

THE ATTITUDE OF THE
PROPERTY TO THE
CULT.

.....

THE OTHER SIDE.

BEST COPY

AVAILABLE

11 2 1

P R E F A C E.

In accordance with long established custom, allow me to apologize for the following pages. They represent the results of some months' reading and consideration, and of about three months' writing. I am sorry that the nature of the thesis has turned out to be somewhat different from that which I intended to write at first; in fact it has become the very thing that I dreaded it would. My intention was to consider each prophet, quite impartially, and to extract from the accepted authentic writings of each (in so far as my limited experience and ability allowed), the positive attitude of each toward the cult. Had I pursued my original plan and considered every statement made by a prophet in which sacrifices are mentioned, the bulk of my remarks on some single prophet might have exceeded that of the whole of this thesis. In the present work, I have taken up for discussion only the leading sentences, what may be termed "pointers." In considering the prophets I have tried to show the line of the development of the prophetic attitude. In so doing, only the general current had to be noticed. I have therefore left entirely out of account some minor prophets, from whom we have no distinctive utterance on the subject and who would

II.

not, at all events, have influenced the movement.

I desire here to express my thanks to the members of the faculty for assistance and counsel rendered, and for suggestions which have been valuable in the preparation of the thesis.

The following books have been consulted in the preparation of this work. Wherever the statements made are not discreditable to them, the credit should be theirs.

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| Robertson Smith: | "Prophets of Israel." |
| | "Religion of the Semites." |
| | "Old Testament in the Jewish Church." |
| | Article "Joel" in <i>Encycl. Britt.</i> |
| T. K. Cheyne: | Isaiah, (Haupt). |
| | "Prophecies of Isaiah." |
| | "Hosea," (Cambridge). |
| | "Isaiah," (Britt). |
| A. T. Kirkpatrick: | "The Doctrine of the Prophets." |
| E. B. Pusey: | "Minor Prophets." (Cam). |
| S. Driver: | "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament." |
| | "Isaiah and his Times." |
| G. A. Smith: | Isaiah. (Expos. Bible). |
| A. B. Davidson: | "Ezekiel." (Cambridge Bible). |
| J. S. Black: | "Ezekiel." (Britt). |
| Philippson: | Philosophische Vorlesungen (IV). |

III.

Oernill:	"Prophets of Israel."
	"Jeremiah." (Haupt. Bib).
Darmstetter:	"Prophets of Israel."
Renan:	"History of the People of Israel."
Montefiore:	Hibbert Lectures.
Kuenen:	"Ezechiel."
	"Prophets and Prophecy."
	"Religion of Israel."
Wellhausen:	"Prolegomena." (E. T.)
	"Israel." (I. G. Britt).
Dahn:	"Theologie der Propheten."
Smend:	"Alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte."
	"Ezekiel." (Es. Cf. Ex. Hdbch).
Keil & Delitzsch:	Prophets. (Gom).

The Encyclopaedia Britannica has been consulted on all the separate prophets, though not mentioned above.

C O N T E N T S.

CHAPTER	PAGE
PREFACE -----	I.
INTRODUCTION -----	1.
I. AMOS -----	5.
II. HOSRA -----	14.
III. ISAJAH -----	28.
IV. REFORM, REACTION AND REFORM --	42.
V. JEREMIAH -----	49.
VI. EZEKIEL -----	60.
VII. THE LATER PROPHETS -----	70.

INTRODUCTION.

I cannot consider it my task in this short introduction, to give an outline of the history of sacrifices from the earliest times up to the time of the prophets. The task is too great for one small chapter, and the particulars not vital enough for my thesis, to be given three or four chapters. The most that I can essay here is to indicate in a general way the differencing marks of the pre-exilic and the later sacrificial systems. As I did not consider this the main topic of my work, I have limited my reading on this point to Robertson Smith's "Religion of the Semites," (Lectures VI - XI); Wellhausen "Prolegomena, etc." (E. T.) (Chapter II); Smend "Alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte," (Part I, IV 9) Montefiore "Hibbert Lectures" (III - VI).

1. The important consideration to notice at the start is that the post-exilic cult was a legal cult; described and prescribed in a law book; the pre-exilic and pre-Deuteronomic cult was nothing more than crystallized custom. The one could be limited and carried out to the letter, the other was spontaneous and personal, hence it often led to shameful excesses. 2. A further difference was that the one was a personal system more than the other. Of course, no sacrifice in those early days was a purely personal matter. But what I mean is that under the new regime the individual was taken entirely out of the religious life. The local shrines, Bamoth, were the ganglia as it were, of the religious nerve system. When these centers were destroyed and the whole sys-

tem under the new regime made to receive its religious impulse from one great centre, the religious activity was but perfunctory. 3. Another fact to notice is that the character of the worship was different under the two systems. In early times, it was of a joyous character, such as we see unsuccessfully trying to survive in Deuteronomy. Every sacrifice partook of the nature of a thankoffering. The sacrificial ceremony was a convivial feast. The worshipper and his friends ate and drank and were merry, and they gave unto God what was God's. So this sacrifice put them on a favorable footing with God--thus partaking also of an expiatory sacrifice. Special offerings for special purposes (like the sin offering, etc. in the Priestly Code), there were none. Now in the later code, the whole spirit is changed. The joyful spirit is gone. The people coming to Jerusalem were commanded to be happy. They could not be so, however. They could be happy and joyful in bringing their gifts to God only when they did so at their own shrines; where each worshipper had a large part in bringing the offering (in fact, every paterfamilias was a priest, in a way). So in a word, under the old cult, the sacrificial system was woven into the life of the people. They loved their with their innumerable traditions and associations, and inaugurated every event of any importance with a sacrifice at those places.

later it was entirely different; they could eat flesh without sacrifices; hence the festal character of the meal was largely gone. The Zadokite priests, and they only, did the official sacrificing. Free-will offerings grew less and less in importance; the prescribed sacrifices took the first place. The people became estranged from their "religion" in so far as their religion was merely sacrifice. (I have shown later on that this was a beneficial result).

Now, the earlier prophets had a hard problem to solve. The Canaanitish cult which the people practised was tainted by the worst kind of idolatry and immorality. We can easily understand how under such a system it was that in times of peril, the people turned with grim zeal to their offerings and sacrifices. When they became really earnest in this, the result was atrocious, even child sacrificing being frequent. That the system was bad, no one would deny, but how could it be remedied? That was the grave question which confronted the prophets. To them the solution was natural and simple. The early prophets held that the whole system must be abolished. Now that this should be the logical and direct conclusion may not appear, at once, to the reader. But it was nevertheless so, as long as the Bamoth existed. For while the Bamoth (really old Canaanitish sacred places) were still the places of worship, there was absolutely no way of reaching the people. The immorality and idolatry that were so prevalent were inseparably connected

with the Baal worship. That was a heritage from Canaan. Canaanitish immorality was the distinctive feature of the worship. And while that worship persisted, the heinous vice that went hand in hand with it, thrived too. The prophets were primarily preachers of morality. Whether or not they objected to sacrifices on the enlightened principles which would be advanced to-day does not matter; it was enough that immorality was inevitably connected with sacrifice. Hence they desired to abolish what they considered the cause of it all. Sacrifice and the Baal must go together.

Of course with the promulgation of Deuteronomy the question assumed a new aspect. The Baal could be abolished and still sacrifices to Yahwe continued at Jerusalem. When the scheme was published the prophetic party (who indeed originated it) rejoiced, but the people scowled. Deuteronomy was in force thirteen years (621 - 608), then the people revolted, and the old joys (what a change circumstances made) $\times$ Cult was again introduced, till the fall. But the step had been taken, and the easier method perceived. At first it failed because the people could not easily be divorced from their high places. But the exile weaned them from this obstacle, and on the return the compromise was adopted. All post-Deuteronomic prophets (except Jeremiah q. v.) because they saw in this compromise an attainment of their end, viz: a moral people, accepted sacrifice, i. e. did not violently oppose it, as did all the prophets up to Jeremiah. This last statement I shall attempt to prove in the following chapters.

Chapter I.

AMOS.

Amos was a herdsman from Tekoa, a small village in the South of Judah, when he received his call to prophesy to Israel. His whole life was marked by that simplicity which characterized all those who lived near the Southern desert. On receiving the call to go to Israel to prophesy, he must have been forcibly impressed by the striking difference between the rustic life as he had seen it and lived it in that quiet little village of Judah, and the highly colored, artificial life which he encountered in the degenerate cities of the Northern Kingdom. Not only was the social life of the people immoral, but also their religion. Formality took the place of thought and feeling; sacrifice became, as such, the means of communion with God and the expression of worship. Now, no doubt to Amos, as to all ancients of that time, sacrifice appeared as the ordinary form of worship. At the local shrines of the people intercourse was always to be had with God through the medium of sacrifice. But, as we have seen, this desire for communion or intercourse, originated in a feeling of reverence; at one time the sacrifice involved as a necessity, a condition of the worshipper befitting such an occasion; the fact of this approach to God awoke in the primitive reverential mind the consciousness of his moral duties and obligations. A man offered his sacrifices be-

cause he felt owed or inspired; or because he desired favor or information from God. The point I wish to make is that he did not sacrifice for the sake of sacrificing.

But in the Kingdom of Israel, the prophet found a different and anomalous state of affairs. He found there that all moral feeling and reverent attitude was absent. While the people attended with all scrupulousness to the details of an intricate and expensive cult, they in no wise heeded the moral law of God, but indulged in every immorality and excess, as a necessary accompaniment of the sacrifice. To him, who was essentially the prophet of righteousness and justice, such a course appeared both absurd and ill-foreboding. The question instinctively formed in his mind: "What does God require of them? Is it sacrifice or is it justice? Does the quantity of slaughter indicate and measure God's favor to Israel, or is it $\eta \eta \gamma \delta$ and $\cup \phi \psi \rho$? Can a multitude of sacrifices at Bethel and Gilgal justify their oppression of the poor and needy? II 6 sq.

Thoughts such as these wrought the fury of the prophets to a high pitch, and caused him to break out with passion against the whole unrighteous system.

IV 4. 5. "Come to Bethel and transgress; to Gilgal and sin greatly, and bring your sacrifices every morning and your tithes every three days; burn your leaven as a thanksgiving and beast of your free will gifts," -- but in

the face of God will it avail? No indeed, for it is not his will that ye perform these, but your own כִּי כֵן אֶהְיֶתם
That closing phrase I think is significant. It indicates that the whole business is without divine sanction. If their valueless sacrifice and elaborate and immoral cult, constitute the whole of their religion--see unto them! Let them prepare to meet their God (IV 12 b), an overthrow will be theirs worse than Sodom and Gomorrah. דָּר שׁוֹנִי

וְחִי (V 4) "Seek me and live" That is what Amos announces as the only way to salvation. "But," think the people, "That is just what we are doing. Do we not continually seek Yahwe? Do we not go to the shrines and sacrifice?" But Amos gives the needed commentary. "Do not go to Bethel and Gilgal, and pass not to Beersheba," where you offer sacrifices, and sacrifices without number, "For I despise your feasts, neither will I smell in your solemn assemblies. Yea, though ye offer me your burnt offerings and your oblations I will not be pleased, neither will I regard the thankofferings of fat beasts. Did ye offer to me, sacrifices and meal offerings in the forty years of your wandering in the wilderness, O house of Israel?"

V 21 seq. Clearly in order to propitiate God, a course entirely different must be pursued. A moral regeneration must be effected. "Justice must flow like water and righteousness like a mighty stream." By leading to such a forceful climax, Amos in his passionate anger avows his bitter opposition to the cult. And this opposition seems to me unconditional. The abuse and folly which the popular

sacrificial system engendered, made clear to the mind of the prophet the utter uselessness of it. He proclaims with emphasis that God's requirement is justice and righteousness. (V 24).

In his short visit to the Northern kingdom of wickedness, it has become painfully evident to him that sacrifice, which to everybody (and even to himself heretofore) seemed the only means of acquiring God's aid and protection, was a useless and meaningless custom. A custom it was, no doubt, long established and deeply rooted, but it was neither inaugurated or sanctioned by God (cf Jer. VII 22). It had no ethical signification and therefore it had no right to exist. For morality is the keystone of prophecy. The prophets, as did Amos, unflinchingly opposed everybody and everything that was immoral or could exist along with immorality. That such gross immorality could thrive alongside the cult, was to him a sure sign of its impending abrogation, and of the end of the people. IX 1 sq. This conviction thus ending the book, considered along with the other verses I have quoted, makes the prophet's stand unmistakably.

In this, as in his crusade against social injustice, Amos is the advocate of simplicity. So with most of the prophets; they uphold the austere plainness of the rugged nomad and farmer, and they abhor the growing delicacy and luxury, the decay, which wealth and civilization bring with them. Amos announces (VI 1 sq.) "Wee to those that are at ease in Zion and confident in Samaria," where wealth and

indulgence abound on all sides. See what has happened to those ancient seats of wealth and ease, Calneh, Hamath and Gath.

They lay on ~~sumptuous~~ couches and fed on young lambs and calves; they had music and wine and unctions. Yet where are they now? So too, beware Israel; for God hates the pride of Jacob, the self-sufficiency which a prosperous people feels." So with the Cult which they borrowed from the Canaanites and which God commanded them not. They offered numberless cattle and sheep, they burnt the costliest incense, and they had elaborated a ritual with great detail. The priests had all the benefit therefrom, while the poor and the needy had to furnish the wherewithal for the sumptuous and virtuous living of this exclusive, aristocratic caste. As the prophet of social justice and equity, Amos would naturally have turned against this abuse. While he does this, it falls in with his religious convictions. For though he is a social reformer and opposes the corrupt cult on social grounds--he inveighs against it for its religious falsity. The sacrifices are vain. He brings together in a new way religion and morality, and thus helps lay the foundation of that ethical monotheism, which is the fruit of the prophetic culture. It is time that Elijah was a prophet of righteousness and justice ^(of in re) (Naboth) as were also Nathan and God. It is further probable that the idea, which is given such distinct utterance by Amos, was fermenting in the intervening century. Still its first public expression as a doctrine that concerned the whole people, as a people, comes from Amos. He chose a public place and a public

occasion to enunciate this (to the people) new doctrine; a place which was typical of the old idea which he wished to uproot. While the people were gathered at one of their religious feasts at Bethel, the most important sanctuary in Israel, when they were, no doubt, deeply impressed with the importance and propriety of the ceremony, and confident of its good results, Amos, a grim, sombre-visaged man, dressed in the well-known hairy cloak of the prophets, steps in front of the assembly, and instead of joining in the festive songs, breaks forth into a sorrowful dirge. "The virgin of Israel is fallen, she will no more rise. She lieth forsaken on her land, there is none to raise her." The end is coming, the feasts will be changed to mourning because "the rich swallow up the poor and make the needy to fail. (VIII 4 R V). Yet they think they are pious and religious. They had no notion that anything but worship (i.e. the cult) had any thing to do with religion. All they thought necessary was to go to the sanctuary with presents, to seek God's favor by bringing gifts. Amos also says, that the object of their religion is to seek God, but he explains it differently (cf V 14) ¹⁰⁷⁷ ²⁷ ⁸⁵¹ ²¹⁰ Seek good and not evil.

When the prophet goes into so detailed an explanation of what he considers the religious duty of the individual, and the manner of approaching God, it seems to me that there can be no doubt as to the *motif of V 21-25*. I don't think that they, in any way, sanction sacrifice combined with morality. The context does not show it.

Besides that idea is late. It is timely in Ezekiel and the Priestly code. The exilic and post exilic leaders had the benefit of prophetic teaching, and of Deuteronomy. The effect of these (cf. infra) was the compromise combination of the cult with morality (which in fact equals the P.C.) But with Amos, I can see no such middle path. He is outspoken in his denunciation of the pompous and sinful cult. And the literary form of his declamations seems to indicate that he was entirely cognizant of the full import of his words. For before he closes his fiery denunciation of sacrifices with the clinching interrogation as the climax *הֲיִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לְאֵלִים וְלִבְשֵׁי שֵׂרָפִים* he first interposes what he considers the desideratum *בְּיָמֵינוּ* : *לֹא יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה אִישׁ לְאֵלִים וְלִבְשֵׁי שֵׂרָפִים* One is almost tempted to say that the whole inspiring mission of Amos was anti-sacrificial, or at least, anti-cult. His closing chapter begins with a description of the destruction of the altar and the annihilation of those who trust in its efficacy. And in this Amos attains his highest. His statement is one of the broadest universalism. For in breaking the altar which rests on infamy and wickedness, which creates confidence in the prerogative and peculiarity of Israel--he throws down the ancient barriers and gives to the world its God. Now as never before we appreciate the fact that all men are brethren having one father. "For are ye not like the sons of the Ethiopians to me, O sons of Israel. If I brought Israel out of Egypt--did I not also bring the Philistines from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir?" (IX 7.) "As their wickedness recoiled upon them, so also will yours on you, and

I do it, in spite of your having been chosen, and of all your rites and sacrifices."

NOTES.

The three important verses of Amos bearing on the subject have been quoted. They are:

IV 4. 5. באר בית אל ופגעו הגלגל הרבו לפשע
הביא לבקר זבחים שלשת ימים מעשרתכם
ורטר מחמץ תורה ורראו נדבות השמיצו כי
כן איהבתם בני ישראל נאם ה'

This verse is evidently against the current Yahwe worship.

V 21 - 25. שנאתי כואסתי חגיגכם ולא ארוח בעצרתים
כי אם תעלו לי עולות ומנחתים לא ארצה ושלם
טריאכם לא אביט... ריגל כמים טשטש וצדקה
כנחל איון: הובחים ומנחה הגשתם לי במדבר ערבעים שנה

This impugns the cult and postulates righteousness and justice, as the religious and ethical desiderata. After such statements, so full of passion and scorn, I cannot see how anything like toleration of sacrifices can be deduced from Amos's teaching.

IX 1. ראיתי את ה' נצב על המזבח ויאמר ה' הכפתור וירישו
הספים ובצצם בראש כלם ואחריתם בחרב אהרג לגינוס מהם בס וכל
ימלח מהם כליט:

The destruction of the altar and all those who have faith in its saving and helping power.

Of also: II 6 sq; III 14; V 2, 4, 5, 6, 7; 14; VI 1 sq. VII 10 sq. VIII 4 sq. VIII 11, IX 7 sq.

Chapter II.

HOSEA.

In the preceding chapter I have attempted to show that Amos was hostile to the cult. In this I shall consider his younger contemporary, Hosea. He began his prophetic career under Jeroboam II, toward the close of his reign, which was a time of great material prosperity. The magnificent cult at Bethel, rendered so much more magnificent at this time, was an evidence of the liberal, wide-awake policy of this successful monarch. It required not only great bravery but also great insight into history and a deeply religious feeling--for Hosea to characterize this reign, which to all the people was manifestly pleasing to God, as a whoredom and apostasy. (Cf CG. I - III). After Jeroboam died, a period of virtual anarchy (not an interregnum, however) followed. King after King ascended the throne in rapid succession, murder and usurpation being generally the only right of succession. Now too, the external foe plainly showed its hand and threatened the existence of Israel. The people remembering perhaps, the sinister threatenings of Amos, were palpably terrified. The two avenues of relief were utilized by the state; they sought foreign political aid and the aid of Yahwe by turning with increased zeal and vigor to their cult, by redoubling the number of their sacrifices. Socially or morally they did not

think of changeing. Their religious activity consisted in trying to sate their God with the blood of sacrifices or in attempting to dull his senses with the smoke of their oblations. At this time the prophet gives most passionate utterance to his disapproval of their course. His opposition to the system is violent. He opposed it "not merely on the ground that it had the absurd motive of forcing Jehovah's favor, but also because it was of heathenish character, nature-worship and idolatry." (Wellhausen Israel Britt).

Hosea was a prophet of much deeper feeling than Amos. He has been called the Jeremiah of Israel. He saw the inevitable doom of Israel, and like Jeremiah in Judah two centuries later, he saw no averting the calamity. Destruction was bound to come, because Israel had forgotten its personal relation to Yahwe and had prostituted to other gods. It had adopted the Canaanitish cult. To the ordinary Israelite this cult was the most important part of the religion. Ritual acts, not moral, seemed to him truly religious. Hence the whole misconception, and Hosea's wrath. When the Israelite thought he was worshipping Yahwe, Hosea thunders against him for idolatry and infidelity to Yahwe. That this is literally true cannot be doubted. At Gilgal and Bethel, we know, there was the calf worship. Yet when the worshipper paid his respects at these shrines, he swore "As Yahwe liveth." (IV 15).

We see from this that Hosea was not satisfied with a mere recognition of Yahwe as God; he wanted much more; he would have no semblance of these other gods which the surrounding nations worshipped. Even their service was repugnant to him. And this is how he came to oppose the cult. It was Canaanitish, heathenish. Certainly this does not prove that he opposed sacrifices as such, although he does proclaim their sinful character in a sinful ritual. We have therefore to seek further evidence of his dislike of sacrifices, as such.

We have seen the universality of Amos. With him the bond between God and Israel is justice and righteousness. That alone, and nothing more, was sufficient communion with Yahwe. With Hosea we found an entirely different essential. And this, as much as anything, brings into strong belief the contrast between the two prophets. Hosea is as intense as Amos is broad. When Amos surveys a whole universe, and announces his principles of a liberality as wide as it, Hosea delves deep into the recesses of the human soul and penetrates the source of the spirit life. His prophecies are all emotion. And it was the intensity of his emotion that guided him to a new thought in the religious development of Israel. In that, I think, we can locate his superiority over Amos. Amos, it is true, also gave us a new thought in prophetic literature. He announces a God of justice. He is not a narrow provincial and partial God, but equally the father of all man-

kind. Still we must remember that Amos stands at the end of a century which was probably the most fertile in all ancient Hebrew religious history. In it was wrought the great change that produced from the old clan worship, which was common to all Semian tribes, the lofty religion of prophecy, broad, universal, just. This justice is a new attribute and to Amos we owe its first publication. He is a genius in that he says what probably was thought, though unexpressed before him. But Hosea, that man of deep and stirring passions, in his character and his mission was the complement of Amos; taken together they comprise all prophecy. Take 'the central teaching of Amos--justice universal, and combine with it the central passion of Hosea, love, and you have the supreme height of ancient prophecy, and the core of modern Judaism.

As I have indicated Hosea's all impelling motive is love. God loves Israel as a son, (XI 1 sq) as a spouse, (I - III; V 4, 7 et Passim). Hence he cannot brook unfaithfulness. Return of affection is all that is required. We can feel the mighty passion that must have stirred the prophet's frame, when he sees instead of rendering a pure return of this love to God, Israel, priests, prophets and people frittering away his resources and energy in thousands of sacrifices at the shrine of the bull and in making fruitless alliances with Egypt and Assyria. What a lesson of infidelity he had learnt from his own saddened life!

It is in this connection that we have Hosea's first reference to sacrifice. He speaks of the time of probation which he has proscribed for Gomer, as conditional to her full reinstatement into conjugal equality (III 3). She must forego all pleasure and gratification of her natural desire. Such conditions being fulfilled, she is admitted again into Hosea's favor, and her past misdoing is forgotten. So with Israel. Before Israel can again come into God's grace, she must give up חַבֵּל, בָּזָז, וְשִׁמְרָה (V. 4). These are evidently evils, and the causes of Israel's backsliding. Under the circumstances I cannot well see how sacrifice could be left out of the proscription. It certainly was exceedingly influential in making Israel go after other gods. Inasmuch as Ephod, Theraphim and Masseba must undoubtedly have been opposed by Hosea, we cannot doubt that he opposed sacrifices too. (Of note). It may be maintained that this verse does not oppose sacrifices as such. Now, although I think I can show the contrary, I will admit that it, by itself would not be sufficient to establish that Hosea did object to them ~~per se~~, it might be said to regard his opposition merely to the Canaanitish cult. Likewise IV 13, has that aim. From these then we cannot infer that even without immorality, sacrifice can have no place in Hosea's religion. But when we bring to bear his other utterances on the subject--those on which the full intensity of his spirit and the deep religiosity of the man are revealed--we can have no doubt that Hosea's religion was a very simple one, entirely free of the intricate ritual of his day. V 6, VI 6, VIII 13.

Chapter IV is a forceful description of the disorder, which reigned in Israel, right after the death of Jeroboam II. There might be material enough in the chapter to make good our contention, were the readings certain. This much we do know from the chapter; that the awful condition of the state politically, had made the people turn to their cruder faith. They worshipped stocks and stones and sacrificed on every green hill. The people had gone astray and committed whoredom. "They shall be ashamed of their sacrifices."

V 6 is more intelligible. In this chapter, Hosea addresses himself to the prophets and priests, the teachers of the people and the leaders of thought. They are primarily to blame for the infidelity of the people. Priests are no better than the people (cf IV 9). "They may come with their sacrifices of flocks and herds to seek God, but they will not find him, he is withdrawn from them." In other words, the people, led by the priests, sin and think to appease God by sacrifice. Now, I submit, that even this thought is an advance upon the popular theology. To the people, sacrifice, in itself, was an act pleasing to God, and potent to make amends for their wrong doing; or at least, to neutralize its evil effect. This, then is a thought that may lead to higher planes. It separates Yahwe worship from heathenism, and makes it a sincere and pure religion. And in following our prophet, we find that he does not disappoint us, but does lead up to higher and

nobler things. In chapter VI he strikes a note which makes his position ethically modern. He breathes forth that spirit of love which Yahwe feels for his people. "He will heal all wounds and bind up the bruises," when the wayward ones return. Yes "when," but when? How ridiculous that sounds to him amid his depressing surroundings! Ephraim's $\pi\alpha\pi$ is like a vanishing morning mist (v. 4). Instead of this feeling, this spirit (which he always emphasizes), he sees the foolish and wicked people, mistaking their whole relation to Yahwe. They know nothing but sacrifice and slaughter, altars and gutters reeking with blood and choking with smoke. What superficiality! Do they imagine to bribe Yahwe with the blood of thousands of victims? Do they not know that he does not even want sacrifices; but love and piety and kindness, ($\pi\alpha\pi$) he prefers the knowledge of God immeasurably to their holocausts. (v. 5). This is the culminating point of his prophecy. It characterizes the man Hosea, as Am V 24 sums up his predecessor. The latter (Amos) was impressed and roused by the want of justice and righteousness; the former, the deeply emotional man, was enraged by the lack of the knowledge of God and the absence of that tender feeling, of love (better of "pietas," as $\pi\alpha\pi$ has been explained) which the people plainly owed to their God. The language of this verse is unequivocal. (VI. 5) כי חסד חס צדי ולא

$\text{זבח ודעת אלהים בעיניו}$

For I desire "pietas" and not sacrifice and the knowledge of

God and not holocausts. (I do not hesitate to translate the *ו* of *לֹא־יִבְיֶה* as the negative--for the construction is not at all strange. Of any Hebrew grammar).

Thus, Hosea, though arriving at the same point regarding sacrifices as did Amos, passes beyond him in one respect and does not reach him in another. He does not reach Amos, I think, in that universality and liberality which we noticed in the older prophet. He surpasses him, however, in laying so much stress on the proper feeling, in making God's relation to Israel one of love, par excellence, and in making man's highest duty, not only *לֹא־יִבְיֶה* and *לֹא־יִבְיֶה* but *לֹא־יִבְיֶה*, which is dependent upon a full and filial *לֹא־יִבְיֶה*. In the Book of Hosea, too, we have a great gain in being able to find the positive religion of the prophet. While indeed Amos did say *לֹא־יִבְיֶה* he does not tell us what people should substitute for sacrifices. Now, as to the shallow, this is a vital objection--it is quite pleasing to be able to point to a passage which entirely fills the void created by the abolition of the cult. In closing the book, Hosea leaves with us as the lingering thought, the love of God for Israel. It is the old idea and aspiration (which to the prophet was a conviction), of a restoration after the destruction. "Ephraim is returned and faithful once more, what has he to do with idols? His backsliding is healed, he trusts no more to his horses." And how does the prophet picture the return of the wayward people? Must

he offer numberless sacrifices to Yahwe, to evince his faithfulness and expiate his folly? Shall he offer holocausts to Yahwe, provided he is moral and offers them to Yahwe only?

קחו עמכם דברים ושובו אל ה' אמרו אלירכס
תשא עון וקח טוב ונשלמה פרים פתינו:

"Take with you words and return to Yahwe; say to him, 'Altogether forgive iniquity and accept the good and we will give the fruit of our lips.' The text may be a little difficult, but the meaning is plain. Israel is returning to Yahwe, and Hosea takes up the old idea that none appear empty-handed. "What gift then will be most acceptable to their heavenly King? The answer that will naturally rise to the lips of a half converted Israelite will be "sacrifices and burnt-offerings." But the prophet in his present mood cherishes the belief that Israel's repentance will after all, not be as superficial as he once feared (V 6). He therefore, urges his people after the bitter lessons of experience, to take as their offerings not cattle, but penitent words spoken out of the abundance of the heart." (Cheyne). Such a state of affairs brings us to the spirit of VI 6. And thus, it is coincidental, that Hosea should leave us, as did Amos, with a vision of the future when there should be no sacrifices. And here, let me remark, we again see the complementary dispositions of the almost contemporaneous prophets. Amos's was a vision of wrath and dire destruction, the justice of God being at work,

uprooting evil. By sheer power the altar is shattered
into fragments. But Hosea forecasts a blissful time--
Israel voluntarily returns to God in and is blessed by
God's benign goodness. God has healed their backsliding
and loves them freely. He is like dew to Israel; he shall
blossom as a lily and cast forth his roots like Lebanon.
(V. 6. 7).

NOTES.

The passages in our book bearing on the subject are:

III כִּי יָמִים רַבִּים יֵשְׁבוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֵין מֶלֶךְ וְאֵין שָׂרָף
וְאֵין זָבַח וְאֵין מַצֵּבָה וְאֵין אִפֹּד וְתִרְפִּים
(cf. Jer. 17) "For many days shall the children of Israel

dwell without a king or prince; without sacrifice or a
massēba, without an ephod or teraphim." Fully to explain
this verse is a little difficult, mainly because the sym-
bolic acts in v. 3, to which its incidents are parallel, are
themselves not perfectly clear. In v. 3 Gomer is made to
refrain from all her bad habits, לֹא תַעֲשֶׂי וְלֹא תִהְיֶי לְאִישׁ
in order to be fit to fulfill her wifely duties. וְאֵין מֶלֶךְ וְאֵין שָׂרָף
Now right here the question is whether this closing phrase

intimates that she is to be installed as wife or not. Most
commentators think not, thus taking these last words to read,
וְאֵין מֶלֶךְ וְאֵין שָׂרָף This is advocated by Aben Ezra and

Kimchi. I do not think, however, that such is the sense.

Calvin (quoted by Cheyne) translates, "Ego vicissim tibi
fidem meam obligo" which I think more nearly renders the
meaning. "Thou shalt not go awhoring and shall not be

for a man (i.e. except himself) and so I (will be) for thee."
Such conditions being fulfilled, Gomer is again considered as
fully restored to favor and the wife of Hosea. Now the

difficulty in drawing the parallel is this: Gomer evident-
ly must refrain only from those things which are evil. She
must not be a whore. But in the case of Israel, are the

things proscribed only evil? Can Hosea characterize שרף לך
and נאך as evil? To me the answer is clearly enough
affirmative. For the kings and princes of Israel he does
not say a good word in his whole book (but of VIII 4, VII 5, 7)
In fact, he foretells a removal of the kings in God's ire,
before there can be a regeneration. (Of XIII 9 - 11).

no one has attempted to show
as favored by Hosea. Since נאך is mentioned right along
with them, it too is included among the evil customs.

על ראשי ההרים יזבחו ועל הגבעות
יראיו תחת אלה ולבנה ואלה כי טוב אדם על כן תזנינה
בנותיכם וכלותיכם תבאנה ואל תבאו הרבאל ואל
תעלו בית און ועל תשבעו חי ה'

These are plainly against the Canaanitish cult. I will not
take the space to refute ^{פרק} a better meaning by completing the
parallelism. To many this verse has been the stumbling
block to accepting the opinion of Hosea's hostile attitude to
sacrifices as such. Indeed Duhm sees no room for argu-
ment at all. "Der Götze beweis t IX, dass Hosea kein
Gegner der Opfer an sich ist," (p. 132). Now such opinion
as this denies its proof from the next verse (v. 5) כה תעשין
לי ליום מועד וליום חג ה' But if this verse be taken, as I think it
ought to be, as ironical, the whole matter assumes a dif-
ferent aspect. According to their notions they cannot
worship Yahwe outside of his own country (this is not the
Deut. idea of one place only). The prophet is plainly
taunting them. In what a light does that put their rel-

Continue
p. 14 The
Canaanitish
Religion

igion! As soon as they are in misfortune, are taken captives, they have no way of worshipping their God.

א.ם גלעד און אן שווארץ בגלגל שפירם זיכר גאס מיזיכחוסם נגלים על תלמי¹² XII
שדי!
The current worship is here denounced. Of also II 18.

(Even the name ^לב shall not be recalled), IV 14,
VIII 5, 6, 11, 12. IX 18, X 8, 9, 9, XI 2, XII 7, XIII 2
(read ^לזבח ^לרם) the criticism that they warn against
worshipping Yahwe outside of Jerusalem. (Pusey). It is
now generally accepted that the doctrine of having but one
place to worship Yahwe, which is first brought out in
Deuteronomy, is later than Hosen.

Explained
V 6 זבח אהרן וזבח אהרן וזבח אהרן
above. VI 6 כי חכר הפסחתי ולא זבח ודעת אלהים (Cf supra).
VIII 13 זבח אהרן וזבח אהרן וזבח אהרן As it stands
this verse is unsatisfactory. It has been suggested to read
זבח אהרן which would make it easier. "Though I write
for him the words (דברי) of my (law) instruction, they
are considered strange. Sacrifices they like, they offer
meat and eat, but the Lord accepts them not." The con-
trast is well brought out, and good sense sustained.

IX⁴ לא יסבו לה יין ולא יערכו לו זבחים כלם אונים
לחםם כל אכלי יטבאו כי לחםם לנפשם לא יבוא ביתה

I have accepted the current emendations to this verse.
While the second is palpably necessary, it may be objected
that the first is not; ערב occurs quite often.

Of (Jer III 20). Still changing the ^ב to ^כ gives

XIV 3. In this verse I have accepted the reading

continue a
p. 16
with
meaning

of the Septuagint and the Peshito (R.V. Margin). פרי
 אשפתיהן Even the labored translation (which is given in
 R. V.) by keeping פריים makes the standpoint stronger.
 XIII 2 is reference to the calf worship. Dalm thinks
 that זבחיהם ארם should be changed to זבחיהם דם.

Chapter III.

ISAIAH.

We have now to shift the scenes in order to direct our attention to the southern country. For now that the northern kingdom is declining, in fact rapidly nearing its end, the religion of Israel must look for its preservation to the smaller principality of Judah. At first blush there does not seem to be much difference in the general outlook. Although the scenes have shifted, the scenery appears very like the last. Still there are differences. In general, however, the condition of the popular religion was the same. A purely spiritual religion there was not. The religion practiced was formal. A most elaborate cult was no doubt no use. Still the southern country was poorer than the northern, so that the observance of the cult could not have been so extravagantly luxurious. Besides the proximity to the southern desert, made for a simpler, more austere religion. Further we must note that in the South there was not so great a number of Canaanitish shrines, which, in the North, had so much to do with corrupting "the faith."

Corresponding to the long and prosperous reign of Jeroboam II in Israel, was the equally long reign of Azariah (Uzziah). His reign like those of most of his predecessors was probably a conservative one. Up to this time on

account of the greater permanence of the Davidic dynasty and the small initiative of the Judean rulers there was more stability to public affairs. There were no such numerous and crying abuses, as we hear of in the Kingdom of Israel. On the other hand there was no religious progress. The lassitude of the monarchs affected a total absence of high ideals--hence religion was at a standstill. But one must not think that the religious status was any higher here than in Israel; those who have this opinion draw their conclusions from the fact that, up to this time, we do not hear of the religious misconduct of the people, as we do in Israel; there are no fierce and furious prophets to denounce the idolatry and backsliding of Judah. But this proves nothing. We do not hear of the abuses because there was no determined effort for reform, as in the North. And only where there is striving for betterment will the evils of a current system be prominently brought to the surface. Politically insignificant, making no ripple in the sea of international life, Judah, unlike Israel, was perfectly safe, and calmly pursued its happiness. There was nothing to call forth the warning voice of a prophet.

But just about this time the political horizon was assuming an altered aspect. The great world powers were coming into conflict. For the first time the little independency saw itself endangered and likely to fall. The wise, here as in the North, saw the inevitable trend of things.

Neutrality to them appeared the only way of political preservation. But they saw also under the given conditions, there was little hope that such a policy would be pursued. As is usual at such times, when there is a great crisis to forecast, the voice of prophecy is again heard.

In the last year of King Uzziah (740 ?) Isaiah, the son of Amoz, had the vision which revealed him to himself as a prophet (c VI). In this vision he "saw the Lord sitting on a throne high and exalted, and his train filled the temple. And above him stood the seraphim. And one cried to another and said, 'Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts, the fulness of the whole earth is his glory. And the foundations of the thresholds shook at the voice of him who cried and the house was filled with smoke,' (R.V.) and he said, "Woe to me, for I am undone, for I, a man of impure lips and dwelling among a people of impure lips, have seen the King, Yahwe of Hosts." And one of the seraphim touched him on the mouth and said "Thy sin is atoned." He then was fit to undertake his prophetic office.

Such a description of the initiation of the prophet is very valuable to us. It lets us into the conception of the prophet of his mission. His is at the start, a message of destruction and desolation. The people will be stiffnecked and blind until the land be wasted without inhabitant and the forsaken place be in the

midst of the land. He sees the inevitability of such a fate when he realizes the "holiness" of Yahwe, and the "uncleanness of the lips" of Judah. This chapter has some bearing on our topic. A great deal has been gotten out of it one way, while I think the inference should be quite in another direction. If written in the order of occurrence this chapter ought plainly to be first. We have no difficulty in accepting the consensus of the opinion of most critics, that it was written later on, and published as an introduction to the second series of his prophecies. To us, however, it is necessary to determine, what, if any, bearing it has on his attitude to the cult? And here I must part from some, to whose opinions great weight attaches. Cheyne (and Smend also) sees in this, that Isaiah felt no opposition to the cult, but on the contrary approved it, because this solemn occasion, his installation ceremony, he imagines to take place in the temple, with a burning altar, and the smoke of the altar (?) filling the house. I am compelled to say that I cannot accept this as sufficient proof of that point. From such purely poetic imagery, it is extremely hazardous to draw conclusions as to doctrine or dogma. It would not be fair, similarly, to charge a modern writer with approval, on religious or theological grounds, of certain ceremonies of the Catholic or Episcopalian Church, simply because he uses them to enhance the dignity and solemnity of an incident in his narration.

Besides, in this chapter, nothing of a ritual or sacrifice is mentioned. The only plain utterance, from which we may legitimately draw our conclusions is the wail, "Behold I am undone because I, who (by living among a people of unclean lips) have become unclean of lips, have seen Yahwe." And this sentence points all the other way. It is uncleanness of lips; in other words, a moral uncleanness, and not a ritual one which the prophet means. (Of note). Still it would be rather dangerous to draw any conclusions regarding Isaiah's attitude to the cult from this picture, and we will seek other timber. There is but one place in the book of Isaiah I, where we have a plain assertion on the topic. Now while it is to be regretted that there are no more passages which we can bring into evidence, it is most fortunate that this one is so perfectly clear and blunt. It is to be found in Chapter I. This chapter was written at a time when an attacking enemy had, in its baleful campaign, been devastating the whole land, and had come as far as Jerusalem. (v. 7 sq). The conditions are somewhat similar to those ⁱⁿ which Hosea found himself when called upon to prophesy to Israel. The proximity of political danger seems to have had a similar effect on the people. Isaiah finds it necessary to upbraid them for their overzealousness respecting sacrifices and offerings. They do not know that the danger comes because of moral laxity. This is the message (N W D) of God to his people, which he

sends through the prophet, " למה לי רב זבחים
יאהרן שבעתי עלות אלים וחלב חריאים ודם פרים
 What care I for the וכבשים וצמדים לא תפלת: כיא

multitude of your sacrifices. I am sated with burnt offerings of rams and with the fat of fed beasts, and in the blood of bullocks and lambs and he-goats, I have no pleasure. When you come to see my face, who hath required this of you, to trample my courts? Do not bring any more vain oblations, incense I hate; new moon, and Sabbath, your public meetings--I cannot bear iniquity and a solemn assembly."

It is undoubtedly a strong enough philippic against ritualistic religion. Not only sacrifices, but also all ceremony, he denounces as interfering with a pure spiritual faith. "Even if you stretch forth your hands in prayer" (under these circumstances) it will be unavailing. "They are full of blood." Wash you, make you clean, take away the evil of your works from before mine eyes; cease to do evil, learn to do well; seek out justice, set right the violent, do justice to the orphan, plead for the widow." It has the ring of one of Amos's stirring charges. In the midst of social and political corruption, he sounds the note of a pure faith. And when the utterance is so positive as the above quoted, I do not see how to explain away its force. There is surely no intimation of any sort of toleration in those few sentences as some (Cheyne e. g.) would have us believe. (cf infra). He states very clearly what he considers the requirements of Yahwe (v. 16, 17).

He must have created a profound impression when he spoke that noble piece. His influence we know was great; and such words, in such a crisis, with the enemy at the gate-- must have been received by the people as the *sine qua non* of deliverance. It was the direct cause of Hezekiah's reform. To be sure this reform was only partial; it did not in any way attain that spiritual height which was reached in the utterances of the prophet. Still it was an important step in the proper direction. It can hardly be doubted that they (the Hezekian reforms) were causally the forerunners of the early reforms of Josiah and of Deuteronomy. But these latter, which were surely approaches to the prophetic ideal, we will consider later.

There is another passage, contained among the first thirty-nine chapters of Isaiah, which we must notice: **IX 19. 21.** It pictures that halcyon era when Egypt and Assyria (that is, all enemies) will be converted to the faith of Yahwe. And in that joyous day (when Egypt will come to the Lord) "there will be an altar in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar by its border; and it shall be a sign and a witness to Yahwe of Hosts in the land of Egypt, etc. And Yahwe shall make himself known and the Egyptians shall know Yahwe in that day, and shall serve him with sacrifice and offering, and shall vow a vow unto Yahwe and shall pay it." There has been a great amount of discussion as to the date and authorship of these verses. On first thought they look to be early and pre-Deuteronomic,

(if not Isaianic). But in the face of numerous scholars, I must defer my own judgment and accept the results found by König, Dalm, Cheyne and others and place them much later. The grounds for this discussion are the style of this portion (XIX 16 - 25) and the standpoint. (Of note).

We see then that in the only verse of Isaiah where he mentions sacrifices at all, he violently attacks them as being the cause of making the religion of Judah formal, spiritless and hence valueless. It fits in with our estimate of that great prophet utterly to hate these conditions. And on account of his prominence and connections, he wielded a perceptible influence. Hazzakiah, a weak king, did not at first heed his wholesome advice in politics, but he bit the tempting bait held out by those who desired his co-operation in a revolt against Assyria. He soon learned, however, to appreciate the soundness of Isaiah's advice, and did not hesitate to consult him on matters of state. Later in his reign, he instituted a reform on prophetic lines, which naturally was evident primarily in the cult. The high places were suppressed and idolatry abolished. Now this required the co-operation of the priestly class. Herein lies Isaiah's chief merit; herein he paved the way for Deuteronomy. "It showed," says Barnstatter, "that the sacerdotal caste hitherto indifferent or hostile, and with no particular antipathy to idolatry was taking an active part in the prophetic movement. From this compromise between

sacerdotal Jehovahism and prophetic Jehovahism resulted within a century and a half, organized Judaism. Through this compromise the conception of the prophets abandoned its high plane; but this was necessary in order that the ideal should become real. If prophecy had remained in the realm of spirit, it would never have been able to penetrate Israel, and through Israel, the world."

The above words of the great French savant, I am glad to be able to quote. For in considering the attitude of the prophets to the cult, I have attained the same result. I am fully convinced that the Judaism of post-exilic times was a compromise; between the ideal spiritual religion of the prophets and the rigid formalism of the priests. But this compromise appeared strongly enough to take permanent root only after the destruction of Jerusalem. It made its first tentative effort in legislation in Deuteronomy, but that was only temporary. Now, though it is due to Isaiah that the compromise was effected, it should by no means be thought that Isaiah himself compromised or would countenance any. He had laid down his principles early in his career; to these he adhered. When he saw his influence in the state waning, he retired from before the public and gathered about him disciples, to whom he expounded his unpopular doctrines. He thus created a party in favor of the prophetic ideas. On account of the strength of this

party, the Josian reforms were rendered feasible. It was natural that these people, who had imbibed the doctrines of the prophets, but in whose veins coursed the formal blood of centuries of priestly nurture, should hit at the mean system. It was a retrograde step, as far as prophecy was concerned, but it was a great stride forward, in the religion of the people, toward that pure ethical monotheism, which had first to be abandoned, in order to be the more easily reached. The prophets had expected too much at the start--hence they failed. As soon as the nature and the reason of the failure was appreciated, the remedy was applied and progress made. But it was long before the prophets themselves would stoop from their supernal height.

ADDITIONAL NOTE.

The fact that the Massoretic text of Isaiah is not exactly chronologically arranged (although the three groups can be easily separated), renders the task of making any general statement regarding his opinions a little difficult. Still I think that I have sufficiently shown that he was an uncompromising opponent of the cult. It appears shifty, it seems to me, to say that the attitude of Isaiah (as of all the pre-exilic prophets) was not, indeed favorable to cult, but it was not antagonistic to it. He "tolerated" sacrifices. I might note here that when reduced to lowest terms such an attitude would involve his hostile feeling. Were he not opposed to them, as such, he would not

have to "tolerate" them. At all events such a passionate outbreak against them, as we have in I. 11 sq. does not allow an inference even, of what is generally called "toleration." Toleration is mild, not passionate. He would not call the leaders of a system which he tolerates וְיִשְׁמְרוּ and its common followers עַם הָעָרָה:

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON MICAH.

Before leaving Isaiah's times, we will glance for a moment at his younger contemporary Micah, who, we learn was very influential in bringing about the Hezekian reforms (Jer XXVI 18 sq). He was a countryman from Moresheth. It was formerly said that he merely echoes Isaiah's opinions. This we now know to be true. For at least one policy of Isaiah's he vigorously opposes. He is no believer in the inviolability of the temple or of Jerusalem. I did not trace the origin and development of this doctrine in the above chapter because it does not come within the limits of this thesis. It does not bear on Isaiah's relation to the cult. Micah, however, foretells gloomy for the perturbed kingdom. Zion will be ploughed up as a field, because it is built on iniquity. In his crusade against injustice, idolatry, etc, he is at one with Isaiah and the other prophets. The destruction which he predicts is a complete and sweeping one. Nevertheless, there will be a "remnant" upon which to build a regenerated people. That he is in the front rank of prophets must be admitted. Some of the most familiar quotations from the Bible are contained in his

book. He shows his liberal spirit by quoting, as does Isaiah, that beautiful picture of the brotherhood of man and of universal recognition of the one God. (IV, 1 sq). His life may have extended into the reign of Manasseh; at all events the only passage in his book bearing on our topic is attributed to Manasseh's time, and will be considered in the next chapter.

NOTES.

There are but three passages in the first thirty-nine chapters that can give us any hint; and they have been quoted and discussed. I, 11 sq. VI 1 sq. 4. יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ

הַסֵּפִים כִּקְוֵל הַקּוֹרֵא וְהַבִּיט יִכְלֹא עֵשֶׂן

Smend and others have argued from this that there was an offering on the altar. This seems to me a little hasty. I will admit that the coals bring hot creates a presumption in favor of such a thought. But it does not prove it. The event of the spreading of the smoke is coupled with the event of the shaking of the house.. These two phenomena are often recorded as happening together in the presence of Yahwe. Since this imagery is common in portraying God's majesty--I do not see why any further significance need be attached to it. (Cf Ex. XIX 18. 19).

XIX 19-21. יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ כִּקְוֵל הַקּוֹרֵא וְהַבִּיט יִכְלֹא עֵשֶׂן
וְהַבִּיט יִכְלֹא עֵשֶׂן

On seeing יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ here spoken of in favorable terms, one would immediately assign it to an early date. Cheyne says that even if it is pre-Deuteronomic, that does not prove it Isaianic. Certainly, but the burden of the proof would then lie with him who desires to prove its spurious character. That, however, is not necessary. Most critics put it late, some very late. The pillar need not be for worship. It may be merely a sign. At all events even if it be a violation of the letter of the Deuteronomic law, the spirit is not violated. (Cheyne

Introd. to Isaiah p. 101 sq). Cheyne says in his introduction to R. Smith's "Prophets," regarding this verse, "one can hardly believe that Isaiah would have spoken of an altar thus respectfully." (Cheyne is not in favor of the theory that Isaiah was opposed to sacrifices).

Chapter IV.

REFORM, REACTION AND REFORM.

Isaiah and Micah left their impress on the religion of Judah. In summarizing Hezekiah's reign, the author of the book of Kings says: (2 K XVIII 4 sq)

הוא קטיר את כל עצי המדבר ואת כל עצי החרש ואת כל עצי הלבנון ואת כל עצי המדבר ואת כל עצי החרש ואת כל עצי הלבנון ואת כל עצי המדבר ואת כל עצי החרש ואת כל עצי הלבנון

Perhaps the praise expressed in the last quoted verse is a little excessive; still we know, as I have said, that Hezekiah inaugurated important reforms. He broke the idols and abolished the *במות*. He instituted a purer worship. He made the temple worship the centre of the religious life. It was the first step toward the centralization of worship which was effected in Deuteronomy. It was a concession of victory to the prophetic party, which the weak king thought they merited. For surely had they not saved the day, when his courage nearly failed him before the insolvent soldiers of the Assyrian monarch? I need hardly repeat here, that as far as the prophet's hope and ideal was concerned, this reform was not very satisfactory. It did not go far enough; it was a timid compromise. But for the people, even that was too much. The restraint from their orgiastic practises at their local shrines seemed to them an interference with their religion and a suppression of pious Yahwe worship. A cult being observed only in Jerusalem, religion was practical-

ly removed from their lives. They were to all intents and purposes deprived of their God. The people looked at it from the point of view of Sennacherib's emissaries. ה לֵאמֹר הוּא אֲשֶׁר הִסִּיר חֲקִינוֹ אֶת בְּמֹתָיו וְאֶת מִזְבְּחֵתָיו וְיָצַח לִיהוּדָה וּלְיְרוּשָׁלַם לְפָנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ הַזֶּה תִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ בִּירוּשָׁלַם :

Outward circumstances confirmed the people in their discontent. Yahwe was showing only his stern side. They were suffering. (Palestine being the only land between Egypt and Assyria--the latter must have done it a great deal of damage in passing through in their campaigns against Egypt). Surely, the people thought, that all happened because God was dishonored, and his shrines dismantled. But Hezekiah showed himself firm to that extent that he strictly enforced his reform measures. This made the many-headed monster more restive and ready to break out at any moment in open rebellion.

In 686 his son Manasseh, a boy, ascended the throne. There was a sullen gloom all over the land. The political misfortunes ^{of his father} (for he had them in spite of his miraculous escape from Sennacherib) was laid on his own shoulders, as the result of his not attending properly to the worship of Yahwe. People had enough of these experiments, they could be rid of the noxious innovations. They wanted their God and their religion back. The regents of the king were patriots of this stripe. Immediately after the accession of *Manasseh* to the throne, there began that bloody reaction against the prophets and their sympathizers. Isaiah is

reported to have been butchered at this time. Everything that Hezekiah had done was undone. The most extreme ritualism, the most flagrant idolatry was introduced. All the fineries of the neighboring cults were copied. Incense was introduced from Damascus. Even child sacrifice was indulged in. A time, it was, that to think of one must needs shudder. But Manasseh, was a patriotic king. He lived long and Israel prospered.

In such conditions, the voice of prophecy was little heard. But it was not stifled. Prophecy in this stormy period secluded itself; it purified and developed. Just such a condition was favorable for the solid work of the prophetic party. Those who still felt the influence of Isaiah in their lives and religion, and who in the evil time remained faithful to his principles, saw the great lack in the system they wished to introduce. Priestism or ritualism or what you will, was ingrained in the very fibre of the being of the people. From it, prophetism was chasmally different. To bridge the chasm and to be rid of the monstrosity that they saw parading under the name of the religion of Yahwe, they had to adopt a via media. Such necessities gave birth to the Deuteronomic code. But before we can come to the practical introduction of this code, we must notice the one solitary prophetic utterance of this period. What a mockery were such noble sentiments in such vile surroundings. As most beautiful flowers flourish in the darkest swamps, so the noblest words that have come to

us from lips of a prophet, must be attributed to the horrible time of Manasseh. No wonder he ^{the prophet} abhors ritualism. (Here we have proof of my contention that while the prophetic party was looking for compromise, the prophets themselves maintained their high level.) What a gruesome religion presented itself to the author of Micah VI 6 sq! A grim and earnest religion to be sure. Yahwe's favor must be retained at any price. Sacrifices without number, incense of the costliest preparation, even the first born must be given up to the unsatiable appetite of their all-devouring duty. Can we wonder that that lone rare spirit should evince the pain he feels, and give us his lament, as the result of his travail, the most beautiful offspring of all prophetic delivery. Micah VI 3 - 8, I venture to say, cannot be equalled in all prophetic literature. Not alone for its sublimity in VI 8, but for the infinite tenderness, the heartache that appeals so in v. 3 sq. How sadly he reminds them of the past, to show them the futility of their present methods. Do they think thus to win God's favor?

במה אקדם ד אכר לאלהי מרים האקדמנו בעלות בעלות
 בני שנה הירצה ה באלפי אילים ברבבות נחלי שמן האתן
 בכורי פשעי פרי בטן השאת נפשי האיר לך ארם מה שוב
 ואלה דורש ממך כי אם נשות משפס ואחבת חסד והאנע לבת אם
 אלהיך

Hosea, Amos, all prophecy is contained in this magnificent outburst. It has ever since been the central moral teaching of Judaism--and it is a moral height which has never yet been reached anywhere in any religion or ethical system.

In such a sentence there can be no trace of toleration of sacrifice. The whole system in its horror must have been thoroughly repugnant to him. At all events his plain statement of the question (v 6. 7) with its magnificent rejection in v. 8 leaves no doubt on the question. It has been told () you, O man, what is good and what Yahweh requires of you; nothing but to do justice, to love kindness (cf under Hosea for 707) and to walk humbly with God.

The excesses of the Manasseh regime could not endure. Already toward the end of his reign it had somewhat subsided; its fury was greatly spent. So that when two years after his death his grandson Josiah ascended the throne, the country was nearly in condition to stand a counter movement. The prophetic party which had been so industrious during the Manassean persecutions, was not able to control the regency of the new king. To be sure at the beginning no startling changes seem to have been made. The same gloomy temper was prevalent. The glum ill-forebodings of Zephaniah come from this time. In the twelfth year of King Josiah (627) the work of undoing Manasseh's evil work was begun. Josiah's reforms were even more thorough going than those of Hezekiah. All the ~~idols~~ were destroyed. Rigorous measures were taken against the priests who still conducted the forbidden service. A purified cult was inaugurated six years after the movement was begun. Conditions were ripe for the establishment of the system, which the practical

spirit of the prophetic party had devised during the Manassean trouble. ¹⁸ Hekiah (a priest, it is worthy of note) sent the rough Shaphan a scribe, the scroll of the law which he had found in the temple. On reading it the king rent his garments. He set about making this book the law of the land. I will not here enter into the details of the Deuteronomic legislation. It was a prophetic religion with a sacerdotal backbone. It was a great advance on the old Canaanitish religion. The middle course was a practical one, because it reached the people. This was something which none of the prophets had accomplished.

By removing the gross religion from the lives of the people, and making Jerusalem the only place where the cruder accompaniments could be observed, the religion of the people could the more easily become one of morality and reflection. In this way could they be shown, that Judaism consists not only in ritual, but also in "going just and loving mercy and walking humbly before God." Had everything gone on nicely materially, the religious progress might have been phenomenal. But there was a rude break in the political world. Josiah, the good king, who did what was right in the eyes of Yahwe, who was so religious, so zealous in his reform, met with a violent death in the pursuit of his duty. (608). The shock to the people must have been severe. It jarred against all their no-

tions of divine justice. They could draw but one of two conclusions. Either they ^{were} worshipping the wrong God--Yahwe was not powerful to aid them--or they had not been worshipping him properly. Either way, they had been making a colossal mistake. The reaction was immediate. His own son takes the backward step, in trying to expiate the wrong of his father. According to the Deuteronomic editor, "he did evil in the sight of Yahwe entirely as did his fathers." But he did not last long. Pharaoh Necho, taking advantage of the disorder caused by the usurpation of Nabopolassar, seized Palestine, deposed Jehoaiah and appointed Jehoiakim in his stead. But these times we must consider in the next chapter, in connection with the prophet who lived during it all, viz: Jeremiah.

Chapter V.

JEREMIAH.

In these eventful times, when the religion of Israel depended upon the temperament of the monarch; when for a time ritualism was succeeded by reform, and reform immediately by a reaction, when the state was likely at any moment to be caught in the "net" of some world grabbing empire, Jeremiah, lived and suffered. His ministry began in trouble and ended in calamity. He was driven out of his native town, Anathoth by his outraged fellowtownsmen and relatives, and he was killed in a strange land by those for whom he had suffered and labored his whole life time. In some respects he was the noblest product of the prophetic spirit, in others he shows a distinct decline. In the thirteenth year of King Josiah (627) Jeremiah entered upon his prophetic career. It was, as far as externals were concerned, a most auspicious time. The youthful ruler was of a disposition entirely different from those of his predecessors, for he allowed himself to be guided by the counsels of the prophetic party. "He did what was right in the eyes of Yahwe." He destroyed the Baalim and the Bamoth, and introduced a new and purer form of worship. Religiously he was all that could be desired by Jeremiah and his adherents. Politically he was unwise, shortsighted. In spite of the wholesome lesson taught Hezekiah and his successors, Josiah still possessed that wretched little

spirit of "patriotism." He did not know that the highest achievements of a country are those which make for the betterment of the individuals, not those that foster a morbid chauvinism and feed a blustering jingoism. In his case, his "patriotism," as in untold others, was his undoing. In opposing Pharaoh Necho at Megiddo (608) on principles no doubt highly lauded by his contemporaries, he was killed. This result, as I have indicated in the previous chapter, having been attributed directly to Yahwe, was the immediate cause of a reaction which lasted until Jerusalem lay in ruins. So we see that Jeremiah's ~~experience~~ was an extremely varied one. Born under Manasseh and outliving the existence of the state, he witnessed the most different attitudes of the people, potentates, priests and (the regular) prophets, toward the prophetic party. Still under it all he was steadfast to the truth which he was bound to tell his brethern. He held on with dogged faith and an inspired stubbornness to what he deemed his mission, always maintaining a stern opposition to the formal meaningless ritualism which had superseded the Deuteronomic legislation introduced by Josiah. He suffered enough for it; he bore stocks and imprisonment; he suffered himself to be put in a pit of mire. At different times, only the most rigorous measures of his friends saved his life. Yet he was a man of the people. He grieved more on account of their misfortunes than of his own wrongs. And though

they persecuted him for unpatriotically foretelling the downfall of Jerusalem, he sorrowed more when he thought of its inevitable occurrence. His was indeed a nobler patriotism than the jingoistic bluster of his fellow countrymen. And when the fatal blow had been struck, and Jerusalem, the proud and beautiful, lay in ruins--its magnificent and luxurious temple reduced to ashes and heaps--among which the sulking fox prowled--he did not point the finger of scorn at the tell-tale desolation, as many another would have been tempted to do, but he sat among the debris and wept. He preferred this to going to Babylon and living a life of ease and comfort.

But not even to him was the future entirely dark. Amid the ~~embowering~~ gloom his optimistic imagination forecasted the reorganized and re-established nation--on the ruins of the old. The thought was an old one; the debacle was a necessary antecedent to the regeneration and upbuilding of the state along the lines pleasing to Yahwe. The calamity having overtaken his beloved people, hope once more lights up the dreary aspect and reveals visions of a glorious future.

הנה ימים באים נאם ה' וכרתו את בית ישראל את בית יהודה בבית הרשהו לא כבנית אשר כרתו את אבתם ביום קדושיהם ביום להוציאם מארץ מצרים אשר הנהו הפכו את בבתיהם ואנכי בעלתיבם נאם ה' את הבית אשר יכרתו את בית ישראל את בית יהודה נאם ה' את אשר יכרתו בקרבם ועל לבם אכתבה והיו להם לאלהים והנה יהיו לי לעם ולא ילמדו עוד איש את רעהו ואני לא אהיה להם רעו אתה כי כלם ירעו אתי כי אסלה לעונם ולחטאתם לא אכיר

The city will be rebuilt, the people will return and they

will "know Yahwe." There will be no sinning and no trespassing. As aspired by another prophet, "the earth will be full of the knowledge of Yahwe, as the waters cover the sea." This expectation of Jeremiah when the Judean state was laid low will bear examination. It furnishes material for a conclusion as to how he viewed not only the cult or sacrifices, but even Deuteronomy. This latter was heralded as the "covenant." Jeremiah refers to it as "the covenant." (C. XI). But it, in no wise, had either the beneficent or permanent effect anticipated. There must have been something wrong. Perhaps Jeremiah attributed the failure to the fact of its being only a half way measure and because it was not sincere. At all events when the "new" covenant is to be promulgated, the will be written, not merely in a scroll, but in the hearts of the people, and all will "know" Yahwe. He evidently believes with Moses that 70 is necessary and not 127 But we can only say so far, that in Jeremiah's religion which will be the faith of forgiven Israel, sacrifice does not have a positive place.

In the treatment of the preceding prophets, I have shown that the well-or ill-being of the state had a great influence on the ritual. In times of trouble it was the ritual that was attended to with heightened zeal and increased earnestness. Such a course naturally aroused opposition from those who had a glimpse of truer things,

viz: the prophets. Now in the time of Jeremiah Deuteronomy must have filled an "aching void." It gave the people in tangible form, what before they had to accept on priests' or prophets' authority. The ~~code~~ was now in the midst of the people. But when they were convinced of their error by the death of Josiah, the code was not formally abrogated. It was just allowed to sink into innocuous desuetude. But still it was of most paradoxical service to them. They had something wherewith to silence the irrepressible prophets. The people could now reply to the prophet--who was always calling them to time and reminding them of Yahwe's commands--"go to -- we need not your prophesying--have we not the law of Yahwe?" (VIII 8). To one who had greatly favored the introduction of this code, because perhaps he saw it as the stepping stone to higher levels, the answer might have been "yes, but you do not observe it." We might, therefore, be somewhat surprised when instead the man of God hurls back at them the judgment ~~וְהִנֵּה כָּל־חֻקֵּי־יְהוָה־אֲשֶׁר־אָמַרְתִּי בְּיַד־נְבִיאִים לֵאמֹר~~ "Behold for a falsehood hath the false pen of the scribes wrought." It did not take him as long as it did the people to find out that Deuteronomy would not result in bettering the men of his time. Long before the death of Josiah he had come to the conclusion that a mistake had been made in transmitting prophetic ideals, which should live only in the souls of men, on parchment black on white. I think that he must somehow or other have felt, what to us is a commonplace enough thought. As soon

as an ideal is embodied in a rule, it is almost impossible to keep alive its spirit. So in later Judaism, "prophecy died when its precepts became laws."

And he was right. With Deuteronomy the prophetic precepts were largely introduced, under the Josian regime. The prophetic morality was probably officially taught by the priests. At the same time the temple grew in importance, the priests in influence and authority and Jeremiah soon realized that religion was once more a matter of externals only; that Deuteronomy had been the means of creating a still more exclusive and oppressive sacerdotal caste. We can, therefore, understand his continual complaining and his incessant chiding at a time when to the superficial, every thing in the state (and church, which was born in Deuteronomy) conformed to the prophetic demands.

We are not at a loss then to explain that remarkable utterance of his in VII 21 sq.
 וְאַתָּה יְהוָה בְּלֹא דַבָּרִית אֲבֹתֶיךָ וְלֹא צִוִּיתָם בְּיָמֶיךָ
 אֵלֶּיךָ לֵאמֹר עֲשֵׂה כִּי אָמַרְתִּי וְלֹא עָשִׂיתָ כִּי אָמַרְתִּי
 וְלֹא עָשִׂיתָ כִּי אָמַרְתִּי וְלֹא עָשִׂיתָ כִּי אָמַרְתִּי
 It could have been spoken in the reign of Josiah, or in the early part of Jehoiakim's reign. Its publication in the fourth year of Jehoikim was very timely. It gives his idea in unequivocal terms concerning sacrifices and the cult. I shall comment on the attempt to juggle the meaning out of these verses. To the impartial reader it has but one meaning. Sacrifices are not wanted. When God brought

Israel out of Egypt (the point to which everything is traced in Deuteronomy) he did not command them to bring sacrifices. The command given to Israel was, "Be my people and let me be your God." At the time of the publication of his first series of prophecies, a statement such as this was absolutely necessary. The old cult, the old idolatry, the old immorality was again restored to its old time glory. Jeremiah had seen enough of compromises. He now comes out flatfooted and denies what the people had learnt to accept as facts, ~~from~~ Deuteronomy. Not only here does he show that what God wants is not sacrifices, but in VI 19. 20, he shows that it goes hand in hand with a rejection of the (Cf Duhm, Theologie der Proph. p. 231 sq).

Another block to the spread of Jeremiah's simple and lofty religion was the unlimited confidence which the people had in the inviolability of the temple. This belief first taught by Isaiah in a crisis (and vindicated by him), was greatly strengthened on the introduction of Deuteronomy. The regular prophets who clung to it with commendable patriotism continually cried ~~over and over again~~ "The temple of Yahwe, the temple of Yahwe is this." They not only ridiculed, they resented as traitorous Jeremiah's sinister predictions of the coming of the northern foe and of the impending destruction of the city and temple. The author of such opinions deserved death. And truly, when Jehoiakim had heard the contents of the scroll (indeed he

did not wait to hear it all) he ordered the prophet to be apprehended and put to death. He escaped by hiding. No wonder he despaired and like Job cursed the day of his birth. And we can sympathize with him when we find him calling the wrath of God down on his godless enemies. He would fain keep silent, but the message burnt within him, and he must needs keep on, though none listened, sounding the warning note, not only of an inevitable but of a necessary imminent destruction of the temple. He lived to see his prophecy realized, although were his advice followed, the event would have been indefinitely postponed. He counseled political faith to the Eastern empire: Jehoiakim revolted. Luckily for him he died before the punishment of his conduct could overtake him. The teeth of his son were set on edge for the sour grapes that he ate. In 597 Nebuchadnezzar made the first deportation of Judeans to Babylon. He took with him the flower of the kingdom. Now the "foe from the North" was understood or at least intelligibly interpreted. The fall of Nineveh, and later the battle of Charchemish pointed plainly to the "servant of the Lord." The land trembled but yet learnt not wisdom. They forgot again that patriotism does not belong to a wise and understanding nation (especially if it is weak). True, Zedekiah would fain have listened to the counsels of the prophet, in fact he sought them, but he could not turn a deaf ear to the will of the clamoring people. He had to, perforce, accept the assistance of Egypt, in order to throw

off the Babylonian yoke. He knew it meant his doom. It was one vassalage or the other. Babylon's army approached; for once Egypt kept its pledge and the foe from the East had to withdraw its troops from the siege of Jerusalem, to contend with Egypt's forces. What sanguine joy, what boundless exultation swelled the vain people! Only the dismal and never-ceasing wailing of the gloomy prophet--disturbed the general joy. To him the destruction was already a fait accompli. Not long after he had all of the rest of the people, to join in his doleful dirges. Pharaoh was defeated at Charchemish. Nebuchadnezzar returned to Jerusalem, destroyed the city and burnt the temple. The whole population, save a small remnant were led away into exile. Now that the much dreaded had occurred Jeremiah ceased mourning. He accepted it as the only thing that could have effected the regeneration of Israel. The temple which had always been an obstacle in the way of a proper
 was down. It would never be rebuilt. It would not be missed when the people came back to worship Yahwe. Even the ark would no longer be necessary.

In Jeremiah we see, more clearly than in any preceding prophet, the complete overturning of external religion. It is interesting coming from him who, at first, favored the establishment of ^{the} code of Deuteronomy. But we must remember that he nevertheless, never relinquished his high ideals. Even under Josiah he protests against the

superficiality of the vaunted reform. He looked to a circumcision of the ears and heart, as well as, or rather than, one of the flesh. This outward reform created that baleful confidence which made the temple and the ark the guaranty of political success. He felt that the temple and the ark were nothing. They had ~~no~~ place in the new covenant. He felt that at the present a long exile was necessary to upbuild the new nation. Then, he predicted a return of the people to Palestine. He pictured a pure and zealous nation undertaking life anew and living up to the sublime heights of the prophetic ethics. His prophecy was partly fulfilled. But the religious development took a different turn. Nearly twenty-five hundred years have passed since he prophesied his ethical or moral people--and it may still be counted among the unfilled prophecies of Jeremiah.

N O T E S.

I will not stop long over the verses of Jeremiah.

They are:

VI 20

cf vv. 19. Cult vs.

VII 21, 22, 23.

XIV 12.

XVII 26

The unanimity of all critics in putting this portion (19 - 27) very late, removed an ugly passage from the book. It is probably as late as Ezra and Nehemiah when the Sabbath agitation was so strong. The spirit of these verses is not Jeremiae. It does not accord with Jeremiah's general tone, to go into detail and with such fervor, about mere form and ceremony. His other ideal pictures contradict this one. The attempt to imitate his style is palpable. (Cf Cornill - Jeremiah - Haupt Bible) XIX 5. (Cf Cornill) XXXIII 18

vv. 14 - 26 are omitted in the Septuagint. "Levitical-priests," his favor of a Davidic dynasty, militate against the genuineness of the verses. Lev. Priests occurs nowhere else in Jeremiah--but often in Ezekiel and in the post-exilic writers. These verses are rejected by most critics.

Chapter VI.

EZEKIEL.

Jeremiah had considered the exile as the salvation of the religion of Yahwe. He thought that its influence would be a purifying one; the people would be weaned from their evil ways; they would be "sifted" and a purified and holy remnant would return to Jerusalem for the purpose of maintaining a spiritual religion. The exile did, of a surety, preserve for us the religion of Israel. But the process and result were rather the reverse of those which the hopeful prophet had pictured. (Jer. XXXI).

In 597, at the surrender of Jerusalem, Nebuchadnezzar carried away the best part of the people of Israel. Only the lower classes, as a rule, were left. These exiled aristocrats settled in Babylon, having more of the character of colonists than captives. They had all personal freedom, and they were at liberty to pursue the religion of their fathers in the land of their forced adoption. This, however, according to their notions they could not do. They could not worship Yahwe in a strange, ~~unclean~~ land. They could not offer services outside of Judea, and to send gifts to their native God was also out of the question. They naturally expected and anxiously hoped for an early return to Palestine. The exiled prophets fostered this hope among them, and, no doubt, raised them by a high pitch of excitement, and rendered them very uneasy. Such hopes, leading to rash action, might have brought them into considerable

danger. Therefore, Jeremiah, who at this time was experiencing the worst part of his sad career and who momentarily expected the tottering state to collapse, wrote a letter to the colonists, warning them of the danger of infidelity, advising them to settle peaceably; to build houses and plant gardens and to show themselves patriotic citizens of their new country.

And there was another prophet, one in their own midst, who held them to that course. He was the central authoritative figure in that exiled company, a man to whom they looked for guidance and instruction, for they knew there was a prophet among them (XXXIII 33). He was Ezekiel, the son of Buzi, a Zadokite priest. He must have been a young man at the time of his deportation, yet old enough to have officiated in the temple. He evidently had heard and learnt from Jeremiah, for he counsels his brethren in like manner as did his revered contemporary. To counteract the bad effect of the brightly colored pictures drawn by the popular preachers, he portrayed for them sombre hued scenes and foretold most gloomy eventualities. (C I - XXIV). He told them of the wildness of their hope of a speedy return to Jerusalem. As a check upon this ever increasing confidence, he predicted, again and again, the capture and destruction of the city. (C. V, IX, XII, XVI). Ten years long he had to din this into the ears of those hopeful but deluded people, trying to make them under-

stand that it was all the necessary outcome of their own misdoing and a prerequisite to a future reinstatement into the favor of Yahwe. It is, to be sure, a grim theodicy that we have presented in the first twenty-four chapters of the book of Ezekiel, a theodicy however, which was to Ezekiel a logical necessity and a preliminary to his reconstruction of the state and of the national religion. He connoed all Israel's history, and showed that from the very beginning Israel had been unfaithful to Yahwe and immoral. All the misfortunes that had befallen the people were punishments sent by Yahwe for their misdemeanors. All of them were then justifiable, though the people more than once were at a loss to understand them. Not only these, but more too must happen on account of the wickedness of the King of Judah and the people of Jerusalem: the temple must be utterly destroyed and the city made a desolation. Therefore, it avails not to hope and pray for an immediate restoration.

Such teaching as this was essential for the preservation of the remnant of Israel. What a shock it must have been to those exiles, when they saw the unapproachable grandeur of Babylon! How insignificant and puny must have appeared their own architectural accomplishments, even those which they had considered the consummation of all magnificence. The immensity and splendor of the Babylonian temples and palaces, to which Nebuchadnezza paid such great attention, must have put them to shame when they

compared with them the temple of Yahwe and the palaces of the house of David. The effect on the average, was at least, demoralizing. Conversion in the face of such over-burdening proof of superiority was an easy matter. In a very short time the "sifting" process began. They mixed with the people of the land and worshipped their idols. It was truly but a small remnant that remained faithful to Yahwe, and preserved his religion for future generations. It was the influence of Ezekiel that kept this small remnant faithful by directing the attention of his followers to their "sins" and emphasizing the necessity of repentance. The two prophets of the fall were soon vindicated. The great catastrophe came in due season. The wicked and idolatrous Judeans were deprived of their country. The predictions of gloom and punishment being now fulfilled are now abandoned by both prophets. They begin to forecast the restored and forgiven people. And here we arrive at the parting of the ways and in the sharp contrast between the re-established states of these two prophets we recognize the difference between the prophetic religion, pure and simple, as exemplified in Jeremiah and the Judaism of the second temple, which was a return to and an enlargement of the Deuteronomic compromise. Jeremiah, as I have noticed, foretold an ideal religion, in which there would be no temple nor ark to lead the people astray; but in which the new covenant would be written on the hearts of the people. Ezekiel, the practical man, the organizer, stepped down from that

lofty platform; it was entirely beyond the people and would be of no practical worth as a moral agent. He apparently submitted to the prejudices of the people, by picturing a rebuilt sanctuary (in fact describing it in all its details) and establishing a ritual evidently much on the lines of the old priestly cult. On this basis the priestly code was founded, and that code was the ritual of the Judaism of the second commonwealth; the religion which after the diaspora has reached the sublime faith which Jeremiah would have had universal in his time.

This is not the place to enter into a discussion on the origin and growth of the canon. It has been, sufficiently proven, I think, that the priestly code originated and was completed in Babylon, during the exile and before the advent of Ezra and Nehemiah. These leaders introduced it, as the ritual of the second temple, where its details were carried out with scrupulous exactness. Under the new commonwealth the church, as it may be called, assumed an ever increasing importance and the high priest later on became the temporal ruler. These things being accepted in the critical world, puts a new appearance on a great many problems of biblical study. One thing to notice is that "the only system of (Semitic) sacrifice of which we possess a full account is that of the second temple at Jerusalem. And though the ritual of the temple at Jerusalem as described in the book of Levitiens is undoubtedly based on very ancient

tradition going back to a time when there was no substantial difference in point of form, between Hebrew sacrifices and those of the surrounding nations, the system as we have it, dates from a time when sacrifice was no longer the sum and substance of worship." (Religion of the Semites p 215).

The forerunner of this system and ritual was Ezekiel. In the last nine chapters of his book he describes with remarkable minuteness, the temple which is to be built, and the ritual of the worship to be observed at the temple. He thus stands out among the prophets as the legalist and ritualist. But withal he was a true prophet and evinced the old prophetic spirit. His teaching was the bridge upon which were brought together the old ritualistic priestly prejudices and the high ideals of prophetic morality and spirituality. His was not the legalism of the later rabbis, his enactments were moral only. His ritual, (different from the earlier one in this) was not an end in itself but only a means to an end; and that end was the realization of a moral Jewish people. The purpose and operation of the later cult gave evidence of the prophetic undercurrent. The great fault of the old cult was, that being directly borrowed from Canaan, it was the link between heathenism and the worship of Yahwe. The great differencing mark of the new cult, such as foreshadowed by Ezekiel and embodied in the Priestly Code was, that it was a barrier between heathenism and Judaism. The spirit of exclusiveness was fostered

during the exile; the faithful remnant having to separate themselves from the foreign idolatry of the Babylonians. How important this was for Judaism we know. It was carried to extremes, some think, when the returned exiles excluded the Samaritans and many of their own people from participation in the temple worship. It brought on them the bitter hatred and intrigues of the Samaritans and finally resulted in the building of the Samaritan temple. To the philosophic of the exclusive Jews, the building of the rival temple appeared a blessing, since it removed the great temptation to admit that "heathen element."

To appreciate Ezekiel we must not think that he had abandoned all prophetic ideals and had become merely a dry, spiritless legalist, who believed in a cut and dried ritual for itself and whose vision was narrow and prejudiced. He was, besides and in spite of his legalism, a true prophet. Prof. Duhm waxes sarcastic on the "merit" of Ezekiel--he closes his criticism of the prophet with the following judgment: "Hezekiel hat das Verdienst die Ideale der Propheten in Gesetze und Dogmen umgesetzt und die geistig freie und sittliche Religion vernichtet zu haben." Such a verdict seems unfair. To be sure Ezekiel saw the need of a fixed ritual as a tangible means to hold the people in the right path. To them it might have been the essential, the enormity of the false worship proving the import-

ance of the true. But he, no doubt, saw that it was an unmistakable retrogress, from the prophetic view-point. He did not, therefore, relinquish the noble heritage of his predecessors. He pleads for morality and spirituality as earnestly as did any of his predecessors. He does not by any means fail to value at its highest, the pure heart, and the proper spirit (Of XXXVI 25 sq. XI 19, XVIII 31). The whole eighteenth chapter is an admirable illustration of how Ezekiel weaves the highest morality and spirituality into his legalism. The standard in this chapter is as high as in any prophet. Justice, kindness and chastity are the moral qualities that go hand in hand with a pure worship of Yahwe (Of Mic. VI 7 f). He advances even from the older prophets in one respect, and this new doctrine (or perhaps old doctrine emphasized) is the very back-bone of modern Judaism. He no longer, as ^{did} preached the earlier prophets, preaches a ^{low} natural morality, and a national repentance. He brings out with all the emphasis possible the individual responsibility of every man and woman. And this is the chief merit of Ezekiel. He made the moral law go hand in hand with the ritual--he was practical. In that way, the results of his prophecy seem to me to be more telling than those of other prophets whom we reckon his superior. Here I must repeat that it was through Ezekiel primarily that personal religion became more and more independent of ritualism. For in the

Priestly Code (the child of Ezekiel's Code) the individual begins to drift away from sacrifice. In the olden times every paterfamilias offered his own sacrifice at the altar. Now, the individual could not do his own sacrificing, the priests and the Levites were the intermediaries. Further the national sacrifice gaining ever in importance, completely overshadowed the individual offering. So the remarkable effect of Ezekiel's teaching, which Duhm characterizes as neutralizing the moral religion of the prophets, really seems to have been, that the cult, the ritual was gradually taken entirely out of the life of the individual, (as far as individual sacrifice was concerned) while the moral laws, justice, kindness, chastity, etc. assumed the prime importance. We can be thankful that Ezekiel stooped to legalism and compromise, so as to lift the religion of Israel to the high plane of morality and spirituality which it occupies to-day.

It is not necessary any further to characterize Ezekiel, or to determine his place in the development of modern Judaism. Having watched the growth of Deuteronomy it might have been expected that the development of religion in the exile, would have proceeded along the same lines and that a restored Judean commonwealth would have attached less, rather than more, importance to an exact regulation of sacrificial worship and outward ceremony, than was attached to it in the code of Deuteronomy. The contrary happened.

We have then to regard the exile as a preparation both for the later Judaism which could live religiously without sacrificial worship and outward ceremony, and for the earlier Judaism of the second temple in which that worship was apparently its most essential feature. This dual preparation was typified in the double role of Ezekiel; he was both priest and prophet. But he was neither a mere visionary nor a dry-as-dust mechanical ritualist and legalist. He combined the good qualities of both-- and although that involves, perhaps, a decline from the highest attitude of Hosea or Jeremiah, still it meant a giant stride forward for the people, and that, it seems to me, is a decisive merit. I hope then that there is nothing paradoxical in the statement, that the ritualism and legalism of Ezekiel and of the priestly code, were the potent causes in the ultimate raising of the people to the spiritual and moral religion of the prophets. Ezekiel paved the way for the legalism and individualism of later Judaism. "Although a priest, he paved the way for a religion in which the priest was finally superseded."

Chapter VII.

THE LATER PROPHETS.

We have now reached the threshold of the Judaism of the second temple. We have noted its origin and growth, and we have seen that henceforward, in the reconstructed religion, the ritual once more assumes an importance such as renders it an integral part of the national religion. The prophetic demands have been met half way--so that the religion is not any more, mere ritualism. Morals go hand in hand with the cult. This compromise was admittedly the best thing for the times. It was a most beneficial makeshift. The masses were uplifted by it and prepared for modern Judaism. From a secondary importance in the personal religion, sacrifice lost more and more of its weight until finally at the great crisis, it was easy enough for the Jews to give up that relic of a cruder religion. Prayer was gradually growing more prominent as the means of communion with God. And when the central house of prayer was destroyed, there was no apprehension as formerly that the establishment of local places of worship would be the means of leading the people back to idolatry and immorality. A complete change had been wrought. The great liturgy of Judaism was at that time in an advanced state of development.

Ezekiel had, as I have shown, harmonized as much as he could, the two extremes of the religion of his day. He no longer objects to the crude and cruel sacrificial system per se, but makes it the inseparable concomitant of morality and spirituality. It seems that in doing this he fixed the attitude of all the later prophets to the cult. For with the prophets succeeding Ezekiel we notice a new phenomenon, viz: they mention sacrifices without declaiming against them. This, I have pointed out does not happen with the earlier prophets. In the books of four great prophets preceding Ezekiel, we do not find a single passage of undoubted authenticity, in which there is implied a tacit acceptance of the sacrificial cult. With Ezekiel and his successors we do not find any such violent opposition to sacrifices, in fact any at all. The only place where a hostile attitude might be inferred is that quite unintelligible verse in the last chapter of Isaiah, which is not attributed to the "Great Unknown" any how. I shall in this chapter, therefore, treat all the later prophets. It would be a grateful task, I know, to devote the space of a whole chapter to the Great Unknown of the exile, but inasmuch as such length is not necessary for the unfoldment of my theme, I must forego that pleasure.

The prophet of the return, the Great Unknown, as he has been called, or Isaiah II (Deutero-Isaiah) as he is designated by some critics, says very little about sacrifices. At

the time of his activity, attention was directed in quite another direction. People and prophets of the exile were at the highest pitch of expectancy, for the time to arrive when their deliverer would come and send or lead them back to Palestine. The prophet was in too hopeful a mood, in general, his imagination too exalted, his exultation and confidence too sanguine to allow him to swerve from the main topic. He portrays in beautiful colors the coming of the servant of the Lord. Touchingly, sympathetically he comforts his people with the promise of redemption. His joy and hope lift him aloft on the wings of poetic inspiration and he sings of the infinite glory of God, the creator of the universe and the father of mankind. He will send his servant to free the captives of Judah, and to convert mankind to his worship, to help praise and glorify his name. Even the beasts of the field will honor him, also the monsters and the ostriches. All creation will harmoniously sing his praise and declare his greatness.

Such thoughts of the prophet bring his attention nearer home. He considers his people and their sad plight. Israel was created to praise God and to make the world know the only deity. (XLI 21). But how has he done it? "He did not call on God's name, nor did he bring him sacrifices; he honored him not with his offerings." (v. 23). Hence God made Jacob a curse and a reviling. (v. 28). In such a manner does Isaiah II mention

sacrifices and offerings. There is no mistaking the attitude. He accepts sacrifices as a means of honoring and worshipping God. He complains of Israel's not using that means. Still it is interesting to note that he says first 20 2877 2018 86 "Thou hast not called upon me." This phrase though used, I believe, to denote the neglect of sacrifice may be or has been interpreted to mean, that prayer has been neglected (Cheyne Prophecies of Isaiah ad loc.) To be sure no hard inference can be drawn from such a phrase, but it may be the incipient custom which in latter times has become universal. But the point to be noted is that we now have for the second time in a prophetic writing utterances which are not unfavorable to sacrifices. Similarly in the fortieth chapter, in describing the greatness of God, he says (v. 16) אין בן עין ואלוהים "And Lebanon cannot furnish sufficient wood or animals for a fitting holocaust." It is a tacit admittance that God is pleased with sacrifices. If even the greatest of all the prophets, whose teachings in other respects reaches the highest altitude of universality and truth, is thus seen to have accepted the Ezekelian compromise, we may be sure that the line between the old and new prophecy is fixed.

The spirit of the restoration has permeated even prophecy and brought it nearer to the standard of its times. While in the Great Unknown, the style is the most exalted and majestic, the genius masterful, we cannot but notice that a decline is setting in. The best and noblest of

prophecy had been passed, when we have done with the prophecies of Isaiah II. His successors, all of whom had imbibed the spirit of Ezekiel, were practical men of the times. Most of them held to a strict ritual and considered its neglect or abrogation a most serious offense to God. But they too, had their spiritual side, quite as important, in our study, as their ritualism. And in the consideration of the "decay" of prophecy, as it is termed, it is too often forgotten that the heritage which these great men received was a twofold one. None of them was wholly legalistic or ritualistic to the entire neglect of the spiritual part of religion. But this point I shall bring out in the consideration of the separate prophets.

There are three prophets whose activities were bent mainly toward the restoration and rebuilding of the Jewish State. They are Haggai, Zechariah (I - IX) and Malachi. The two first mentioned lived and exerted their influence earlier than did the last, and we will consider them briefly.

Haggai and Zechariah came forward prominently in the interval in which the building of the temple was interrupted. It was due mainly to their exhortation that the obstacles in the way of the reconstruction were removed, and the work continued. There is no necessity for asking what the attitude of these prophets to the cult was. They considered sacrifices and the temple a necessity, without which God's favor could not be gotten; and that the

numerous troubles of those returned exiles were all due to their neglect of the proper service of God. But right here I must protest against those critics who see in these two prophets nothing but a ^cman and sordid feeling and vision which could not rise above the plane of sacrifices and temple service. This is manifestly unjust, especially to Zechariah. Surely we must credit him with one of the most beautiful and spiritual verses in Scripture :

וְהָיָה בְּיוֹם הַהוּא אֵין בְּיָדָם זָבָח וְעֹלָה
 The sine qua non for God's approval is not sacrifice and offering. He points to the words of the former prophets, who lived before the destruction, and the neglect of which brought about the downfall. He gives the gist of their teaching in VII 9, 10.

וְהָיָה בְּיוֹם הַהוּא אֵין בְּיָדָם זָבָח וְעֹלָה
 Such teaching does not come from a man who believes in a cult and in a cult only. (Of VIII 17).

Later than Haggai and Zechariah (about fifty years) did Malachi prophesy to the new nation. His mission was rather to bolster up the wavering faith and waning courage of the people. After all their trials and suffering (for we must not imagine that the resettlement of a devastated country does not entail enormous difficulties) they saw none of the brilliant results which they had been made to expect by the joyous prophecies of the great unknown and by the world

and extravagant predictions of the regular prophets. Even when (after great exertion had been used to push the work of building) they saw the temple completed, they were sorely disappointed. It in no wise fulfilled the great promise which they had all along placed in it. It was not even as magnificent as the first temple, and that in no way compared with some which they had seen in Babylon. Discontent and murmuring were heard on all sides. They came to the conclusion that it is vain to serve God; "for what profit is it that we have kept his charge and that we have walked mournfully before the Lord?" The priests become negligent and they misuse their priestly office. It is with this sin that Malachi unraids them. They offer polluted bread and unfit animals. They dishonor God. Such offerings are vain, God does not accept them. He predicts dire results, if there be not a speedy repentance. We see that Malachi considered the cult as highly important. In fact, most of his prophecy is simply a rebuke for disregarding the rules of the ritual. But he too shows that righteousness is the main requirement of the offerings, and when that lack is made up they will again be pleasing to God. (III 11 sq). But there was not sufficient spirit left among the disgruntled people to undertake any reforms, and it looked as if the religion of Israel would die from the face of the earth. But help came again from Babylon. A pious and energetic

leader, with a second band of pilgrims, came to Jerusalem (458). He was Ezra and he had with him the "law of his God" VII 14. He had power from the king to carry out any reforms which he deemed necessary. But even he could not accomplish that difficult task. He found it a greater labor than he had anticipated, to separate the Jews from their neighbors (for they had made alliances with the neighboring princes) and to purify the worship. These early colonists did not appreciate so well the necessity of keeping to themselves. It might have been a liberal spirit which prompted them, after all their anxiety to keep strangers out in the beginning, to allow foreigners to come in and to make marriages with the royal families of the petty kings near by. But such a practice in general would have been disastrous, and if followed by the common folk, would have brought about the same undesirable state of affairs as existed before the fall of Jerusalem.

Hence Ezra welcomed, as a valuable adjutant, the new satrap Nehemiah. This Jewish favorite of the king brought with him the iron hand of the law, to aid him in enforcing those measures which the priestly scribe had not succeeded in introducing. These two (ably seconded by Malachi) made the Priestly Code, the offspring of Ezekiel's legislation, which had been completed in Babylon, the law of the land. It caused suffering and discontent at first; breaking up family ties, and making numbers leave the land. The wor-

ship was once more purified, and the heathenish elements of the faith being removed, it was rendered distinctive for all times. Ritualism and legalism it was no doubt, yet it still had the prophetic modification. It was, by the way, this hard and fast formal side of the Judaism of the second temple, which preserved it from heathen encroachments and from Hellenistic and Christian temptations.

I have still to mention one prophet, whose view on sacrifices and the priesthood is interesting to us. I mean the prophet Joel. His attitude toward the ritual has been of great assistance in aiding critics to determine the date of his prophecies. Most modern critics have agreed in assigning a late date to Joel. And when we judge him along the lines set forth in these pages, I think, that the Credner hypothesis must be abandoned. This is not the place to enter into that discussion. I will only say that the fact that he, a prophet, combines a respect for the ritual with a high morality, places him after Ezekiel. While the conditions, etc, may well fit to an early date, we do not find any such standpoint among the earlier prophets. To see this attitude compare I 9, 13 with II 12 sq. For a detailed list of the arguments which make this hypothesis probable compare Driver's Introduction.