

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 30.—OCTOBER, 1894.

I. DR. DRIVER ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF ISAIAH
XIII. AND XIV.

As shown in the first part of this paper,¹ the validity of Dr. Driver's conclusion as to the non-Isaianic authorship of these chapters hinges upon the validity of the minor premise of his argument. That premise is embodied in the proposition, *the prophecy of these chapters has no intelligible relation to, or bearing upon, the interests of the contemporaries of Isaiah*. We have already noticed one of the propositions laid down by Dr. Driver, presumably in support of this position. We will now ask attention to some others which are laid down, presumably for the same purpose.

I. The first of these is expressed thus: "The circumstances of the exile—while the Jews were still in bondage, and the power of Babylon seemed yet unshaken—constitute a suitable and sufficient occasion for the present prophecy, an occasion of exactly the nature which the analogy of prophecy demands; on the other hand, the circumstances of Isaiah's age furnish no such occasion." Now, in reference to this proposition, there are several points that can scarcely fail to arrest the notice of the thoughtful reader: (1), The first is this: The sting of the proposition, if it has one, is in its tail. In other words, we may admit that the circumstances of the Jews, while still in bondage, constitute a suitable and sufficient occasion for the present prophecy, and the admission will be without prejudice to the position of those who maintain the Isaianic authorship of this passage, and without profit to those

¹ *Presbyterian Quarterly*, April, 1894.

II. THE THEOLOGY OF HOSEA AND AMOS, AS A WITNESS TO THE AGE OF THE PENTATEUCH.

IN very recent years the attempt has been made to reach the solution of the Pentateuchal problem through the testimony of the Psalms. Thus the published lectures of Cheyne on the Psalter were saluted by a famous critic of America with these words: "It has long been evident that the Psalter was the key of the Old Testament. Biblical criticism will never attain its end with regard to Pentateuch or prophets until the Psalter has given its witness." But those who claim even a passing acquaintance with Old Testament criticism justly question the force of this remark. The two distinct methods of criticism, the linguistic and the historical or comparative, are most conclusive when used suppletively. But when applied alone the former is the less trustworthy, and, indeed, has proved self-destructive.

When the Higher Criticism proceeds to revise the traditional acceptation of the age and occasion of the Psalms, it is forced by the rarity of historical allusions to use the literary analysis as the almost absolute criterion. In this lies the weakness of any critical theory of the Pentateuch, based upon the Psalter. Poetry of right is accorded license in language. Psalms express religious feelings that may be the same in differing ages and circumstances. Therefore many differences must be found in the chronological systems of the Psalter; and he who trusts to these for the settlement of the issues of the Higher Criticism may expect to be led far astray. To the spiritual believer the Psalms are a mighty volume of praise, ascending to heaven from Israel's long and eventful history; to the rationalistic Higher Critic, seeking signs, this book is a trackless wilderness.

Without doubt, the historical method is the safer, and is as useful to the conservative student as to any other. This paper is designed to direct attention to the evidence in the Pentateuchal question furnished by a special part of Old Testament history, the writings of Hosea and Amos, the prophets of Israel. The

classification of these prophecies as historical is justified by the following considerations: Many historical data and allusions are found in them; they cast bright sidelights on current Hebrew life; appeal must be made to them for the religious, social, and political condition of the Israelites in that age.

Several attendant circumstances make them the most important witnesses in the case before us: First, the nature of the prophet's office prepared him to be an impartial and trustworthy witness. He was not the official custodian of the written law, for this duty had been assigned to the priests, who should preserve, interpret, and promulgate it. The prophetic office was quite different; he was a man of a crisis; his was a special work; he received his message often direct from God, and had license to rebuke priest and doctor of the law, as well as common people. Frequently he was raised up to denounce undue reliance on ritualism, or too rigid regard for the letter of the law; and it is wrong to expect their discourses to be mere commentaries on the ceremonial and civil laws. If, however, from their impartial and apparently hostile point of view, they do quote and approve the law, it is the more striking corroboration.

Again, these are among the few books of the Old Testament universally accepted as authentic, therefore their importance in matters of dispute cannot be overestimated. The rationalist and the supernaturalist can come to no agreement about the age and authority of the other early books of the Old Testament, and with differing premises they reach differing conclusions. But in these prophets we find common ground, a battle-field where terms are equal, a witness admitted by all, an arbitrator whose decision each is pledged to honor. Finally, their testimony is invaluable, because it is given where we least expect it. They prophesied in the kingdom of Israel, and two hundred years before, under Jeroboam, the Ten Tribes had separated themselves from the Levites, who kept the law, and from Jerusalem, where only it could be fully observed. After this schism and apostasy they could not have been specially interested in the observance of the Mosaic law; and if we should find no appeal in these prophets to the law, we could not therefore deny its existence; but if it still appears well

known and supreme after these two hundred years of lapse and opposition, no further evidence of its existence and authority is needed.

As witnesses, they are well chosen, for they speak from very different points of view, and more diverse characters could scarcely be found. They began their work about the same time, but Amos continued about two years, while Hosea labored probably more than sixty. Hosea, a native of the northern kingdom, seems to have been of noble birth, gentle in character, a patriotic Israelite, and prepared for the prophetic office. He may have come into his ministry under the influence of the preaching of Elijah and Elisha, still powerful, though they had long since passed away. Because of his patriotic devotion to, and intimate acquaintance with, the people, we look to him more for references to the inner life of Israel and for statements concerning morals and worship. Amos, a citizen of Judah, and a rough herdsman of Tekoa, was stern, moved more by the will of God than by love for the sinners, and called without elaborate preparation for his mission. He was the John the Baptist of that age, not so much concerned with the history and welfare of Israel, as a messenger of judgment to come. But while they set out on their mission with different antecedents and motives, they bear the same witness.

It is taken for granted that the reader is familiar with the rise of the Higher Criticism, and has a general knowledge of the position of the school now prevalent, including the stages through which the development of the laws is supposed to have passed, and the periods to which the various documents are assigned. We are told by this school that Hosea and Amos lived and taught before the rise of the Mosaic ritual, and show a spirit not only free from but hostile to it. Let us judge this theory by what the prophets have to say. It must be borne in mind that the northern kingdom was now steeped in vice and idolatry; it was no longer a question of observing the Mosaic law, but of reviving and preserving the principles of Jehovah's worship. We need not look for ritualism; the true test is the existence or absence of those fundamental principles for which Israel, Moses and the law were raised up by God. In short, what are the controlling ideas of the theology of these prophets?

I. Hosea and Amos recognize two depositories of revealed truth. God is a Great Author, and has written two books: the Universe and the Book of the Law. They answer to each other, and both are used to press upon man obedience to the divine will. In their preaching these prophets drew largely from nature, as great preachers have generally done. They sent sinful Israel to God's creatures and works to learn his greatness and goodness, and their miserable apostasy. In this they were forerunners of Christ, who understood so well the human heart, and used so effectively lessons from the physical world; and we may well believe that, as a man, he studied diligently these prophets. Can we not trace in his teachings his intimate acquaintance with them? Every sermon or prophecy delivered by them is full of illustrations from nature. We might say of them that they sought to clarify and beautify historic faith by nature's countless analogies. They and Christ realized the importance of her testimony to truth, and it is a luckless day when, through indifference, or by meek surrender to the materialist, the church loses the support of this great field of revelation. Paul goes so far as to state that, by the manifestations of nature alone, man can come to an adoring knowledge of God. Botany traces his power in leaf and flower, Geology declares that he laid the foundations of the earth, and Astronomy, leaping from star to star, ascends to his "holy hill on high."

Let us cite some examples of their remarkable use of analogy: All kinds of things, grand and lowly, beautiful and commonplace, are taken with good effect, just as Christ made us see the truth through mountain and mustard seed, king and sparrow, talent and farthing. Every sphere of life is invaded for mediums to convey truth; even the barnyard and kitchen are drawn upon. Israel's wickedness is represented by a cake not turned, and his folly as the confusion of a silly dove; his weakness through wantonness is like the grey hairs of age; as a luxuriant, unpruned vine cannot bear good fruit, neither does he, because of rank temporal growth; his goodness vanishes as the morning cloud and early dew; his obstinacy is like that of the stubborn heifer or untamed wild ass; and his wicked king shall be cut off as foam on

the water. Confusing wilderness, arid desert, hunger, thirst, nakedness, rottenness, moth-eating, laceration by thorns, eagles' tearing, lions' devouring, the wind's fury and torrent's devastation set forth the tribulations of those who forget God. The righteous are beautiful as the lily and established like the strong, deep-rooted cedar of Lebanon; his God is refreshing shade, reviving dew and rain, and life-giving food to him. Jehovah's calling his people to follow him is like the mighty, yet tender, roaring of the lion for her young. Marriage, the closest and most affectionate relation of life, suggests the blessedness and nearness of God's relation to his people. Agriculture gives the plowing of the plowman, and the harvest of grain and fruit for illustrations; and the nine chapters of Amos are filled with pictures from his own shepherd life. These are some of the hundreds of instances in which Hosea and Amos appeal to nature as a witness for God.

But nature, though important, is not all. They have a surer guide, a stronger witness: this is that historic revelation which they call the Law of God. Their mission begins with this law, and all their warnings and entreaties are enforced by appeal to it. As theologian and preacher of this day must turn to the Bible for authority, so these prophets appealed to a well-known law. It was a revelation, despised by Israel, a standard of life, from which they had departed. What was that law? This question brings us face to face with the theological issue of our day: The age and authority of the books of the Bible.

This law, to which Hosea and Amos held Israel accountable, was written: "I have written to him the great things of my law, but they were counted as a strange thing." (Hos. viii. 12.) Some in recent years have boldly asserted that no trace of a full ritual, moral and civil law, such as the Mosaic Law, can be found in the time when these men lived. They tell us that the first centuries of Israel's life in Canaan were half-barbaric, and that the first signs of emerging from this state are found in these early prophets, and that by them and their successors the people were finally led up to the high religious life found in the Pentateuch, and they expect us to believe this in the face of archæological discoveries, which have proved that the use of letters antedates

Moses by centuries; that in and before his day legislation, historiography, and theology flourished, and that all the early life of Israel was in closest association with the nations especially proficient in these things. Is it even supposable that under such circumstances we should find them a nation without a written history, without a written law, without a carefully-appointed religion?

This written law was committed to a certain class for preservation and instruction, namely, the priests. The fourth chapter of Hosea is a rebuke of the sins of the priests, and two of the charges brought against them are, that there is no knowledge of God in the land, and that they have forgotten the law of their God.

In the same chapter of Hosea in which this law is said to be written we find the statement that it is also of ancient origin, for the prophet associates it with the covenant which God entered into with the Israelites at the beginning of their national independence: "They have transgressed my covenant and trespassed against my law" (Hosea viii. 1); and following this are four specifications of their trespass against the law: the schism under Jeroboam, which cut them off from the central and legal sanctuary at Jerusalem (verse 4); idolatry, in the same verse; too intimate association with the Gentiles (verses 8 and 9), and lastly, profane and unprecribed worship (verses 11 and 13).

We must not forget that Amos also knew of this law, and has made a very suggestive reference to it. In declaring the wrath of God against seven prominent nations he has only one charge to bring against Judah, while a long catalogue of Israel's sins is given. All of Judah's sinfulness can be reduced to one great crime: he has despised the "Law of the Lord." (Amos ii. 4.) In connection with this statement we must remember that the authorized sanctuary, the regular line of priests, the faithful Levites, and the ark of the covenant were with Judah. Now, these statements that Hosea and Amos make about this law: that it was written, was in the keeping of the priests, was of ancient origin, and was specially authoritative in the kingdom of Judah, create in our minds the suspicion, at least, that it was very much like that law, which, according to Deuteronomy, thirty-first chapter, Moses

wrote and delivered to the Levites for preservation in the side of the ark, and for teaching and judging the people.

Now let us examine some of the ideas and doctrines of these prophets, that we may come to a knowledge of the contents of that law to which they refer their authority:

II. First, their idea of God. The modern school of criticism asserts that it was materialistic and narrow. Jehovah was the God of Israel in the same sense that Moab had Chemosh and Phœnicia had Baal. And the low and cruel traits which other nations ascribed to their national deities, the Israelites of early times entertained of their God. It is not merely asserted that this was the belief of *some* of the people, but that it was originally the approved faith of the nation, and that evidence of this is found in Hosea and Amos. If this were true, how far they were from the Almighty God of the Book of Genesis! But whatever erroneous and low ideas the apostate people might have held, the prophets had an exalted and spiritual conception of the Divine Being. His power was as boundless as space: "He that formeth the mountains, and createth the wind, and declareth unto man what is his thought, that maketh the morning darkness, and treadeth upon the high places of the earth, the Lord, the God of hosts, is his name." (Am. iv. 13.) And again: "It is he that buildeth his stories in the heaven, and hath founded his troop in the earth; he that calleth for the waters of the sea, and poureth them out upon the face of the earth: the Lord is his name." (Am. ix. 6.)

His omnipresence was stated by them in almost the identical thought of that beautiful and spiritual Psalm, the cxxxix. Amos says there is no place in the universe whither the wicked can flee and be beyond the reach of God: "Though they dig into hell, though they climb up to heaven, though they hide themselves in the top of Carmel, though they be hid from my sight in the bottom of the sea, though they go into captivity before their enemies," they cannot evade his hand. (Amos ix. 2-4.) His intelligent justice is taught by Amos in the parable of the plumb-line, and its universality by the arraignment of all nations before his tribunal. It may be said that a more beautiful description of God's providence is found in no other part of Scripture, except in

the words of Christ. In the second chapter of Hosea he is represented as bringing back the sinful people to his service and blessing by want and sorrow. His constant care in the wilderness is often mentioned: "By a prophet the Lord brought Israel out of Egypt, and by a prophet was he preserved." (Hos. xii. 13.) Captivity can come only when God raises up a nation. (Amos vi. 14.) Not only was the belief in separate national deities foreign to these prophets, but they also rise above the narrow race religion that has characterized the Jews, and declare God's fatherly care for all nations. Notice the beautiful words of Amos: "Are ye not as children of the Ethiopians unto me, O children of Israel? saith the Lord. Have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt? and the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir?" (Amos ix. 7.)

III. Another point to be noticed is their high and spiritual conception of Jehovah's relation to his own people. Continually they call the attention of the people to the unfailing and adorable mercy of God. "Come," says Hosea, "and let us return unto the Lord: for he hath torn and he will heal us; he hath smitten and he will bind us up." "O Israel, return unto the Lord thy God; for thou hast fallen by thine iniquity. Take with you words, and turn to the Lord: say unto him: take away all iniquity and receive us graciously." And to the penitent sinner thus returning, God's answer of mercy is: "I will heal their backsliding, I will love them freely." Their teaching about God's love for his people calls to mind the pure and holy doctrines of the New Testament. Hosea plainly declares God's fatherhood: "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt. I taught Ephraim also to go, taking them by their arms." As the Apostle Paul represented Christ's relation to his church by the marriage bond, so Hosea begins his book with an allegory in three chapters, grounding God's affection for, and forbearance with, his people on his marriage to them by the covenant. The keynote of Hosea's prophecies is the tender, forgiving, yearning love of God. Can this be the product of semi-barbarism and the accompaniment of sensual and idolatrous worship?

IV. Another part of the prophets' theology to be considered is

their idea of the relation of the people to God, the duties which God requires of them. We may express these briefly by the term worship; for it covers the praise of heart and tongue, the offering of the hand, and faith, love and obedience.

The rationalistic school holds that the early religion of Israel was polytheistic and materialistic, and that even in the days of these prophets the calf-worship was the authorized form, and that the prophets knew and winked at this. It is the idea of Kuenen that human sacrifices were offered, although this was without the prophetic approval. History does state that the worship of the people had become corrupt, but the prophets, far from countenancing, vehemently condemn these corruptions. Their writings show that they received and taught the same pure and spiritual worship which God has ordered in every part of the Scriptures, and to which the holy men of old, moved by the Spirit, have gladly subscribed.

That cardinal institution for the preservation of Jehovah's worship, the single sanctuary, stated most clearly in Deuteronomy, is maintained by Hosea and Amos. There were, in fact, many places of national worship in both kingdoms, and the existence of these is supposed by some to be an evidence that there was no law to the contrary. They had come down as holy places from antiquity, because of association with the patriarchs, and no organized effort was made to suppress them until Hosea and Amos were resting in their graves. Such is the so-called scientific theory of this generation. But these prophets thought and spoke differently. Hosea, though a citizen of the northern kingdom, and showing his love for his country throughout his book of prophecy, traces all the corruptions in religion to the schism from the kingdom under the son of David, and to him it appears that the restoration of religion shall come along with the reunion under the rule of the house of David. He states, very particularly, that the fault to be found with the schism is, the origin through it of unauthorized sanctuaries and worship: "They have set up kings, but not by me; they have made princes, and I knew it not; of their silver and their gold have they made them idols, that they may be cut off. Thy calf, O Samaria, hath cast thee off." (Hos.

viii. 4, 5.) The inference is clear, that if separation from Judah has been the natural cause of forbidden and sinful institutions, then the sanctuary and the worship of Jerusalem must be of divine authority. It is worthy of special mention, that the statements of Hosea concerning the schism are in complete harmony with the history of that event contained in the First Book of Kings. We are told by this same prophet in plain words, that instead of these sanctuaries having come down with authority from former ages, the opposite is the case, and they are a recent and sinful growth. Israel fell into the same folly that has ruined so many nations. Worldly prosperity and military triumph had resulted in the corruption of all spheres of life. Religious life had been overloaded with multiplications of illegal sanctuaries and appointments: "According to the multitude of his fruit he (Ephraim) hath increased his altars; according to the goodness of his land they have made goodly images." (Hos. x. 1.) Can we ask for language that is clearer than this? The reign of Jeroboam II. had been a time of remarkable political and financial prosperity. But the people had not been brought back in humble gratitude to God; they were encouraged to multiply their sins, and to leave further behind them that pure and divinely-given system, which is always so uncomfortable for the voluptuous and wicked.

While the northern kingdom is uniformly condemned, both prophets speak with favor of the southern kingdom: Hos. i. 7, 11; iii. 5; and Amos ix. 11. But we know that there was the same proneness to sin in Judah as in Ephraim, and in the fifth chapter of Hosea they are classed as equal sinners; hence this approval cannot be on the ground of better conduct, but simply because Judah had been true to David, possessed the true sanctuary, and was in nearer accord with the covenant than Ephraim.

Many passages can be found in which the false sanctuaries are denounced in unequivocal terms. They are called places of sin, and also sin in themselves. Hosea makes a very significant play on the name of the principal idolatrous sanctuary, calling it *Bethaven*, house of iniquity, instead of Bethel. Indeed, all the sanctuaries of Israel are condemned in the same language: "the

high places also of Aven, the sin of Israel." (Hos. x. 8.) Amos, viii. 14, calls the worship at Bethel the "sin of Samaria," and in bitter irony the people are derided for resorting to such places of worship: "Come to Bethel, and transgress; at Gilgal multiply transgression!" If any one should raise the objection, as some have done, that this language is directed, not against these places as sanctuaries, but against the evil practices so common there, other passages rule out the objection by showing that the places in themselves are the objects of attack. In one passage the seeking of the Lord is put in opposition to resorting to these places: "Seek not Bethel, nor enter into Gilgal, and pass not to Beersheba: *seek the Lord.*" Their speedy destruction is promised, together with the certain punishment of their devotees: "The calf of Samaria shall be broken in pieces." (Hos. viii. 6.) "The high places of Aven, the sin of Israel, shall be destroyed." (Hos. x. 8.) After setting forth the bitter humiliation and the severe punishment in store for Israel, Hosea attributes all to these false sanctuaries: "So shall Bethel do unto you." (Hos. x. 15.) Many similar passages might be cited on this point, but one other, that is conclusive, will suffice. Amos describes the punishment of those who frequent these places thus: "They that swear by the sin of Samaria, and say, Thy God, O Dan, liveth; and, The manner of Beersheba liveth; even they shall fall, and never rise up again." (Amos viii. 14.)

This is their witness against the unauthorized sanctuaries; they also express their approval of the divinely-appointed place of worship. It is at least remarkable, that, in condemning the sins of Bethel, Dan and others, Jerusalem is never spoken against. Nor can the importance of this silence be diminished by the plea that these prophets were laboring in the northern kingdom, and, therefore, were not concerned with Judah; for the Beersheba against which Amos more than once utters judgment, is, in all probability, the city of that name in the southern part of Judah, and well known to the prophet, as it was not far from Tekoa, his own home. In positive language, also, Jerusalem is declared to be the legal sanctuary, and no such favor is ever shown by them to any other locality. Amos begins his prophecy with these signifi-

cant words: "The Lord will roar from Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem." In order to realize the force of this introduction we must bear in mind that the prophet is on a mission to the Ten Tribes. He does not seek to court favor, after the manner of a wily politician, by praising Bethel and its costly and beautiful structures, but declares even to those who have thrown off Jerusalem's authority that for them Jerusalem is the place of the Lord's manifested presence, and seat of his earthly dominion.

It is evident that the prophets admitted a divine law which regulated the worship of God. We have given their direct references to it. Let us now examine some of its features as they appear incidentally in their writings:

Certain religious offices are mentioned and described. The priests are keepers of the law and instructors of the people; they dwell in particular priestly cities, and a part of their living at least is derived from the sin-offerings of the people. These facts are gathered from the fourth, fifth, and sixth chapters of Hosea. The separation of the Nazarites by vow is said to be of God, and those who cause them to break the vow by drinking wine are upbraided. (Amos ii. 11, 12.)

The feasts and other religious days are mentioned frequently, and most significant is the fact that in two instances at least the statements made concerning sacred occasions correspond with laws which the rationalistic critics assert came into existence at a much later time. Hosea associates the Feast of Tabernacles with the sojourn in the wilderness, although it has been asserted that the historical significance belongs to the latest stage of development: "I that am the Lord thy God, from the land of Egypt, will yet make you to dwell in tabernacles, as in the days of the solemn feast." In the days of Amos the Sabbath was not the great and festive holiday that some would make it now, and that some assert it was before the so-called rise of ritualism after the exile. It is true that many in that time were eager to profane it, but they were held back by some power or law. Amos states this, and leaves us as the only inference from his words that the Sabbath was to be kept holy in his time when he speaks against those who say,

“When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn? and the Sabbath, that we may set forth wheat?”

We can also trace here the features of a ritual for sacrifice, familiar to prophets and people. Burnt-offering, meat-offering, sin-offering, free-will-offering, and thank-offering—that is to say, nearly all of the offerings prescribed in the Mosaic Law—are mentioned incidentally in the course of their writings. And certain peculiar rites are connected with certain of these offerings. For instance, the burnt-offering is daily, and there is a tithe to be offered every third year. (Amos iv. 4.) It has been mentioned already that Hosea knew of the support which the priests received through the sin-offering. Amos iv. 5 makes a peculiar statement. Leaven was regarded as a symbol of corruption, and therefore prohibited as an offering. But he speaks of an offering being made with leaven, and this offering appears to be the only one permitted to be brought with leaven in the Levitical law, as stated in the seventh chapter of Leviticus. With this thank-offering both unleavened cakes and leavened bread should be brought. The former were burned; the latter was eaten by priest and offerer. Amos in his irony represents the zealous but deluded offerer as burning both unleavened and leavened in vain.

The patient reader, who has followed the enumeration of these facts, will at once recognize them as laws he has already found in the Pentateuch. And now, in addition to mentioning the laws of sacrifice, the prophets give them their approval. The Lord is represented by Hosea, viii. 13, as speaking of “*mine offerings*,” an indication that sacrifices, if offered in the proper manner and spirit, would be accepted. The burden of the entire fifth chapter of Amos is, that the sin and corruptness of the people have made their offerings unacceptable to God; not but that sacrifices from clean hands and pure hearts would be acceptable. Hosea prophesies the cessation of the feasts, and of religious rites generally, as the direst calamity. The principal passage for this prophecy is in the ninth chapter of Hosea. In captivity they shall be cut off from all religious privileges, and even their daily food will be polluted, because it has not been sanctified by the offering of the first-fruits to God. Here is both statement and approval of sacrificial order.

But in pursuing the evidences of a divinely-prescribed place and manner of worship we must not overlook the teachings of the prophets concerning the spirituality of worship. They uphold the spiritual nature of Jehovah's worship in two ways: First, They denounce the existing idolatry in most emphatic terms. Many of the passages cited to show their disapproval of the various sanctuaries carry with them also condemnation of the idolatrous practices so common at these places. Whenever Baal-worship is condemned, idolatry in general is condemned; for this was not the worship of the Phœnician god, which prevailed in the days of Ahab, since Jehu had eradicated this. The name was now applied to idolatry in general, especially to the worship of the golden calves. This worship, and also that of all images, is spoken against in direct terms: "Of their silver and their gold have they made them images, that they may be cut off." (Hosea viii. 4.) Of the calf in Bethel, Hosea speaks in language almost similar to Isaiah's famous and beautiful description of the worthlessness of man-made gods: "The workman made it; therefore it is not God" (Hosea viii. 6); and: "They sin more and more, and have made them molten images of their silver, and idols according to their own understanding, all of it the work of the craftsmen." (Hosea xiii. 2.) One of the first resolutions of penitent and pardoned Israel, in the restoration-prophecy of Hosea, is the surrender of idolatry: "Neither will we say any more to the work of our hands, Ye are our gods." (Hosea xiv. 3.)

There is a verse in Hosea about which much discussion has centered, and which many have interpreted as an approval of a certain form of idolatry: "The children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim." (Hos. iii. 4.) It appears that memorial pillars were set up in places of special importance in the patriarchal history, and these became the objects and the centers of idolatrous worship. The Book of Deuteronomy prohibits the using of them in worship. The "image" mentioned in the verse just quoted is one of these pillars, and the rationalistic interpreters have supposed that Hosea regards the loss of it as a great misfortune, and, therefore,

virtually sanctions them. Those who maintain the non-existence of the Pentateuch in the time of these prophets make much of this interpretation of the verse. But it is an impossible view according to the facts. In another place, chapter x. 1, these pillars are condemned as idolatrous abuses, which have increased with prosperity. The interpretation carries too much with it, for it would make the prophet sanction teraphim, common household gods, and this is contrary to his repeated utterances against image-worship. The proper interpretation brings Hosea out in strong disapproval of the entire mixed and idolatrous system. He does not regard captivity as a time of calamity, because the people shall be deprived of civil and religious ordinances, but as a time of correction, in which they shall be purified from illegal institutions; for after their return, they shall not desire the restoration of these things, but, in striking contrast to the past, they shall then "seek the Lord their God" (Hosea iii. 5).

The second way in which these prophets emphasize spirituality of worship is by attacking gross formalism. The true people of God in all ages have contended that the state of the heart is more important than the outward forms; that the latter are useless unless they are the expression of the former. And such is the teaching of Hosea and Amos. Let us take a well-known passage from each: Hosea says; "I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings." After setting forth the enormity of Israel's sins, Amos uses this strong language concerning their formal worship: "I hate, I despise your feast days, and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies. Though ye offer me burnt-offerings and your meat-offerings, I will not accept them; neither will I regard the peace-offerings of your fat beasts." In all succeeding ages the church has appealed to these beautiful passages as proof-texts for heart-religion.

But at this point an objector comes upon the scene to tell us that these verses prove conclusively the ignorance of the Levitical law on the part of the prophets, since they express a spirit antagonistic to the cold legalism of this law. The religion sanctioned by the prophets before the Exile is spontaneous and spiritual, while that embodied in the Priest-code is cold and rigid formal-

ism. It is sufficient to reply in passing that this assertion is based upon one of the most outrageous assumptions ever made by bold mortal. It is true that bigoted men have reduced the Levitical law to legalism, but it is far from the truth to say that it takes an attitude of bare formalism. On every page there is the stamp of spirituality. The minute sacrificial directions were not merely for the sake of ritualism, but apart from their evident typical bearing, their great lesson is the holiness of God and the holiness required in his worship. The laws concerning uncleanness were not intended for meaningless restrictions, but to teach the necessity of separation from sin and sinners. The moral and civil laws of the Pentateuch express that brotherly interest which has always characterized the relation of the Hebrews to each other. And even circumcision, the initial rite of the Hebrew church, is declared in the Pentateuch to have its spiritual significance. (Deut. x. 16.) Such was also the doctrine of Hosea and Amos, and such the doctrine of Christ, who came not to destroy, but to fulfil and interpret the law.

So striking is the correspondence of these prophets to the Priest-code, and so many allusions do they make to it, that a large branch of modern critics, ably represented by Professor Dillman, refuse to admit the conclusion of Wellhausen and his followers, that this legislation is exilic or post-exilic, but stoutly maintain that it originated in or before the time of Hosea and Amos.

V. Another duty which God requires of his people is prominently presented in these writings: It is a service which God has co-ordinated with the worship of himself, namely, the righteous and hearty discharge of man's duties to man. This might be classed under worship, for God made man in his own image, and he that honors the creature honors also the creator. The practical fulfilment of the two great commandments may be summed up largely under the second, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." "For if a man love not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" Great prominence is given to moral and civil ordinances in the Pentateuch, and the prophets press them on the people as necessary in true religion. Justice, uprightness, and charity must be followed by

those who will worship God acceptably. The use of false weights and measures is denounced; the landmarks between adjoining estates must not be changed, nor must bribery be practised; creditors must respect the rights of their debtors; considerate charity and the absence of oppression must be the spirit that a worshipper of God manifests to all in trouble, such as the unfortunate, the poor, the widow, and the orphan. The associations of men must be pure, and violation of this requirement is a profanation of the Lord's holy name. So the prophets conceive of man's duty to man in thought and language similar to that great law of the Hebrews which has made their life honored in persecution and adversity. Such have been the sentiments of the wisest Christian law-makers, who have transferred the outlines of the Pentateuchal moral laws into the codes of their own nations.

High conceptions of the nature of God, of his relation to man, of man's duty to him in worship, and of man's duty to man are the characteristic features of the teachings of Hosea and Amos. But the rationalists, who are seeking to revise the Old Testament history, claim, finally, that these lofty ideas appear for the first time here; that there has been progress in civilization and spiritual development until a great revolution is at hand, of which the prophets are precursors. What now do they teach on this point? Do they profess to be the heralds of new things?

It is evident, throughout, that they lay no claim to originality for their ideas. They speak of things well known to all the people, and the doctrines they present are familiar standards, from which Israel has departed, and by which he is now to be judged. The law, which has been ignored, counted a strange thing and despised, is of ancient origin, being connected with the covenant. We can conceive of no more striking figure than that which Hosea uses to express the apostasy of the nation from an old faith: their idolatrous worship and sinful life are represented by adultery; and this unfaithfulness occurred not once, but repeatedly. This implies a contract by which, and a time when, all these violated laws are binding. There are three passages which deserve special mention, as showing the antiquity of the commands which the prophets seek to enforce. Hosea compares the princes of

Judah, who have done evil and caused others to sin, to those who remove their neighbors' bounds. So they have removed the bounds between right and wrong, between the worship of God and that of Baal, bounds well known and fixed. The other two passages refer the beginning of Israel's apostasy and wickedness to the forty years in the wilderness: "I saw your fathers as the first ripe in the fig-tree at her first time: but they went to Baal-peor, and separated themselves unto that shame." (Hos. ix. 10.) "Did ye offer unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel? But ye bore the tabernacle of your Moloch and Chiun your images, the star of your god, which ye made to yourselves." (Amos v. 25, 26.) The latter passage has been made to bear many interpretations. The key to its interpretation is the time referred to in the second verse: "But ye bore," etc. The natural and common-sense view is that the time must be the same as in the preceding verse, the years in the wilderness; and according to this, Amos declares that the idolatrous worship, which he denounces, began even in the wilderness, and the laws against it existed and were violated then, as in his own day.¹

This rationalistic theory takes away the text of the prophets' sermons, makes their threatened judgments without cause, and reduces the expressions of their righteous wrath against the national sins to unjust tirades. Worst of all, it takes away their claim to historical accuracy, a claim that none have a right to deny them. Uniformly they represent the idolatry and corruptness of the nation as departure from the "Law of the Lord," for which punishment by overthrow and exile shall come. But if there was no law, the nation's direful end was either a great misfortune or a great injustice. Let us be satisfied with their records, unrevised by modern science, and give to these holy men of old the credence they deserve, when they tell us that Israel sinned in departing from God's law, and received just retribution for continued apostasy, in continuous exile.

The Higher Criticism has accomplished much good. Not least

¹ We are encouraged to hold this interpretation by the fact that Stephen in his famous speech adopted it. (Acts vii. 41-43.)

of its good deeds has been the turning of the eyes of the church to this portion of the Scriptures, so often and so unjustly ignored. And we have found in the prophets "a treasure hid in a field." Besides trusting them in the defence of our faith, we receive from their writings sermons of wonderful power, ideas and illustrations of surpassing beauty, and the most helpful exposition of Old Testament religion given before the coming of the Greatest of prophets.

EDWARD MACK.

St. Louis.