we understand the Israelitic custom of blowing trumpets on the 1st of the seventh month. In Leviticus xxiii. 23 and Numbers xxix. 1 the day is said to be "a day of blowing of trumpets unto you," and we know from the rabbinical literature that every one used to blow trumpets on this day.

So the customs practised on this day show that New Year may be an old Israelitic feast. Notwithstanding this we do not find this day mentioned in the lists of feasts assigned by the Wellhausen school of critics to the pre-exilic period. Neither in Exodus xxiii. nor in Exodus xxxiv. nor in Deuteronomy is it mentioned.

This fact can be easily accounted for as Exodus xxxiii. and Deuteronomy xvi. enumerate the pilgrimage-festivals only, without mentioning other holy days, on which it was not obligatory "to appear before the Lord," as on Mazzoth, Pentecost and the feast of tabernacles. So, for instance, the new moon is not mentioned in Exodus xxiii. and Deuteronomy xvi. Nevertheless, it was a holy day according to numerous texts belonging to the pre-exilic literature (1 Sam. xx. 4 ;

2 Kings iv. 23 ; Amos viii. 5 ; Hos. ii. 13 ; Isaiah i. 13). This shows that we must be careful in reasoning from these lists to the post-exilic origin of those feasts that are not mentioned in them.

The name "New Year's Day" does not occur in the Pentateuch. In Leviticus xxiii. 23 and Numbers xxix. 1 the day is simply called "the 1st day of the seventh month." Nevertheless it must have been known as Rosh haššana (New Year) in the pre-exilic period, as Ezekiel xl. 1 uses this term. In this chapter the name of the first ten days appears to be "New Year," the hand of the Lord being upon Ezekiel in the Rosh haššana, on the tenth day of the month. The tenth day here is supposed to be included in the term Rosh haššana. In the Rabbinical literature the term Rosh haššana is also applied to the 1st day of the seventh month. It is to be noted that Ezekiel assumes that Rosh haššana has nothing to do with the beginning of the calendar-year, for the 1st day of the first month occurs Ezekiel xxix. 17 without any allusion to New Year.

From Ezekiel xl. 1 we understand that the day of atonement is mentioned in Leviticus xxiii. 26 ff. and Numbers xxix. 7 ff. directly after New Year's Day, these days being closely connected to one another. Until the present time there is great resemblance between the celebration of the two days in the Synagogue. On both days a trumpet is blown by an official, who is dressed in mourning dress, and no Hallel is to be sung, the Lord being supposed too busy with the books, and therefore not to be disturbed.

The ritual of the day of atonement, as found in Leviticus xvi., describes the day as a day of hallowing of the priests, the temple and the people. This is generally supposed to be the result of the theological opinions of the post-exilic priests, but as a matter of fact we find that in various religions the temples were hallowed once a year. Ezekiel made an

attempt to have the temple hallowed twice a year, on the 1st of the first month and on the 1st of the seventh month (Ezek. xlv. 18, 19, LXX). He would not have tried to introduce this novelty if no yearly hallowing of the temple was known. We understand his attempt if we assume that he wanted to apply the ceremonies of the old New Year also to the real beginning of the calendar-year in the spring-season. Therefore no serious objection can be made against the pre-exilic date of Leviticus xvi. 32-34, saying that the high priest shall make atonement once in the year for the temple and for the people.

It is also difficult to assume that the other parts of the ritual are post-exilic innovations. Leviticus xvi. 7 prescribes that Aaron shall take two goats and cast lots, one lot for the Lord and the other lot for Israel. The latter goat is burdened with the sins of the people and is supposed to carry them away into the desert in the same way as the bird in Leviticus xiv. 4 carried away the leprosy into the open field. This way of removing evil influences by no means agrees with the religious ideas of the post-exilic priests, these being monotheists in the strict sense of the word. Ceremonies like those, however, are very common in primitive religion and are to be classed with the various magical practices by which illness and evil were expelled by the old Semitic priests. These practices, however, were regarded by the post-exilic priests to be inconsistent with pure religion. Therefore we are compelled to assume that the sending away of the he-goat was a very old custom, that could not be done away with by the priests of Jahve. Azazel in any case is a demon of the desert, who has nothing to do with the pure cult of Jahve as is supposed to have been introduced by P.

Leviticus xvi. 12, 13 contain another instance of primitive religious thought. Aaron shall not enter into the holy place

before the ark without making a cloud of incense that covers the ark. "He shall take a censer full of coals of fire from the altar before the Lord . . . and he shall put the incense upon the fire, that the cloud of incense may cover the ark, that he die not." These last words "that he die not" explains why the cloud of incense must cover the ark. According to the old belief one cannot see God without dying (Judges vi. 23, xiii. 22; Gen. xxxii. 30; Exod. xxxiii. 20). The cloud is to protect Aaron and to prevent him from seeing God. This implies the personal presence of God in the holy place and is, therefore, inconsistent with the supposed transcendental conception of God, ascribed by the critics to P.

Furthermore, it is highly improbable that Leviticus xvi. 12, 13 should have been written in the post-exilic period. In these verses reference is made to the ark. The Kapporeth, mentioned in verses 2, 13, 14, 15, is, according to Exodus xxv. 17 ff., a golden plate covering the ark. Now scholars concur in assuming that the second temple of Zerubbabel did not contain the ark. The holy place then was empty. We fail to understand how the priests of the temple of Jahve could make and promulgate a law in which the temple was said to contain the ark of which everybody knew that it did not even exist.

An objection of the school of Wellhausen against the pre-exilic date of Leviticus xvi. is the theory that no sin and guilt-offerings existed in the pre-exilic period. The sacrifices of Leviticus xvi. are sin-offerings and are consequently assigned to the fifth or fourth century B.C. As I tried to show in the EXPOSITOR of October, 1910, p. 323, we learn from 2 Kings xii. 7 that they are by no means an invention of the post-exilic priests. In the same article I argued that Leviticus i. 5, where also is dealt with the sin- and guilt-offerings, must be assigned to the pre-exilic period. I refer

to this article for the arguments supporting the thesis that the fundamental idea of atoning for sins by offerings was by no means unknown in the pre-exilic Jahvistic religion.

A more serious objection against a pre-exilic day of atonement may be derived from Ezekiel and Nehemiah viii.

How is it that Ezekiel does not mention this day if it existed already before the exile? The answer to this question is that the list of feasts in Ezekiel xlv. 9-25 does not prove anything for the date of the feasts not mentioned in it. For some reason unknown to us Ezekiel omitted in this chapter Pentecost. He deals with the duty of the prince in the various feasts, and mentions sabbaths, new moons, the first day of the first and of the seventh month, passover and the feast of tabernacles. Pentecost is not mentioned. Nevertheless it existed in the time before Ezekiel and was also celebrated after the Babylonian captivity. The only possible reason for this omission is that Ezekiel wished to drop this feast, perhaps for some heathenish customs connected with it. In the same way and for the same reason he may have omitted the day of atonement.

In Nehemiah viii. we find mentioned a joyous celebration on the first day of the seventh month, and a celebration of the feast of tabernacles on the fifteenth of that month, without any allusion to a day of atonement on the tenth day. But on the twenty-fourth day a general fast with confession of sins was held. On this ground scholars assume that the day of atonement was not yet known. But this conclusion is not justified, as Nehemiah viii. does not narrate about ordinary but about extraordinary circumstances. The promulgation of the law by Ezra was a new departure. The people wept and mourned on the first day after listening to the contents of the law, and it took several days before the law was read. We easily understand that in those circumstances the annual day of fasting and mourning was

postponed until the 24th. It may be that Ezra's law-book also intended to drop the day of atonement, and therefore did not mention it. We are not able to decide whether the day was postponed or whether it was not mentioned at all in the law promulgated by Ezra, as we do not possess the law-book he read before the people (see EXPOSITOR for October 1910, pp. 307-316). The general fast and confession of sins on the 24th shows in any case that the customs of the day of atonement were not unfamiliar to the Jews of this period. So neither Ezekiel nor Nehemiah viii. prove that the day of atonement was an innovation of the fourth century B.C.

If we study Leviticus xvi. not only from a critical but also from an archaeological point of view we are compelled to assume that the day of atonement originated in the old Israelitic belief that the Lord rules mankind and that He destines the fate of men according to His severe righteousness.

B. D. EERDMANS.

DR. LEPSIUS ON THE SYMBOLIC LANGUAGE OF THE REVELATION.¹

A. INTRODUCTION (*concluded*).

In the second place, we must always keep in consideration the "astrological" views of the ancients. The heavens, as I have tried to show, following and simplifying Dr. Lepsius, were a book of Divine truth always open before them, and a guide and clock and calendar given by God to show them what was useful for them. This book and this calendar they had to learn by study to understand. The information was there; but teaching was needed before one could read what was written in the sky. Some familiarity with astronomical facts was far more necessary and far more

¹ On p. 466, l. 3 from bottom of text: for "December" read "October."