



The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL, 1918

THE TERMINOLOGY OF LOVE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

II*

The story of the Septuagint usage of the terms for love is almost told by the simple statistics. The verb *ἀγαπᾶν* occurs in the Septuagint about two hundred and sixty-six times, *φιλεῖν* about thirty-six times, *ἐρᾶσθαι* only three times, and *στέργειν* just once. Even this does not give the whole state of the case, for in the majority of its occurrences *φιλεῖν* is used in the sense of "to kiss." It occurs only sixteen or seventeen times with the meaning of "love." That is to say, this word, the common word for love in the classics, is used in the Septuagint in only a little more than five per cent of the instances where love falls to be mentioned: in nearly ninety-five per cent *ἀγαπᾶν* is used. Here is a complete reversal of the relative positions of the two words.

In more than a third of the instances in which *φιλεῖν* is used of loving, moreover, it is used of things—food or drink, or the like (Gen. xxvii. 4, 9, 14, Prov. xxi. 17, Hos. iii. 1, Is. lvi. 10), leaving only a half a score of instances in which it is employed of love of persons. In all these instances (except Tob. vi. 14, where it is a demon that is in question) it is a human being to whom the loving is ascribed. The love ascribed to him ranges from mere carnal love (Jer. xxii. 22 [paralleled with *ἐρασταί*], Lam. i. 2, Tob. vi. 14, *cf.* Tob. vi. 17), through the love of a father for his son (Gen. xxxvii. 4), to love for Wisdom (Prov. viii. 17, xxix. 3, Wisd. viii. 2). Cremer drops the remark: "In two passages only does *φιλεῖν* stand as perfectly synonymous with *ἀγαπάω*,

* The first portion of this article was published in the number of this REVIEW for January 1918: pp. 1-45.

THE SANCTUARY OF ISRAEL AT SHILOH

The sanctuary of Jehovah which stood in the town of Shiloh in the days of Eli and Samuel owed its origin to Moses. Upon this fact the three co-existing schools of biblical criticism are agreed, that of Wellhausen, that of Ewald, and that school which regards the biblical account of the rise of Israel's institutions as trustworthy. And upon many of the circumstances that attended the founding and later travels of the sanctuary there is agreement. The critical schools acknowledge and accept as historical among other events the bondage in Egypt of "that section of the Hebrew group which afterwards developed into Israel,"¹ consisting of "a number of kindred clans,"² their exodus under the leadership of Moses at a time when Egypt was scourged by a grievous plague, their deliverance through a marvellous occurrence at the Red Sea, their visit to Sinai, their settlement at Kadesh, and their residence of many years in the wild pasture lands that lie round about Kadesh and stretch for miles in every direction.³ Moses was the supreme judge, "the great national 'Kadhi' in the wilderness"; and he was also the founder of the sanctuary which "was with the so-called ark of the covenant," the latter object being a "symbol of Jehovah's presence." This sanctuary of the ark was taken by the people with them into Canaan, and after a time was established at Shiloh; the ark was there, and priests of the same line that had ministered at the sanctuary in the wilderness continued in charge.⁴

¹ This quotation and the statements that follow in the paragraph are taken from Wellhausen, *History of Israel*, pp. 430-435, 441, and 142.

² Wellhausen limits the number to seven. "Israel at first consisted of seven tribes," not including as yet Dan and Naphtali, Gad and Asher, and Benjamin (p. 432).

³ According to Wellhausen, at Kadesh "they remained for many years, having at the well of Kadesh their sanctuary and judgment-seat only, while with their flocks they ranged over an extensive tract" (p. 430). Moses exercised "his judicial functions . . . in the name of Jehovah. By connecting them with the sanctuary . . . he made these functions independent of his person" (p. 434).

⁴ See *infra*, footnote 32.

It was no novelty in the time of Moses for a traveling host to use a portable sanctuary. While the children of Israel were still in Egypt Ramses II carried religious emblems with him on his campaign against the Cheta; and at the headquarters of the camp, within the royal enclosure, in a pavilion of some sort, men offered adoration and supplication before a symbol of divine royalty.⁵ At a later period the Assyrian kings had with them on their military expeditions emblems of deity and furniture wherewith they were able to improvise formal ritual service under the open sky with priest and altar and incense and image.⁶ In a camp of the

⁵ In the camp of Ramses II at Kadesh on the Orontes the royal quarters occupied a rectangular enclosure near the center. In the scene as carved on the pylon at Luxor a pavilion is pictured within the enclosure which is thought to be the royal tent (Breasted, *The Battle of Kadesh* p. 42; comp. his *Ancient Records*, iii. 148 f; on the contrary, see Murray's *Handbook for Egypt*,¹⁰ p. 389), while in the carving on the walls of the temple at Abu Simbel an act of worship is delineated within the enclosure, and probably in a chamber of the pavilion. Five men kneel before a canopy with their arms outstretched toward a symbol of royal presence divine, guarded by the hawk figures (see Champollion, *Monuments de l'Égypte et de la Nubie*, tome I. pl. xxx; smaller reproductions are conveniently accessible in Rawlinson, *History of Ancient Egypt*, chap. xi. p. 476; Budge, *A History of Egypt*, v. 49, comp. ii. 18 f; Breasted, *The Battle of Kadesh*, pl. vi, facing p. 40).

⁶ In Assyria, just as the throne and other furnishings for the king were carried on military expeditions for use at official functions, so an equipment suitable for sacrificial worship was taken along on the campaign. An act of sacrificial worship is depicted with considerable completeness in a sculpture of Ashurnazirpal's, 884-858 B.C. (see sketch in Rawlinson, *The Seven Great Monarchies*, Vol. I. pl. cxliv; described in chap. viii. p. 363; reproduced by Jastrow, *Bildermappe zur Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens*, Abbildung 89; comp. 226; see also *British Museum: Guide to the Kouyunjik Gallery*, 1883, No. 62, p. 115). The king is offering sacrifice before a god seated within a temple. In front of the building are an altar, a tall, tapering fire-stand from the top of which out of a dish issue flames, and a large bowl on a low stool; then, facing these, the king in the act of pouring a libation, behind him an attendant with a cup, and lastly men bringing forward an ox for sacrifice. Certain of these objects, and in the same sequence, appear in the Assyrian camp and elsewhere during military expeditions. Standards, which contained symbols of gods, were set up on the ground (Botta, *Monument de Ninive*, tome II. pl. 146, described tome V. 163; *Bronze Reliefs from the Gates of Salmeser*, edited by L. W. King, plates I

Carthaginians, centuries indeed after the time of Moses, was a sacred tent with an altar hard by.⁷ Likewise the sanctuary established by Moses in the wilderness was portable, being a tent as is attested by the earliest historical records of the Israelites (Ex. xxxiii. 7, E, the provisional tent of meeting: Num. xi. 16, 24, later E; Deut. xxxi. 14, 15 E).⁸

There was more to the tent than mere curtains stretched to form a roof and afford shelter from sun and rain. According to the description of the tabernacle given in the book of Exodus at least, beneath the great awning erected by Moses was a room, forty-five feet long and fifteen feet wide. Three sides of this apartment were formed of boards set upright on end. The fourth side, which was the eastern end and front of the tabernacle and its entrance, consisted of a row of five pillars, standing about two feet and a half apart and supporting curtains. The room itself, thus enclosed, was divided into two chambers, separated from each other by a curtain, the inner of the two being the smaller, only one-half the size of the outer. In these main features the description of the tabernacle erected by Moses in the wilderness is corroborated by three facts:

and II), or else a chariot to which they were attached was drawn up (Layard, *Monuments of Nineveh*, second series, pls. 24 and 50, comp. 36; Jastrow, *Bildermappe zur Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens*, Abbild. 99). Before them was placed the portable altar and the tall fire-stand, and last of all, facing the sacred objects, the officiating priests or the offerer himself. Thus, as depicted in the bronze relief on the gates of Shalmaneser, at the dedication of his image which was carved in the face of the rock near lake Van, in the open field before the image and its encircling divine symbols have been placed two standards, an altar for offerings, a tall fire-stand, and a bowl. The king is pouring out a libation. He is accompanied by two priests bearing offerings of wine, and by three musicians, followed by soldiers driving up oxen and rams for sacrifice. The elucidating inscription states: "I set up an image [of my person, and inscribed on it the glory of Ashur and my exploits (cp. Monolith col. I. 26 f., II. 59 f.)] on the shore of the sea of Nairi; I made offerings to my gods."

⁷ Diodorus Siculus, 20:65.

⁸ "Some kind of a tent for the ark there may well have been" (Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*,³ S. 40, English p. 39). "The institution of the ark as well as the erection of the tent must have been narrated between [Ex.] xxxiii. 6 and 7" (*ibid.*, S. 387, p. 370).

1. The correspondence of the structure of this sanctuary with the possibilities of the desert; for the materials required for a simple tent of this sort were obtainable in the wilderness where the Israelites were encamped. From their flocks could be gotten the goats' hair for the women to weave into the cloth which was needed for making the roof; from the flocks too could be gotten the skins of rams, and at the seashore the skins of porpoise, to be thrown over the tent as an outer covering, the better to protect the cloth-roofing from the severity of the weather;⁹ and boards and posts could be had for the mere labor of swinging the ax and hewing a few acacia trees in that unowned region. It is of the sanctuary as a tent that we are now speaking, not of its embellishment. But it is worth noting that the passages which expressly or in current critical theory¹⁰ describe the construction of the ark and the tabernacle agree in telling how the people gave their personal ornaments, in particular their brooches, their ear-rings, finger-rings and armlets of gold, together with silver and brass and precious stones, for use in worthily furnishing Jehovah's abode.

2. Not only were the materials for the tent readily obtainable by the Israelites while sojourning in the wilderness, but in the second place confirmation is afforded by the correspondence with the tent of importance in an encampment of the Bedouin, the Arabs of the desert, nomads of Arabia, Syria and Egypt, in their customs inheritors of by-gone ages. The dwelling of the Arab sheik, the head of the tribe, is a spacious tent, conspicuous by reason of its largeness and sumptuousness in the midst of the ruder tents of his subordinates. Its roof-covering is made of strips of black cloth, woven by the women from goats' hair and stitched together

⁹ When on a campaign the Romans covered their tents with the skins of animals. Hence *sub pellibus hiemare*, Livy 5, 2. 37, 39. Caesar, *bell. gall.* 3, 29 and *bell. civ.* 3, 13. Tacitus *ann.* 13, 15. Cicero *acad.* 4, 2 (Dillmann, *Exodus und Leviticus*,³ S. 321).

¹⁰ Ex. xxxiii. 6 E, xxv. 21 f, 24, 27 P. See Kittel, *Geschichte der Hebräer*, i. 215. Ex. xxxiii. 6 E is elucidated by Ex. iii. 22, xi. 2, xii. 35, xxxii. 2, all E, and further by Gen. xxiv. 22, 53 and xxxviii. 18 J.

along the sides. Upheld by three rows of poles, it is kept firm by cords stretched to pins driven in the ground. Underneath the shelter of these protecting curtains is an enclosed room, the sides of which are made of cloth of goats' hair or mats of rushes or split reed, and the apartment itself is divided into two chambers by a curtain drawn across the tent and fastened to the middle row of posts. Of these chambers one is the men's room; at its side, not behind it, is the women's apartment. The public entrance is in the long side of the tent, into the men's apartment. By shifting the curtain from one side of the tent to the other the entrance may be changed so as always to be away from the wind or the blazing sun. To secure this protection from the weather it has been found convenient to place the two chambers side by side rather than front and rear. Such is the tent of the Semites of the wilderness today.¹¹ It is an inheritance from ages long past, as is sufficiently attested by the Hebrew writings.¹² Thus as described in the book of Exodus, and as was quite natural in itself, the tabernacle erected by Moses in the wilderness was the ordinary tent of the desert adapted to sacred use.

3. The third corroborating fact is the correspondence between the plan of this better class of tent and the common type of sanctuary to which Moses and the Israelites in Egypt were accustomed. Of course even in Egypt there were occasionally slight deviations from the type; as, for example, when instead of one chamber for deity there were three side by side, a shrine being built at each side of the shrine of the principal god, one for the consort and the other for

¹¹ Prime sources are Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins and Wahabys*, cited by Theodore F. Wright, "Was the Tabernacle Oriental?" in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1899, xviii. 195-198, and comp. *Quarterly Statement, Palestine Exploration Fund*, 1897, pp. 225 f; Doughty, *Arabia Deserta*, i. 224 ff; William Ewing, article "Tent" in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*.

¹² An awning made of curtains, i.e. strips (Is. liv. 2) of black cloth (Song i. 5), woven by the women (2 Kin. xxiii. 7), from goats' hair (cp. 1 Sam. xix. 13), stayed by cords stretched to pins (Judg. iv. 21, Is. xxxiii. 20, liv. 2); and curtains hanging underneath (Jer. x. 20).

their child, and thus the holiest place of all was tripartite instead of being single. But the normal type of temple, already splendidly exhibited in the days of Moses at the great centers of Egyptian civilization and worship, consisted of a holy house of small size, usually two or three times as long as it was wide; and when divided into separate chambers, the innermost room was the place the most sacred of all. Here in solitary regal dignity stood the image of the god or the shrine in which he dwelt. This holy house was surrounded by a courtyard. The yard itself was enclosed by a wall, and was set apart for the officiating priests. Access to these sacred precincts was through a great portal. In front of this gate the worshippers assembled and through it they beheld the doors of the holy dwelling and at times caught a glimpse of its secret recesses.¹³

Viewed from the standpoint of archaeology, therefore, the tabernacle in its general outline as described in the book of Exodus was appropriate to the times of Moses. It conformed to a practice of migrating men in that day. Its materials were obtainable in the wilderness. It satisfied the religious needs of the people as felt in those days. To the stranger of that age it was not altogether foreign in its plan and form, but it spoke to him in language intelligible and told him much of Israel's doctrine of Jehovah.

¹³ The correspondence between the ground-plan of Egyptian temples and that of the tabernacle of the Israelites is often very close. To cite only temples built by Ramses II or his predecessors, in that of Seti I on the western bank of the river at Thebes the holy room is divided into three sections; and its length, measured from its rear wall to the entrance, is three fifths of the width of the court in which it stands. The length of the court itself from the rear wall to the colonnade, the original plan of the edifice, is double the width. In the ancient temple of Hathor at Dendera, the Hathor chamber was square, and the outer chamber was twice as long as broad. A passage way separated the two chambers, whereas in Israel's tabernacle it was only a veil which divided the holy of holies from the holy place. These two chambers at Dendera stood in a court twice as long as broad, and the combined length of the two chambers bore the same relation to the length and breadth of the courtyard as the length of the tabernacle bore to the length and breadth of its court.

After the conquest of Canaan the sanctuary of the ark was established at Shiloh, and continued to be served by priests of the lineage of Aaron. The town of Shiloh, where the sanctuary founded by Moses was now established, was built on the top of an isolated hill, in the very center of the land of Israel, almost exactly midway between the northern and southern boundaries, between the river Litany on the north and the wady el-Fikreh on the south, about ninety miles from each. The place lay just aside from the natural and actual route of travel from Galilee and Jezreel and Shechem on the north to Beth-el, Jerusalem, Hebron, and Beer-sheba on the south (cp. Judg. xxi. 19), and was accessible from the Jordan valley and from the Mediterranean coast by ravines and defiles through the mountains. The hill, on which Shiloh stood, rises from the midst of a fertile plain bordered by the mountains. Access to the town was had at its southern end only, by a road leading up the one gradual ascent from the plain.¹⁴ But where was the site of the sanctuary? At the northern end of the summit, and immediately adjoining the ruins of the town, is a remarkable terrace.¹⁵ It is a rectangle, about four hundred and twelve feet long and seventy-seven feet wide, and lies east and west. There are traces of a wall along the sides. This terrace satisfies the requirements of all references to the sanctuary in the records, older and later (e.g., Ex. xxvii. 9-13 and 18); and it explains at once certain statements that have always perplexed expositors of the books of Samuel; namely these, the ark of God had been taken to the field of battle where

¹⁴ Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs ii. 367-370.

¹⁵ The terrace was pointed out, and was suggested as the site of the sanctuary, by Major Charles W. Wilson (*Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement*, 1873, p. 37 f). The suggestion has been received with favor, but not adopted as a certainty, by Dr. Immanuel Benzinger (*Baedeker's Palästina und Syrien*,⁶ 1894, p. 188; English translation,² 1894), Father Barnabas Meistermann (*New Guide to the Holy Land*, English translation, 1907, p. 340), Rev. William Ewing, D.D. (*International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, 1915, p. 2769; see also *Temple Dictionary of the Bible*, 1910), each of whom has intimate acquaintance with the land, due to long residence and study in Palestine.

the army of Israel faced the hosts of the Philistines, and Eli was sitting upon the seat at the gate anxiously waiting for news (1 Sam. iv. 18, also verse 13, and Antiq. v. 11, 3).¹⁶ The field of conflict was about fifteen miles to the south of Shiloh; and the fugitive bringing word of the defeat of Israel reached the town and announced the dread tidings before he came to Eli. These facts raise a strong presumption that the gate at which the aged high priest sat was at the northern end of the town and was the gate giving access from the town to the courtyard of the sanctuary. Eli had not left the sacred precincts. But whether the terrace is the real site of the tabernacle or not, the essential thing is that the priest at Shiloh was reached by the messenger from the south after he had entered the town. Consequently the gate at which Eli sat was not the town gate through which the only road that ascended the hill passed.

Seeing that the ark had been taken to Shiloh and established

¹⁶ The Septuagint and Targum presuppose the word gate in the text of 1 Sam. iv. 13. Eli occupied a seat "at the side of the gate watching the road" (Septuagint; comp. the phraseology, 2 Sam. xviii. 4) or "at the side of the way of the gate watching" (Targum; comp. 2 Sam. xv. 2). Driver and Löhr do not decide between the two readings. The Septuagint is thought to represent the original Hebrew text by Thenius, Wellhausen, Kittel, H. P. Smith, Budde, Nowack.

The least emendation of the Hebrew text is required when the reading of the Targum is followed, which indicates that the word *hassha'ar* only has been lost from the Hebrew. The emendation based on the Septuagint involves much greater change; not only the insertion of *hassha'ar*, but also the prefixing of the definite article to *derek* and the transposition of *hadderek* with *metsappeh*.

The word *derek* may, of course, in this passage denote "the road" to Shiloh or more particularly, to the sanctuary, or else "the way [within the walls of Shiloh] to the gate" of the town or of the sacred inclosure (cp. 2 Kin. xi. 19, xxv 4, Ezek. xlii. 11, 12).

The expression "watched the way" is found in Nah. ii. 2 also. The statement that Eli was sitting on the seat "at the side of the way to the gate watching" is paralleled by Jer. xlvi. 19, "stand by the way and watch: ask him that fleeth and her that escapeth; say, What hath been done?" See also Ps. v. 4, where again the verb is used without a direct object. The context determines whether one is awaiting an answer to prayer, or news, or the return of an object. There is no contradiction in this with verse 15 and iii. 2.

there, and that priests of Aaron's line ministered there, it is probable¹⁷ that the tent which housed the ark had also been taken there. In fact, if reliance may be placed in the genuineness of a statement which forms part of a verse in the narrative of Eli's judgeship (1 Sam ii. 22, latter half)—and the only substantial reason for questioning the brief passage at all is its absence from one of the chief texts of the Greek version (it is found in the other great texts and was known to Josephus also)¹⁸—then the sanctuary at Shiloh still bore the old name tent of meeting.

¹⁷ Probable even without the notice in Josh. xviii. 1 P.

In the narrative that immediately follows as the text now stands, Joshua is present at Shiloh in his official capacity and there casts lots before Jehovah in order to divide the undistributed portion of the land. Dillmann, who assigns Josh. xviii. 8-10 to E rather than to J, suggests that since the phrase "to the camp at Shiloh" is lacking in verse 9 in the Septuagint [text B; but it is found in Lucian's text, and "to Shiloh" is in A], therefore in verse 9 the word Shiloh is possibly a harmonistical insertion in conformity to verse 1, P; and perhaps also in verse 8, where the emphatic position of the word "here" at the beginning is surprising; and in verse 10 (*Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua*, 2te Aufl. S. 550 and 625.) Steuernagel, too, who assigns the verses to D², questions every mention of Shiloh in them, arguing that the phrase "in Shiloh" in verse 8 is "perhaps an addition of the Redactor's in accordance with verse 1," on the ground that the place where the allotment is to be made, is doubly stated, by the words "here" and "in Shiloh," which is surprising since the two statements are separated, one being at the beginning and the other at the end of the verse thus: "Here will I cast lots for you before Jehovah in Shiloh" (*Deuteronomium und Josua* in Nowack's *Handkommentar*, S. 222, and 137 and 221). The argument is invalid. The same phenomenon is met with in 1 Sam. xi. 15, a passage assigned to J and of unquestioned integrity: "The people went to Gilgal; and they made king there Saul before Jehovah in Gilgal."

Wellhausen regards Josh. xviii. 2-10 as a Jehovistic passage, according to which the land was allotted to the remaining tribes "von Silo oder vielleicht ursprünglich von Sichem aus;" "siehe die charakteristische Korrektur der Sept. zu xxiv. 1, 25" (*Prolegomena*,³ S. 374; *Composition des Hexateuchs*, 3te Aufl. S. 129). Kittel follows Wellhausen, except that he assigns verses 2-6, 8-10 to E (*Geschichte der Hebräer*, § 29, S. 281, and 280 Anm. 4) In the Hebrew text published by Bennett (*Sacred Books of the Old Testament: The Book of Joshua*), and in that by Driver (*Biblia Hebraica*, edited by Kittel), Shiloh is retained in verses 8-10.

¹⁸ According to Wellhausen the latter half of verse 22 is an inter-

It had, of course, undergone changes in the lapse of many years since Moses' day. The weather had done its work. Sun and wind, rain, dew and frost, had made inroads on the exposed haircloth and leather. The old and weather-beaten curtains of the roof had been torn and sewed up, and patched

polation, lacking in the Septuagint (*Prolegomena*,³ S. 43, Anm. 1, *Composition des Hexateuchs*,³ S. 238). To quote Driver, "the entire clause . . . is not found in LXX, and is probably not part of the original text (the context speaks of a *hêkal* with *doors*, not of an *'ohel*: i. 9, iii. 3, 15)" (*Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, p. 26, 2nd edition p. 33). The clause is lacking, it is true, in the text B of the Septuagint; but it is found in those of A and Lucian, and it was known to Josephus also (*Antiq. v. 10, 1*). Kittel notes the fact of its absence from the text B, and indicates that in his judgment it is "probably an addition" in the Hebrew (*Biblia hebraica*; comp. Budde, *The Books of Samuel: Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text*, p. 54). Apropos of the doors, the word *pethah*, opening, in verse 22, is used either for the entrance of a tent or for the entrance to a building of wood or stone. If the doors mentioned in iii 15, comp. i. 9, belonged to the holy house itself, and not to the gate of the enclosure, it is easy to understand how in a permanent tent with an entrance opening directly into an apartment, especially into one having side and rear walls of boards, doors could advantageously be used in place of a curtain. Nowack, amplifying Löhr's statement, declares the clause to be "ein später nach Ex. 38:8 gemachter Zusatz; der hier berichtete Frevel ist ganz anderer Art als der oben v. 13 ff. ausgesprochene Tadel, und während sonst immer in c. 1-3 das Heiligtum zu Silo *hêkal* heisst, erscheint hier *'ohel môed*, der term. bei P für die Stifftshütte" (*Handkommentar*; comp. Löhr's edition of Thenius, *Die Bücher Samuels*. The name "tent of meeting" is, however, older than P (Ex. xxxiii. 7 E).

H. P. Smith adds to the foregoing that "the whole narrative, except in this verse, is ignorant of *women who ministered*" (*International Critical Commentary: Samuel*, p. 20). The matter, it may be remarked, did not call for frequent mention, and the allusions to it are merely incidental. But there was custom for it. Women filled honorable posts at Egyptian temples and had an official function, albeit a minor one, to perform in the cult; and in Israel idolatrous women wove tents in the house of Jehovah for the goddess Asherah, whose rites were conducted there; so that, even apart from the incidental allusion, it is not improbable that the custom was followed at Shiloh, and women rendered useful service at the sanctuary of Jehovah. There was work for women to do which might be done at the entrance to the sacred precincts, whither men and women brought their offerings and those undergoing cleansing were placed (Lev. i. 3, xii. 6, xiv. 11). There was the work of grinding meal and baking cakes and loaves for the stated offerings, of spinning and weaving for the maintenance of the sanc-

and repatched. Entire curtains had been replaced, until the whole outside covering perhaps had been renewed. The curious might at length inquire, as teachers of logic are wont to ask regarding the ship of Delos or the knife that received new blades and new handle and new spring, whether the tent of cloth and skins that covered the sanctuary at Shiloh was the same that Moses had erected in the wilderness. There were probably other changes besides those necessitated by wear and tear: for the sanctuary was no longer intended to be moved from place to place with a migrating host, but had a fixed abode at Shiloh in the midst of a settled people who had given up their tent-dwellings for houses of sun-dried brick or stone. Hence probably changes would be made in the outward form of the sanctuary to meet the changed

tuary and its ritual, of making the holy garments, and on occasion of playing on timbrels and singing (comp. Ex. xv. 20, 21, Ps. lxxviii. 26, English 25). All this was woman's work.

Gray pronounces 1 Sam. i. 22 b. "a late gloss." In commenting on Num. iv. 3, he says: "The same word (*tsaba'*) is used in both chapters [i and iv], though RV. here renders by 'service,' there by 'war.' Originally the word had reference to war: its use of menial service about the tabernacle or temple is late. . . . It is one of several interesting instances in which terms originating in the early and more warlike periods of Hebrew history, and retaining their military reference down to the close of the monarchy, took on after the Exile a fresh meaning, in consequence of the change from a national society under a monarchy to a religious community under a hierarchy" (*International Critical Commentary: Numbers*, pp. 32, 36). But why "after the exile" in this instance? The use of the word in 1 Sam. ii. 22 for service at the sanctuary may antedate its use in this sense by P, since according to critical theory it is here in a context assigned to E,² "prior to 650 B.C." And according to the school of Ewald the word was in common use for service in war or at the temple in literature produced during the early monarchy, in the "time of Solomon, after the erection of the temple" (Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*,³ I. 113 ff), or "± 800 B.C.; so already Nöldeke 138 ff and JPT h. I. 343 ff" (*Dillmann, Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua*,² S. 666). After all, the fundamental question is: How came it that service at the sanctuary of Jehovah was called by a word used of military service? Was it because service was rendered to "Jehovah of armies" (1 Sam. i. 3, iv. 4, xvii. 45), to "Jehovah, a man of war" (Ex. xv. 3), and because Israel formed "the armies of Jehovah" (xii. 41 P) and fought the "Wars of Jehovah" (Num. xxi. 14)?

conditions.¹⁹ It need cause no surprise, if the courtyard about the tabernacle had come to be surrounded by a wall of stone. There is no explicit statement that it was, but the suggestion of such a wall is found in the narrative, in the reference to the gate (1 Sam. iv, 13, 18), for the gate cannot mean the door of the tabernacle nor the gate of the town. Quite probably also the curtain which closed the entrance of the tent had been replaced by doors swinging between the pillars.²⁰ Indeed, now that the permanent location of the sanctuary at Shiloh permitted their use, since there was no longer the frequent transport to be burdened by them, doors were almost a necessity. They would afford the sacred chambers of the sanctuary a better protection against wind and rain than the curtain or flap of the nomad's tent.

There may have been still other changes,²¹ but notwith-

¹⁹ For although the tradition was fondly cherished that Moses had been directed to build the tabernacle in exact conformity to the model showed him in the mount (Ex. xxv. 9, 40 P, Acts vii. 44, Heb. viii. 5); it was not regarded as sacrilegious to make alterations in the size and structure and furnishings and service of the sanctuary as time went on and conditions changed. Historically changes were made both in the sanctuary and in its worship, and even in the most sacred annual festival, evidently with the full consent and sanction of the religious authorities.

²⁰ This is a reasonable conjecture even if the doors of the house of God which the boy Samuel in the performance of his regular duties used to open in the morning and the doorpost of the temple by which Eli sat were not the doorpost and doors of the tent itself, but were post and doors of the main gate which opened into the courtyard and gave access to the sacred precincts from the world outside. The usage of the designations house of God and temple throughout the Scriptures permits the latter interpretation, since the terms are comprehensive at times and include the entire complex of buildings and courts (Brown, *Hebrew and English Lexicon*, p. 228). See footnote 18.

²¹ A passage is often quoted from the Mishna to the effect that the sanctuary at Shiloh was "a structure of low stone walls with the tent drawn over the top" (e.g. Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 299). With its context, the passage is as follows: Before the erection of the tabernacle (*mishkan*) the high places [i.e. the local altars], were permitted and the service was performed by the first born; but after its erection, the high places were forbidden and the service was performed by the priests. Most holy offerings were eaten within the hangings [i.e. in the court of the tabernacle (Ex. xxvii. 9, xxxv. 17; and Lev. vi. 9,

standing them all the sanctuary at Shiloh was still a tent. For in David's day men knew that from the date of the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt until then Jehovah had dwelt "in a tent and in a tabernacle," at least characteristically and customarily, and not in "a house of cedar" (2 Sam. vii. 6, 7).²² And David himself, the mighty king, with

Eng. 16, x. 12 f)], and less holy offerings anywhere in the camp of Israel (Tract *Zebachim*, xiv. 4.) "They came to Shiloh, the high places were forbidden. There was not a roofed building there, but a house of stone below and curtains above. And it was a place of rest. Most holy offerings were eaten within the hangings, less holy offerings and second tithe, anywhere within the sight [of Shiloh]" (Tract *Zebachim*, xiv. 6; see Surenhusius *Mishna*, vol. v. 59, Goldschmidt, *Der babylonische Talmud*, vol. viii. 394). Rabbi Obadiah de Bartenora, who died about the year 1500, comments thus: "Inasmuch as it is written 'And she brought him unto the house of the LORD in Shiloh' [1 Sam. i. 24], you see, therefore, that in Shiloh there was a *bayith*, house; and in Psa. lxxviii. 60 it is written 'And he forsook the tabernacle of Shiloh,' whence evidently curtains were there, yet not a roofed building, but a structure of stones merely below and curtains above" (Surenhusius, *loc. citat.*) An identical argument had already been advanced in the Babylonian Talmud.

The statement in the Mishna had its origin, like the explanation, probably in a harmonistic attempt. If so, the Jewish harmonizers did violence to the word *bayith*, in assuming that it involved the idea of solidity of structure, like the ordinary stone houses of Palestine. Modern critics rest their contention rather on the designation *hêkal*, given to the sanctuary in 1 Sam. i. 9, iii. 3. See footnote 26.

²² The two words tent and tabernacle, which are used in 2 Sam. vii. 6, are the words which are employed technically in the book of Exodus for the outer covering and the dwelling (Ex. xxv. 9 and R. V. margin, xxvi. 6 and 7). In 2 Sam. vii. 6 Budde following Klostermann would substitute the form of words used by the Chronicler: "from tent to tent and from tabernacle [to tabernacle] (1 Chron. xvii. 5); but his argument has been met by H. P. Smith and Benzinger (comp. Curtis, *International Critical Commentary, Chronicles*, p. 228). In the judgment of Bertheau, Wellhausen, Kautzsch, Kittel, Benzinger, H. P. Smith, Nowack, the text is not suspicious.

The date of the chapter is apparently placed by H. P. Smith "perhaps in or after the exile" (p. xxvi with xx, and 298); but it is generally conceded that the narrative was committed to writing before the exile, perhaps in the time of Josiah, 639-608 B.C. (Wellhausen, *Composition*,³ S. 255, *Prolegomena*, S. 46; Löhr, S. lvi.; Nowack, S. 176), or "prior to 650 B.C." (Budde), or "hardly later than circa 700 B.C." (Driver, *Introduction*,¹⁰ p. 183), and based on old historical material (Kittel, *Geschichte der Hebräer*, II. 43). The argument is mainly this: The narrative was written after David had pitched the tent for the ark and

wealth at his disposal, who built a house of cedar for himself (2 Sam. v. 11, vii. 2), did not venture at any time during his life to have any other sanctuary in his capital than a tent (1 Kin. ii. 28, 29).²³

The sanctuary at Shiloh is frequently called the house of Jehovah (1 Sam. i. 7, 24; iii. 15; and house of God, Judg. xviii. 31); and it is properly designated in this way, although it was a great tent. The tabernacle had been known by the same designation centuries earlier while it was still carried about, a portable tent, from place to place by the migrating tribes of Israel (Josh. ix. 23, early J; vi. 24 P);²⁴ and the had built a palace for himself at Jerusalem; and, apart from possible later touches, before the exile, because the fall of the dynasty and kingdom is not yet within view; but not a great while before the exile, since (so it is assumed in the argument) the author is looking back, not forward, in verses 14 and 19 (Wellhausen; Cornill, *Einleitung*,³ S. 104; Nowack).

The ark had been kept first in the Mosaic tabernacle, and latterly in the tent that David pitched for it at Jerusalem; hence, to cite words of Wellhausen, "die Lesart der Parallelstelle in der Chronik (I. 17, 5) beruht darum auf einem ganz richtigen Verständniss (*Prolegomena*, S. 47).

²³ Sellin, *Das Zelt Jahwes*, in *Alttestamentliche Studien Rudolph Kittel zum 60. Geburtstag dargebracht*, S. 175.

²⁴ The word house does not appear in the Septuagint (A, B, Lucian) of Josh. vi. 24, being perhaps omitted because not used in the Hebrew text of verse 19. In Josh. ix. 23 the genuineness of the words "house of my God" is unquestioned.

Wellhausen assumes an anachronism in Josh. vi. 24 and ix. 23 [in the designation "house of Jehovah" in a narrative of events in the time of Joshua], and says this anachronism "proves that the conception of the tabernacle was unknown to the author" (*Prolegomena*,³ S. 43, Anm. 2); and Steuernagel, who treats the word "house" in the Hebrew text of Josh. vi. 24 as an interpolation says that house of Jehovah "wäre für die Zeit Josuas ein Anachronismus. Der Ausdruck kam wohl einem Abschreiber in die Feder, weil er zu seiner Zeit gebräuchlich war, doch cf. auch zu ix. 23" (Nowack's *Handkommentar: Deuteronomium und Josua*).

The soundness and antiquity of 2 Sam. xii. 20 is unquestioned; and there the house of Jehovah designates the tent of the ark. Löhr acknowledges this; but suggests as an alternative that the use of the word "house" in this connection is due to the negligence of the author, since elsewhere it is used of the temple on mount Zion (*Die Bücher Samuels* von Thenius).

These various theories are groundless in view of the breadth of meaning in the Hebrew usage of the word rendered "house."

tent which David pitched for the ark at Jerusalem became forthwith the house of Jehovah, and is so described (2 Sam. xii. 20; I Chron. vi. 16, English 31). Indeed the designation *bāyith*, which is translated house, is applied to any dwelling, and has no reference whatsoever to the material of the structure or its durability. The tents or curtains which were woven for the goddess Asherah are called houses (2 Kin. xxiii. 7, R. V. text and margin); and in Arabic and Assyrian speech the tents of the Bedouin are "houses of the desert."²⁵

The sanctuary at Shiloh is twice mentioned in the narrative by a word which is translated temple (1 Sam. i. 9; iii. 3); and it could be thus spoken of, even though the tent had remained unchanged since the days of Moses in the wilderness. Yet in view of this designation the assertion has been made that "the structure [at Shiloh] seems to have been a solid building, otherwise it could not be called a temple."²⁶ The argument thus based on the word temple is not sound. It is not solidity that is denoted by the word translated temple. Etymologically²⁷ it seems to involve the ideas of largeness and capacity. But largeness and capacity are relative qualities. The sheik's tent is large and capacious and

²⁵ Concerning the Arabic usage of the word *bait* Freytag says: "Domus: sive ex materia fabrili, sive ex lino, lana vel pilis, confecta: uti est tentorium" (*Lexicon Arabico-latinum*, tom. I. p. 175).

²⁶ H. P. Smith (*International Critical Commentary: Samuel*, p. 9). Similarly his predecessors Graf, *bayith* "steht nicht zur Bezeichnung eines Zeltes, am allerwenigsten aber *hēkal*" (*Geschichtliche Bücher des Alten Testaments*, S. 56), and Wellhausen, "überall sonst in 1 Sam. i-iii ist das Heiligtum von Silo ein Hekal, d. h. sicher kein Zelt" (*Prolegomena*, S. 43, Anm. 1); and more recent writers Löhr, "es ist ein festes Gebäude (*hēkal*), kein Zelt" (*Die Bücher Samuels von Otto Thenius*, S. 7), and Nowack, "*hēkal* lässt darüber keinen Zweifel, dass das in Silo stehende Heiligtum ein festes Gebäude und nicht nur ein Zelt war" (*Handkommentar zum Alten Testament: Richter, Ruth u. Bücher Samuels*, S. 5).

²⁷ Whether derived from *yakol* in the sense of capacious, spacious; or, while associated with that root in the mind of the Hebrews, was really borrowed from the Assyrian and Babylonian composite *ē-kal*, great house.

sumptuous in comparison with the tents of his subordinate tribesmen. And the tent at Shiloh, merely to shelter the ark and other sacred furniture known to have been used there, was itself large and stood in a large and ample court in comparison with the dwelling-houses in Shiloh and other towns of Israel in that day, houses which were almost incredibly small and were packed together along alleys but three or four feet wide. The thought of size, however, is seldom to the forefront in the usage of the word, even though the idea may be lurking in the back ground. In its use the word means a royal residence. It seems never to have been used of the abodes of the rich, however extensive and magnificently furnished such dwellings might be. In usage the word denotes the residence of a king. It is the palace: the palace of the king of Babylon, for example (2 Kin. xx. 18), the palace of Ahab (1 Kin. xxi. 1), the palace of Jehovah, Israel's divine king (Is. vi. 1). It is merely compliance with western usage which has led the translators of the Scriptures to render the word by palace when the residence of human royalty is intended, and by temple when an abode of deity is meant (2 Sam. xxii. 7; and Ezra v. 14 with i. 7). The sanctuary at Shiloh was called the palace of Jehovah, not because of its solidity, but incidentally because of its size and chiefly because it was the dwelling-place of Israel's divine king. Jehovah was of old regarded by Israel as king. The doctrine is voiced in Ex. xix. 6, Num. xxxiii. 21, Deut. xxxiii. 5, Is. vi. 1, Mic. iv. 7. It is found in the name of Saul's son, Malchishua (1 Sam. xiv. 49; xxxi. 2) and Naomi's husband Elimelech (Ruth i. 1).²⁸

²⁸ It is also found in Ex. xv. 18, Judg. viii. 23, 1 Sam. viii. 7, xii. 12. And the God of Israel performed all the functions of a king, as is set forth in the decalogue and its preface. He was lawgiver (verses 2 ff), judge (5, 6), deliverer of his people (2), their protector, who secured to them the peaceful possession of their country (12; comp. Isa. xxxiii. 22). He was acknowledged in their civil law book to be the Lord (*ha'adon*, Ex. xxxiii. 17, xxxiv. 23); and the doctrine of his sovereignty was enshrined in proper names, not only in those already mentioned, but in other names of the same period: Adonijah, son of David, and Adoniram, one of his officials (2 Sam. iii. 4, xx. 24); Eshbaal, son of

The furnishing of the sanctuary is not described, but several sacred objects connected with the worship are mentioned in the narrative. There was an altar there, on which burnt-offerings and peace-offerings and votive-offerings were brought to Jehovah (1 Sam. i. 3, 4, 21, 25, ii. 13, 28, iii. 14). Unfortunately the narrative gives no information, not even a hint, of the form and structure of this altar. Within the sanctuary was the bread of the presence; for the priests of the family that ministered at Shiloh were accustomed to lay holy bread, known as showbread, before Jehovah in the sanctuary, that it might be exhibited in his presence (1 Sam. xxi. 3-6). The lamp of God was there too, burning nightly during the hours of darkness (1 Sam. iii. 3). A lamp is not necessarily a seven-branched candelabrum; nevertheless the same expression that is employed here is sometimes used when the seven-branched lampstand is in mind (Ex. xxvii. 20 f; Lev. xxiv. 2 f). Another object of note, an ephod, for use when the priest made solemn inquiry of God, was kept at the sanctuary at Shiloh, to judge from an ephod being found later at Nob, in a definite place in the sanctuary there and known as the ephod and in the custody of the officiating priest, a descendant of Eli (1 Sam. xxi. 9; xxii. 10). But the chief object of all, sheltered beneath the tent at Shiloh, was the ark of God, the symbol of Jehovah's presence (1 Sam. iii. 3). It had been made in the wilderness under the direction of Moses, was constructed of acacia wood, and when carried was borne by means of poles (Deut. x. 1-5. J or E; Num. x. 33, Josh. iii. 3 E, 11, 13 J, 1 Kin. viii. 8). These facts are reported by the early historians; and as the ark was in existence from the time of Moses until the fall of Jerusalem in the sixth century before Christ, its form, structure, and contents were not matters of tradition, but of contemporary knowledge. The natural place for this ark was the inner chamber of the two apart-

Saul, and perhaps Meribbaal, a grandson (2 Sam. ii. 8 with 1 Chron. viii. 33; and 2 Sam. iv. 4 with 1 Chron. viii. 34), and Beeliada, son of David (2 Sam. v. 16 with 1 Chron. xiv. 7).

ments of the tent. For that room was the inviolable part of the nomad's tent. It was the place in the Egyptian temple where the image of the god stood; and it was the place which the ark occupied three generations later in Solomon's temple. It was the only proper place in the tent for the ark.

The sanctuary at Shiloh has been spoken of by influential writers as the principal place of worship for Israel in the days of Eli. As appears from the narrative it was visited by all Israel (1 Sam. ii. 22; cp. verses 14 and 24), and what occurred there was known to all Israel from Dan to Beersheba (iii. 20; iv. 1). This resort of Israelites from all parts of the country proves that it was at least the sanctuary of greatest renown and widest influence, for it had no rival in respect to this general concourse of the people. But was it also the national sanctuary of Israel? In intention, and as founded by Moses, and by inherent right because possessing national symbols, and in the consciousness of the people was Shiloh the common sanctuary of all Israel? Not, was it the only place where God might be worshipped; but was it the sanctuary for all the tribes, a sanctuary in which all Israelites were equally represented, and in the privileges and obligations of which all had an equal share?

1. There had been a national sanctuary during the sojourn of Israel in the wilderness: a tent that was established for the God of Israel, that was erected at the headquarters of the camp, that contained the ark of God, and that accompanied the people in all their migrations; the sanctuary where counsel was asked in behalf of the nation and whence with its sanction civil and religious laws went forth to all the people.²⁹ Of this sanctuary Shiloh was the recognized

²⁹ The tent of meeting (Ex. xxxiii. 7) was the tribunal of justice, whither everyone went that sought the Lord (7); for the matter in dispute was laid before God or, to use their phrase, the party sought Jehovah's face (2 Sam. xxi. 1, R.V.), inquired of God (Ex. xviii. 15), brought the cause to God (19, Num. xxvii, 5), came unto God or came before him (Ex. xxi. 6, xxii. 9, R.V.), stood before Jehovah (Deut. xix. 17); and it was a place of revelation (Ex. xxxiii. 9). Compare footnote 3.

continuation. Why should this sanctuary lose its national character, especially since it was the resort of Israelites from all parts of the land?

2. The selection of Shiloh as the site for the sanctuary of the ark and the place of ministry of the Aaronic priesthood demands an explanation, and the only satisfactory reason for the choice of this obscure town is its location almost exactly midway between the northern and southern, eastern and western boundaries of the land, and its nearness to the highway of travel between north and south. The suggestion made by the historian Josephus, that Shiloh was chosen "because of the beauty of its situation" (*Antiq.* v. 1, 19), is inadequate; for other towns equalled Shiloh, and some excelled it, in beauty. Nor is the selection of Shiloh explicable on the theory that it was the sanctuary of the tribes descended from Joseph, for Shiloh was far south of the center of the Joseph-tribes; and was an obscure town. Sacred associations and central position and accessibility pointed to Shechem as the natural place for the sanctuary of the ark, if the Joseph-tribes had been primarily in mind. But the tribe of Judah had as much right in the ark as had the Joseph-tribes.³⁰

When David became king of all Israel he made Jerusalem the political and religious capital of the united nation, largely because of its position on the boundary between the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, between the northern and southern divisions into which the Hebrews had become separated. Similarly Shiloh also seems to have been selected because of its central position in relation to all the tribes of Israel.³¹

3. The possession of the ark made Shiloh the religious

³⁰ Compare footnote 2.

³¹ Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 298. After the loss of the ark the priests of Shiloh took up their residence at the village of Nob, near the abode of king Saul and in a measure in association with him (similarly Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*,³ S. 132). An intentional renewal of the ancient conditions when Aaron stood at the side of Moses at the headquarters of Israel?

capital of the nation; for the ark was not only the most ancient and holy religious symbol in Israel, it was also the one religious object of prime importance which belonged to the nation as a whole and which from the first had occupied the place of prominence in national affairs. The ark was the common property of the nation, for it had been made by Moses from the gifts of the people generally, a fact recognized by biblical critics of all schools. It was the ark which had been kept at the headquarters of the tribes when they were encamped in the wilderness and had formed the supreme place of worship for the Israelites without distinction of tribe during their migration. It was revered as the throne of Jehovah, the place of his presence and manifestation in the midst of the ten thousands of the thousands of Israel (Num. x. 35, 36, 1 Sam. iii. 21; cp. iv. 4 and margin). It was the paladium carried by the nation at the crossing of the Jordan and the capture of Jericho. About it the assembly of Israel gathered in the vale of Shechem, when they met to take upon the nation the obligations of Jehovah's law. At the summons of the elders of Israel it was brought from Shiloh in the territory of Ephraim to the battle where it fell into the hands of the Philistines (1 Sam. iv. 3, 5; cp. 12 and 16), and on its restoration to Israel it was cared for in a town of Judah; and it was taken to Jerusalem by David when he made that city the capital of re-united Israel. The ark of God was not of any local significance; with its loss "glory departed from Israel" (1 Sam. iv. 21 f. with 19). None was left. Name the child Ichabod, "glory is not." The ark of Jehovah was not the glory of Shiloh merely, as Dagon was the god of Ashdod, and Baal was the shame of Peor (Hos. ix. 10), and Ashtoreth the abomination of the Sidonians (2 Kin. xxiii. 13); not the glory of Ephraim only, but the glory of Israel, the glory because it was the symbol of Jehovah's glorious power (Ps. lxxviii. 61, cxxxii. 8), and the visible representative of the God of Israel glorious in his moral character (1 Sam. vi. 20, Ex. xv. 11), and the token of his glorious pres-

ence in deeds of deliverance wrought in behalf of his people (1 Sam. iv. 7 f.). While it abode in the midst of Israel glory was there. The ark thus made Shiloh the place of worship for the whole nation. Other towns had sacred associations with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and on that account were dear to all Israel, but Shiloh alone possessed the ark of the nation, the throne of Jehovah, the token of his presence in the midst of Israel.

4. The official head of the priestly family that ministered in the wilderness and at Shiloh was recognized as the national priest. It is unnecessary to dwell on incidents of the early history.³² Two statements of significance in the narrative of king Saul's reign will suffice.³³ In the early days of the kingdom, during an invasion of the country by the Philistines, Saul abode near the town of Geba (1 Sam. xiv. 2 with xiii. 16), in order to defend the pass at Michmash against

³² The earliest literature tells of the association of Aaron with Moses in the deliverance of Israel from Egypt (Ex. iv. 28, v. 1, 4 E; and v. 20, viii. 8, 25, ix. 27, x. [3], 8, 16, xii. 31, and before v. 3 originally, J; also 1 Sam. xii. 6, 8, Mic. vi. 4), of the prominence of Aaron at the headquarters of the camp (Ex. xviii. 12 E), of the appointment of Aaron and his two oldest sons with other representatives of Israel to take part in the ceremonies that officially completed the ratification of the covenant (xxiv. 1 J), of the authority accorded to Aaron in the government of the nation (xxxii. 1-5 and 21 E), of Aaron's priesthood and the succession of his son Eleazar to the office (Deut. x. 6 E), of Eleazar's death and burial in the inheritance of his son Phinehas (Josh. xxiv. 33 E). "With historical probability the family of Eli can be traced back to Phinehas, who was priest of the ark in the earlier period of the judges, and after whom the landed inheritance in mount Ephraim and likewise the younger of Eli's two sons were named" (Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, S. 143, with a reference to Judg. xx. 28a, comp. *Prolegomena*, S. 245). Generally in the Old Testament the term father's house is technical, and denotes a clan, a secondary division of the tribe. Eli's father's house or clan was the family of Aaron, belonging to the tribal division of Kohath (1 Sam. ii. 27, see *Princeton Theological Review*, 1913, pp. 288-290).

³³ Contained in 1 Sam. xiv. 2, 3 and 18. Arnold condemns 3^a as an interpolation, but accepts 18^b as genuine (*Ephod and Ark*, p. 14); whereas Wellhausen holds 18^b to be genuine, and 2^b 3^a to be interpolated (*Text der Bücher Samuels*, 1871, S. 86). The three verses are assigned to the same source and treated as genuine by later critics of the text, Kittel, Budde, Löhr, H. P. Smith, Nowack.

the invading host. The band of faithful men who staid with him in this desperate venture is described thus: The people that were with him were about six hundred men; and Ahijah, the son of Ahitub, Ichabod's brother, the son of Phinehas, the son of Eli, the priest of Jehovah in Shiloh, wearing an ephod (xiv. 2 f, comp. xiii. 15 f).³⁴ The statement is cumbrous; but the unwieldiness arises from the necessary identification of Ahijah as a lineal descendant of Eli. The same form of statement is met with elsewhere in the Hebrew narratives.³⁵

This is a formal account of the entourage of the king, and is comparable with others where officials of the government are named. The organization of the state was quite embryonic in Saul's day, and in the distress and confusion caused by the Philistine invasion there stood at his side only a force of six hundred men and Ahijah, descendant of Eli, priest of Shiloh, ephod-bearer. The latter title is without the definite article, and in the English version is translated "wearing an ephod." The indefinite wording suggests to the uninitiated perhaps merely that Ahijah was present with the paraphernalia of a priest. But the ephod in this instance is not described as a linen ephod, which was a garment worn by priests of all ranks and by other persons when taking part officially in religious functions; and wherever an ephod is mentioned in the history, as it is here, without being

³⁴ The narrative, of which these verses form a part, "scheint," according to Kittel, "nicht erheblich von den Ereignissen abzustehen" (*Geschichte der Hebräer*, 1888, II. 31). According to Budde it belongs to "J¹, compiled before 800 BC." (*Books of Samuel: . . . The Hebrew Text printed in colors*, 1894). Löhr dates it not long after David's reign (Thenius' *Die Bücher Samuels*, 1898, pp. lxvi and lxviii). Henry Preserved Smith discerns in it "affinities with the stories that form the basis of the book of Judges rather than with J" (*International Critical Commentary, Samuel*, 1899, p. xxii). And Nowack sees here "eine mit den Ereignissen zwar nicht gleichzeitige, aber von ihnen auch nicht sehr ferne Quelle" (*Handkommentar zum Alten Testament: Bücher Samuelis*, 1902, S. xvii). See also Driver, *Introduction*,¹⁰ pp. 175 and 183.

³⁵ For example 1 Chron. xii. 27 f [Heb. 28 f]; also 2 Sam. ii. 30, xix. 17 [Heb. 18], 1 Kin. xx. 1.

specifically described as made of linen,³⁶ it is understood to denote something that served as a means in consulting the oracle. In the sanctuary at Nob, and hence previously at Shiloh, there was only one such ephod. It was known as "the ephod" (1 Sam. xxi. 10, English 9), and was a notable part of the furnishing. Recent critics are fond of asserting that it was a prominent solid object in the sacred apartment, and occupied a fixed and quite definite place. Be that as it may, it was this ephod of which the priest Ahijah was now the bearer or the wearer—the Hebrew word may have either meaning.³⁷ He was ephod-bearer. The phrase lacks the definite article because it is a title of office. In official titles the definite article is unnecessary, and frequently is unused. Thus for example, Jehoshaphat was recorder and Seraiah scribe in the cabinet of David (2 Sam. viii. 16-18); and it is recorded that Joab was army-commander for king David, not captain of the army, but simply captain of army (1 Chron. xxvii. 34), but later Amasa was made army-commander in the room of Joab (2 Sam. xix. 14, English 13); that people of the north made Omri, who was army-commander, king over Israel (1 Kin. xvi. 16); that Zechariah, son of Meshelemiah, was keeper of door, or door-keeper, for the tent of meeting (1 Chron. ix. 21); that the commander

³⁶ Judg. viii. 27, xvii. 5, xviii. 14-20, 1 Sam. ii. 28, xiv. 3, xxi. 9, xxiii. 6-9, xxx. 7, Hos. iii. 4.

³⁷ Like the German *tragen*. "Whether we should translate *to bear* an ephod, or *to wear* an ephod depends upon the meaning of the word ephod, concerning which this passage [1 Sam. ii. 28] leaves us wholly in the dark" (H. P. Smith, *Samuel*). Accordingly 1 Sam. xxii, 18 is rendered "wore the linen ephod" (*ibid.*). On this latter verse Nowack remarks, "Hinter 'ephod fehlt in LXX *bad* mit Recht, denn *nasa'* wird sonst nur [nie (?)] vom Tragen eines Kleidungsstückes gebraucht." See also Löhr; and Driver *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, 2nd edition, pp. 182 and 37. The word linen is lacking, it is true, in the Septuagint texts B and Lucian, but it is present in text A. It is retained by Budde, and belongs to a passage assigned to "J¹, compiled before 800 B.C." It is retained in Kittel's text also, who notes its representation in Aquila's version by a Greek word meaning choice (*Biblia Hebræica*; see Field's *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*). It is represented in the Chaldee version also (*Targum Jonathan*), and in the Vulgate.

of the Babylonians at the capture of Jerusalem was Nebuzaradan, captain of guard (2 Kin. xxv. 8-20; Jer. xxxix. 9-13 et passim), and that Nebuchadnezzar raised Daniel to the rank of master of magicians (Dan. v. 11) and made him chief of governors over the wise men of Babylon (ii. 48). So Ahijah, descendant of Eli, priest of Jehovah in Shiloh, was bearer of ephod. His official title was ephod-bearer. In his official capacity of ephod-bearer the priest of the lineage of Eli was with the king of Israel in this critical hour for the nation. Officially he was ephod-bearer for the nation. Such appears to be the meaning that belongs to the peculiar form of statement.

The fact itself appears a second time a little farther on in the same narrative, where it is written: Saul said unto Ahijah, Bring hither the ark of God; for the ark of God was in that day and the children of Israel (1 Sam. xiv. 18). Evidently the text is corrupt; but fortunately in one important particular it is established by the concurrent testimony of ancient versions. In the makeshift translation adopted in the English version the passage reads thus: Bring hither the ark of God, for the ark of God was *there* at that time with the children of Israel. The margin of the Revised Version notes that "some editions of Sept.³⁸ have, Bring hither the ephod. For he wore³⁹ the ephod at that time before Israel." For reasons that need not be entered into here, this reading of the Septuagint has been accepted by textual critics and commentators generally, as representing the original Hebrew. Ahijah had the ephod, not likely the ark, with him at the time. He had the ephod itself with him, not merely the title of office derived from it. So much for the first part of the verse. In the latter half of the verse, whether it was ark or ephod which was originally written there—and it makes no material difference to the meaning of the sacred

³⁸ B and Lucian.

³⁹ So the Revised Version, both English and American; but the Greek verb is *airein*, to carry, bear (not, to wear). It testifies, of course, to the presence of the verb *nasa'* in the Hebrew text.

historian which word is preferred by textual criticism—there once stood before ark or ephod the word bearer, as is witnessed by the Greek version. The priest Ahijah is stated to have been at that time⁴⁰ officially ark-bearer⁴¹ or ephod-bearer, and for this reason was competent to make inquiry of Jehovah. And for whom did he hold this office? The answer is given by a couple of words at the end of the sentence, which are guaranteed by a comparison of the Hebrew and Greek texts: he was at that time ark-bearer or ephod-bearer “before Israel” (לפני) ⁴² or “for the children of Israel” (לבני). Ahijah held this official priestly position for Israel. It was a national ecclesiastical office, and it was

⁴⁰ Hebrew *bayyom hahu'*. Whether “that day” is interpreted in the restricted sense of one particular day (Arnold, *Ephod and Ark*, p. 13 and note 2, “on the day in question”) or, in accordance with its quite frequent use, is understood to denote a period and rendered “at that time” (A. V. and R. V.; Wellhausen, *Text der Bücher Samuelis*, S. 89, Nowack, and Löhr, “damals”; see Josh. xiv. 9, 1 Sam. iii. 2, 2 Kin. iii. 6, 2 Chron. xv. 11, Jer. xxxix 10, and in reference to the future Deut. xxxi. 17, 1 Sam. iii. 12, viii. 18, Isa. ii. 11, *et passim*), makes no essential difference in the general meaning of the passage. The latter interpretation is, however, the correct one; since it is impossible to think that the narrator is describing the priest in the act of conducting a solemn spectacle before the army, as the restricted interpretation implies, and especially since Ahijah was sojourning at headquarters, abiding with Saul and the army, as told in verses 2 and 3.

⁴¹ At a later period another descendant of Eli, Abiathar by name, held the position of ark-bearer, and on occasion took active part in bearing the ark (2 Sam. xv. 29 with 24). And in 1 Kin. ii. 26 f, of Abiathar it is written, “Because thou barest the ark of Jehovah before David”; “namely, both on the occasion of its solemn conveyance to Jerusalem (1 Chron. xv. 11 seq) and also on David’s flight from Absalom (2 Sam. xv. 24, 29), that is to say, because of his high-priestly dignity” (Keil). “By its tense the verb denotes not a habitual act, but the function of ark-bearing, taken as a whole” (Beecher, *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, art. Abiathar): and “dem Zusammenhange nach mit jenem Satze nichts Anderes als das heilige Amt überhaupt, welches Abj. unter (der Hebräer sagt vor) David verwaltet hatte, bezeichnet sein kann” (Thenius, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 1849, S. 18).

⁴² On the conformity of the phrase “before Israel” to the usage of Hebrew prose, see H. P. Smith, *Samuel*, p. 112 bottom. Compare the use of the preposition in Num. viii. 22, Deut. xviii. 7, 2 Sam. xvi. 19, 2 Chron. xix. 11.

filled by a member of the priestly family that had ministered for centuries in the sanctuary at Shiloh. The earlier passage which describes Ahijah (verse 3) and this one (verse 18) tell the same story: Ahijah, head of the priestly family of Shiloh, was ephod-bearer in those days, in his official capacity he was with the king (verse 3) and in his office was agent for the nation (verse 18). His priestly office was national. Thus in the history of Israel, as in the earlier days so now, the chief minister in the sanctuary which was founded by Moses in the wilderness and established at Shiloh after the conquest, is the only priest who is found officially occupying a national ecclesiastical position and officiating in the priestly office, himself or by deputy, in behalf of the entire nation.

In summary, the intention and function of the sanctuary erected by Moses, the selection of Shiloh for its permanent location in the land of Israel, its possession of the ark, the common property of the tribes and the one national symbol, and the position which the priest of the ark occupied in national affairs combine to certify that Shiloh was not merely the principal sanctuary in Israel in the time of the judges, but the national sanctuary and recognized by Israel as such.

JOHN D. DAVIS.

Princeton.