

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 34—April, 1898.

I.

DR. MCGIFFERT ON APOSTOLIC CHRIS- TIANITY.*

WE confess to no little disappointment with this new book of Dr. McGiffert's. The author had previously given us an edition of the *Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius* for which we were justly grateful. The scholarship, acumen, and good sense displayed in that valuable work gave hope of a handling of the phenomena of the apostolic age which would mark a true advance in our knowledge. In his more recent *Inaugural Address* Prof. McGiffert showed that he had come under the influence of the newer Harnackian ideas to an extent which awakened some apprehensions. But we were certainly not prepared for so radical and revolutionary a production as this new volume of "The International Theological Library" proves to be. Dr. McGiffert says in his Preface that his aim throughout "has been positive, not negative, constructive, not destructive." We fully believe it; but his work is destructive all the same—destructive of most received notions on the subjects he is treating of—and his construction is of a sort which will cause many not over-conservative people to shake their heads. Had the work come from the study of one of the German theologians Dr. McGiffert loves so much to quote, there would have been little occasion to marvel at its contents. But the views it propounds are surprising as coming from a sober professor

* *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, by Arthur Cushman McGiffert, Ph.D., D.D., Washburn Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897, \$2.50 net; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

II.

THE MODERN HYPOTHESIS AND RECENT CRITICISM OF THE EARLY PROPHETS.

THE study of the early prophetic writings has become invested with a threefold interest through the rise of the Kuenen-Wellhausen hypothesis. Externally looked at, the reversal of the customary sequence, Law-Prophets, seemed to form the distinctive feature of this hypothesis, and around this point accordingly the battle between its defenders and opponents was at first concentrated. It appeared obvious that for the decision of the controversy everything depended on the literary and historical testimony of the earliest prophets. The question was one of verifying whether any, or how much, of the material, legislative and narrative, embedded in the Law existed in written form in ancient times. Apart from a few poetic compositions of smaller size,* and some historical documents, which are, however, held to have been incorporated in and adjusted to works of much later date and whose original form can therefore no longer be precisely determined,† the Prophets were the only writings in regard to whose date and genuineness in the main both sides were still agreed. All else appeared unsettled and involved in the great critical upheaval: here at least a common basis for argument had remained. But this reveals only one side of the importance to which the prophetic books suddenly attained. It was soon realized that much more was at stake than the relative age of certain writings, and that the shifting of dates on so broad a scale had taken place in the interest of a philosophical theory regarding the development of Israel's religion. Hence the discussion was pushed into the wider field of the history of revelation or religion, into the midst of the living movement of events, where research bids fair to be rewarded not by discovery of the external sequence of writings alone, but by insight into the causal connection of the forces that have shaped the development of which the writings are mere precipitates or products. If the new hypothesis was right, then Prophecy, coming

* The Song of Deborah (Judg. v), David's Song of the Bow (2 Sam. i. 19-27).

† The oldest material in Judges and Samuel and in the story of Elijah and Elisha in 1 Kgs. xvii-2 Kgs. xiii.

before the Law, claimed all the interest attaching to records which stand nearest to the mysterious but fascinating beginning of things. The removal of the Pentateuch from its place before the Prophets had created a clear field for that form of naturalistic theorizing to which hitherto the Law with its sharply defined supernaturalistic signature had always formed an insuperable barrier; the question had now become open, What is it that lies back of Prophecy, evolution or revelation, the physical or the ethical, the imperfect or the perfect? * But, contemporary records failing unless the constructions attempted in answer to this question were to be wholly baseless and subjective, a process of backward reasoning, taking its point of departure from the earliest ascertainable data, had to be resorted to; and these data were furnished by the eighth-century prophets, who were thus made to bear witness direct or indirect to the stage of religious development preceding their own times. Even this, however, does not exhaust the significance of the early prophetic writings as a factor in the critical controversy. They appear not as mere literary or historical witnesses, but as independent actors in the drama of development constructed by the critics. Even on the old view, Prophetism at its rise marks an epoch in sacred history. The modern hypothesis, however, having reduced everything in the oldest period to a naturalistic level, is bound to make this epoch a creative one; to it the prophets are the originators of the unique ethical and religious teaching Israel has given to the world, whereas according to the traditional view the prophets simply enforced and applied and developed what was already contained, germinally at least, in the Mosaic revelation.

Neither side was slow to perceive the strategic value possessed by the prophetic writings in each of these three respects. First of all, from the conservative side the claim was upheld that the high antiquity of both the narrative and legislative material in the Pentateuch in all its parts was placed beyond attack by the testimony of the earliest prophets. Over against this the adherents of the modern view attempted to show that the prophets of the eighth century, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, contain no traces of the existence of the Deuteronomic and priestly documents, whereas references to the Jahvist and Elohist are clearly found in them; that the prophets of the seventh century, Obadiah, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Jeremiah, show, beside traces of JE, points of comparison or marks of actual acquaintance with Deuteronomy; that

* It is not accidental that the great evolutionary constructions of Israel's history date from the time when the posteriority of the Legal to the Prophetic period had become with the leading critics a settled conviction. Kuenen's *Religion of Israel* could not have been written before his espousal of the Grafian view between 1865 and 1869.

Ezekiel, the prophet of the exile, reveals great similarity in his ideas and manner of expression with the oldest of the priestly sections of the Law; that finally, the late writers, Malachi and Daniel, offer parallels with all parts of the Thora, and speak of the latter as an organic whole attributed to Moses. All this in entire harmony with the main contentions of the critical hypothesis.

With equal eagerness the prophetic testimony in regard to Israel's past religious development was seized upon by both parties to the controversy, although it must be admitted that here the critics were at a serious disadvantage. The defenders of the traditional view maintained, and evidently on strong grounds, that the unanimous voices of Prophecy pronounced the corrupt state of popular religion among Israel the result of an habitual declension from the higher and purer faith once delivered to the fathers by Moses; that the antithesis between prophets and people was to be explained, in agreement with the explicit declarations of the prophets to this effect, as the natural opposition of the few faithful upholders of Israel's best traditions to the degeneracy of the apostate mass. The critics could not deny that on the whole this was a fair statement of what appeared from their writings to have been the prophets' own convictions on this point. But, in spite of this, they asserted that the data of the prophetic literature, when rightly interpreted, favored not the conservative, but the modern construction of history. And the assertion was made plausible by the demand that a correct interpretation of the past in the light of Prophecy should begin not with accepting the Prophetic judgment as historical evidence, but with explaining it, together with a number of other facts, on philosophical and psychological principles. If the prophets characterize the popular religion as apostasy, it is not so much as a piece of credible testimony that this has interest for us, but as an unconscious revelation on their part that in the course of evolution they had risen above the majority, and were so naïvely and intuitively convinced of the truth of their higher views as to be unable to think of them as not having been known and valid since the first beginning of Israel's history.

But the main trial of strength between the two contending views was reserved for the interpretation of the Prophetic movement itself, and its contribution to the development of Old Testament religion. The critics had to show, and endeavored to show, that the historical constellation under which their hypothesis placed the birth of Prophecy was not only consistent with but favorable to the intensely productive power ascribed to it. Given the antecedents and the environment supplied by the reconstruction of the older period, it was said, and the work of the Prophets stood out

upon the background of their age luminous and intelligible; the mystery and darkness which had hitherto enveloped the genesis of the loftiest teaching of the Old Testament were at once dispelled. The antiquated notion of objective supernatural revelation could now be discarded and the modern idea of development take its place. It was easy to trace the psychological processes in which the distinctive doctrines of the Prophetic theology were evolved. Part fitted into part, and for each truth there was a place and function in the growing organism. The ethical idealism, the monotheism, the spiritual conception of the nature and service of Jehovah, the universalism, the Messianic predictions of the prophets, all these were furnished with a rational explanation and exhibited in their mutual dependence. The veil was lifted from the reading of the old covenant and the history of its ideas almost wrote itself. In a word, it was claimed that the new hypothesis found its chief commendation and celebrated its highest triumph in the brilliant simplicity with which it solved the riddles and swept away the problems of Old Testament science.

On the other hand, those who were convinced of the correctness of the older views did not hesitate to take up the challenge thus thrown out to them. If anywhere, then here was the point where the critical theory was to be met aggressively and to be subjected to criticism in its turn. In this particular field it undertook to be positive and constructive, and its exploits were so daring and comprehensive, covering such a wide range of evidence upon which it must either plainly approve or discredit itself, that no possibility seemed left for a *non liquet* in the end. And not only did a critical examination of the hypothesis on this point seem to promise definite results, it offered the further advantage of testing the same, not in some subordinate feature, but in the centre of its life on which all other parts are dependent. Should it fail to substantiate its claims here, it must break down entirely, for its own assumptions have led it to place at this point the main problem of Old Testament history, for the sake of solving which it exists. In so far as the hypothesis could lay claim to being the most ingenious and best-balanced scheme yet devised for a purely naturalistic explanation of the phenomena of Prophecy, it was justly deemed to involve in its success or defeat the general cause of anti-supernaturalism as regards the Old Testament. Under the influence of so much that invited and stimulated criticism, it is no wonder that the evolutionary scheme was rigorously tried by the stern facts of the history of Prophetism and all its weakness exposed. It was shown without difficulty that it misconstrues the evidence on which it pretends to rest, that it fails to explain the most impor-

tant elements of the prophetic consciousness and teaching, that its reasoning is more specious than logical, that in its psychological constructions it makes the Old Testament writers think in modern forms, that its assumed development stands in chronological conflict with the data of history, that it is too narrow to subsume under its categories the doctrinal wealth of prophetic revelation and its broad outlook into the future.

In that first flush of enthusiasm which is wont to attend every new discovery, whether real or imagined, the entire contents of the prophetic literature were claimed by the critics as in full harmony with their position. There was no inclination to admit that any part of the evidence appeared inconclusive or suggested problems as yet unsolved. With amazing unconsciousness of the mysteries of prophecy, the defenders of the modern view proceeded to argue their case. When hard pressed by some of the conservative representations recourse was had to an exegesis which more or less plausibly explained away the evidence of the religious vitality of the Law in the prophetic consciousness, or pointed out subtle differences between the early Prophetic and the later Deuteronomic philosophy of history, or reduced the most marvelous Messianic predictions to the level above which mere preachers of righteousness should not rise. Holiness in the Prophets was claimed to be a totally different conception from holiness in the Pentateuch. References to the Thora were interpreted either of the Prophetic instruction itself, even where the context seemed to favor no such sense, or else, if the allusion to priestly Thora could not be denied, the reader was carefully warned against a possible confusion between the written Thora of a later age and the oral Thora supplied by the priests in individual instances. With so much assurance was this method of dealing with the inconvenient parts of the evidence at first applied, that for a considerable time no necessity was felt to propose the question, whether some of the prophecies in which these phenomena occurred might not be of a later date, so that protection against them ought to be sought in critical excision rather than in exegetical makeshifts. The well-nigh universal denial of the genuineness of such sections as Isa. xxiv-xxvii and xl-lxvi, and the late dating by many of the prophecy of Joel had, besides, removed the most serious difficulties in advance.

In the course of time, however, a great change came over the critics in their attitude toward the prophetic writings. They began to be more thoughtful and less eager to claim that their conception of Israel's history and the testimony of the Prophets in their present shape were in perfect agreement. It was perceived

that the hypothesis did not find as smooth sailing in the often-disturbed waters of prophetic revelation as was at first anticipated. Difficulty was experienced in reconciling the realistic content of many an oracle with the highly idealistic character in which the critics were accustomed to conceive the prophet. But these doubts and misgivings were not signs of any inclination on the part of the critics to retrace their steps. On the contrary, they indicated a more than ever assured conviction of the substantial truth of their conclusions. The precipitancy with which the champions of the new views had in the beginning thrown themselves upon the available evidence to press every part of it with equal ardor into the service of their cause, wore off in the same proportion as the hypothesis was believed to have been placed on a secure basis, so as to be no longer dependent on single data for its support. A calmer tone and temper took its place, which enabled the critics to observe more accurately and to recognize more readily the real nature of the facts, than was possible before. Still more influential, however, in bringing about this change was a second cause. The criticism of the Hexateuch had run its course and been carried to that point of minuteness and perfection of detail where little attractive original labor remained to be done. New fields were to be opened up in which the critical faculty could exert the powers acquired in its employment upon the Mosaic writings. The fact that difficulties had to be admitted in squaring the modern theory with the prophetic books naturally turned the attention of the critics in this direction. So it came about that a vigorous movement for the reconstruction of the criticism of the Prophets set in, in which, so far as the situation allowed, the performances of Pentateuch criticism were reënacted, and the first canon applied was the probably late, in most cases post-exilic, origin of all such prophecies as did not harmonize in their traditional place with the evolutionary programme of the history of religious ideas.

It is assumed by the pioneers in this field that the prophetic literature has been subjected to a systematic redaction guided by religious or theological view-points and involving important excisions, additions and alterations. This process reached its height during the Persian period, after the writings of the prophets had for some time possessed a certain degree of sacredness, which could not be maintained unless their contents were made to agree with the then prevailing beliefs.* An extensive literary activity

* It is difficult to conceive of a mental attitude toward ancient prophecy sufficiently convinced on the one hand of its absolutely divine origin to conclude *a priori* that certain elements must be contained in it, and yet unscrupulous enough, on the other hand, to manipulate those divine oracles for the purpose of supplementing what was wanted. If we may believe the critics, the later scribes united these contradictory mental traits in themselves.

is believed to have developed which, in close dependence upon the older models and largely anonymous, adapted the ancient prophecies to the historical circumstances of the period; and the products of this activity, it is said, have been incorporated into the writings of the earlier prophets, so that, in the latter, compositions of widely distant ages and of entirely distinct stages of religious development are now agglutinated. The Prophetic books are composite in a sense somewhat analogous to that in which the Legal literature is held to consist of various layers. Among German critics Stade and Wellhausen have been chiefly identified with the advocacy of this view, the former by his *Geschichte des Volkes Israel** and a number of articles in the *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, the latter by his *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte*† and the new translation with accompanying notes of the Minor Prophets which forms Part v of his *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*. To the criticism of Isaiah the principle has been applied with great boldness by Duhm's *Kommentar*, and also by Hackmann's treatise on *Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaia*: most painstakingly and comprehensively, however, by Cheyne's *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*. The last-mentioned critic has likewise espoused the results of the recent criticism of the Minor Prophets from this point of view, in the Introduction written by him for the new edition of Robertson Smith's *The Prophets of Israel*.

It will be at once apparent that by this new departure the significance of the prophetic writings for the questions at issue has been essentially modified. It can be of no use any longer to appeal to traces in the early prophets of the Legal organization and spirit or of the Thora as an organic whole, or of any of the alleged products of post-exilic Judaism; for these very features have now become the criteria by which, without appeal, the late origin of every prophecy wherein they occur is established. To carry on the debate on the basis of what remains, after the critical expurgation has been accomplished, would be a wholly fruitless undertaking. The standpoint represented by the assumed post-exilic writers or redactors is in most cases identical with the conservative standpoint. Hence to rule out their testimony would be a begging of the question on a grand scale, something resembling a judicial process in which the desired verdict were used be-

* i. 14; ii. 205-212; *Z. A. W.*, i. 171.

† pp. 155-157. Cf. further Kuenen, *Historisch-kritisch Onderzoek*, ii, 21-25; Smend, *Alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte*, 183; Giesebrecht, *Beiträge zur Jesaia-kritik*, 187-220, and *Das Buch Jeremia* (who, however, rejects Stade's theory of a systematic redaction of the prophetic canon by the later scribes). Nowack, *Die Kleinen Propheten*, recently published in his *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament*, and Volz, *Die vorexilische Jahveprophetie und der Messias*, did not come to hand until after this article had been written.

forehand by one party as the test for admitting and excluding evidence. A critical comparison of the old and new views, as far as the Prophetic books are concerned, was possible only while the critics were yet in a position to admit the testimony of these books in their entirety.* But this period has now begun to belong to the past. The adherents of the modern hypothesis, at least the progressive ones among them, are fully aware of this, as appears from the fact that without controversial regard for their conservative opponents they proceed to manipulate and distribute the prophecies to their own satisfaction. When sometimes from the apologetic side complaints are still heard, that the critics cannot be reasoned with, because no sooner is any passage quoted from the prophetic writings making against their assumptions than they declare it of later origin, such complaints are in one sense hardly justified. In point of fact, the critics are no longer engaged in demonstrating or defending their hypothesis; they are at work in applying it.

But if, in the old sense, the apologetic significance of the early prophetic writings has for the time being been neutralized, in other respects their study with a view to the pending issues has acquired new interest. Altogether apart from the question as to the correctness of results, it cannot be concealed that a large part of the arguments once used in defense of the critical hypothesis has been by this recent move entirely discredited. The present attitude of the critics themselves is a practical confession to this effect. At a time not so very far removed they contended hotly that the prophetic evidence submitted by the apologists in favor of the high antiquity of the Mosaic writings and institutions was imaginary, distorted, unworthy of serious attention. And, behold, at present the critics of the same school, sometimes the very same men, are making use of these identical arguments to prove the identical proposition, viz., that when these prophecies were penned, the Thora and its religious organization were supreme factors in religious life. A more complete *volte face* is scarcely conceivable. That the conclusion to be established was in the minds of the conservatives associated with the Mosaic origin of the Law, and in the mind of the present-day critics with the post-exilic date of the prophecies, is a mere accidental feature, which ought, of course, not to affect the estimate placed upon the quality of the reasoning itself. Either, the apologetic arguments

* It would be an entirely different matter, of course, if one were to eliminate from the discussion such sections of the prophetic books on whose date critical opinion departs from the traditional view independently of *a priori* considerations. The testimony of Isa. xl-lxvi, for instance, might for argument's sake be excluded, without rendering further debate useless.

were as worthless as they were branded by their opponents—and then what value can be attached to them when employed in the critical cause?—or, they are sound and conclusive now,—in which case the apologists have been splendidly vindicated and ought to receive an apology from those who once scorned their conclusions and now silently appropriate the substance of them.

After all, however, this is a mere matter of historical justice, which, while apt to reflect unfavorably upon the methods of the critics in general, need not be fatal to the correctness of their main thesis. Insufficient caution and limited insight have often made it necessary to defend one truth by controverting another, because at the time it was not seen how the two could be reconciled. The apologists may have rightly pointed out traces of the existence of the Thora in the Prophets, and yet the Thora as an organic whole may be post-exilic. In the abstract the two alternatives, that the Law is pre-Prophetic or that the prophecies in question are late interpolations, come before us with an equal show of logical possibility, and we cannot refuse to consider the solution now proposed by the critics. The reconstruction of the data of Prophecy on the lines of the modern hypothesis may be *a prioristic*, and we may regret that it confiscates the last common territory on which the disputed questions could be brought to a decision; it need not for these reasons be false. There is one right, however, which no amount of *a priori* treatment of the prophetic books can take from us—the right to subject the proposed manipulation of these writings to the test of the principles which are immanent in the writings themselves. No mistake could be greater than to suppose that the critics have now finally escaped from the control of objective facts as far as the Prophetic literature is concerned. Even in applying their theory it will not do for them merely to postulate that such and such a prophecy must be post-exilic, because the ideas contained in it are according to the modern view the specific products of that late period. They will be justly expected to show that in each individual case internal indications of a literary and contextual nature, if they do not directly require, at least favor the excision made in obedience to the claims of the hypothesis. In this sense the use of a theory as a working principle and the demonstration of its scientific character go hand in hand. The most crucial test to which every hypothesis must submit consists in its application to the widest possible range of phenomena, in distinction from the narrower circle of facts to account for which it has been constructed; and its plausibility increases or decreases proportionately to the ease or difficulty with which it subsumes under itself the phenomena beyond the horizon of its original field.

For this reason it may be said that, in the critical manipulation of the prophetic writings which it is at present pursuing, the modern hypothesis is putting itself on trial. Devised for the immediate necessities of Pentateuch criticism, it must now prove itself capable of assimilating the facts of Prophecy without resorting to revolutionary methods. It must show that the two lines of argument, the one proceeding from considerations external to the prophetic books, the other from internal evidence supplied by the latter, do actually converge. If, in attempting this, it should be compelled to displace a large amount of material from its traditional environment, or to resort, for the dissection deemed necessary, to violent means, both will have to be counted as serious instances against its probability. It seems to us that this is the point on which conservative scholars should, in the present situation, concentrate their efforts to expose the weakness of the hypothesis as regards the prophetic portion of the Old Testament. It should be shown not merely that the ideas in question are there, but are rightly there; and that they themselves, as well as the passages in which they occur, cannot be expunged without doing injury to the inner organism of the prophetic teaching and the prophetic books.

It must be confessed that from this point of view the representatives of the newest phase of prophetic criticism have made very light of their obligations. Little or no objective evidence is adduced to show that the assumed redaction or expansion of the ancient prophecies actually took place. Too often the excisions from the prophetic text are not justified, nor is their justification seriously attempted, on internal grounds. The utmost that can be said is that the critical reasoning here and there finds some apparent support in the darkness of the prophetic style or the corrupt state of the text, which makes it easy to assert lack of connection or detect seams of redaction at numerous points. The treatment of the prophetic word which is fast growing fashionable may be aptly characterized as *exegesis by means of criticism under the forced application of certain literary canons concerning the lucidity, straightforwardness and general perfection of the prophetic style*. If a passage presents exegetical difficulties or cannot be interpreted except at a sacrifice of that transparency we are accustomed to expect in modern literature, straightway the knife is inserted. Duhm's *Commentary on Isaiah* offers numerous examples of curtailment of the genuine text on no other ground than that the style or diction are thought unworthy of the prophet. Even less satisfactory is Wellhausen's manner, who, as a rule, simply *ex cathedra* decrees the spurious or late origin of a section omitted in his translation, whether from lack of other

grounds than his general critical instinct or from aristocratic disdain to state them, it is hard to tell. Cheyne not uncharitably calls this "the conciseness" of Wellhausen's argument. Whatever value may be placed on this part of his work, it must be acknowledged that Cheyne has, at least, given himself the trouble of working out the literary side of the critical case in reference to Isaiah. As a rule, however, the critics openly profess that in their estimation the literary or contextual arguments are merely secondary, and that the Biblico-theological criteria are the really decisive ones in determining the date of a prophetic passage. Cheyne himself admits that the phraseological section of his argument is on the whole not so decisive as in Hexateuch criticism, and assigns to the literary phenomena the last place among the marks of late origin of a prophecy.* Still further than this goes Hackmann, who says that, although in Hexateuch criticism far more abundant literary data were available, nevertheless even in that department no progress was made until the religious spirit and tendency of the documents became the subject of investigation; and that to a still greater extent this method will have to be pursued in the criticism of the Prophetic literature.† This is an admission that in Hexateuch criticism *a priori* principles derived from the idea of evolution, in Prophetic criticism principles derived from the evolutionary interpretation of the Hexateuch, are to be the chief canons—that in neither the literary evidence is of an independently conclusive character, and in the prophets less so than in the Hexateuch.

The necessity for these general concessions can be easily demonstrated in detail. In the following pages we endeavor to give a survey of the more important material affected by this new method of critical procedure. The examination confines itself to the prophets whose work and writings are by common consent contemporaneous with the crisis in the assumed evolution of ethical monotheism. These are the prophets of the eighth century, in chronological order—Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah. We leave Joel out of the discussion, for although the critical views concerning the development of religion furnish the chief arguments for assigning him to a post-exilic date and the contents of his book are of great importance for establishing the high antiquity of the priestly organization, yet his case is unique because here not isolated sections but the whole prophecy is transferred to the later period, and our special purpose for the present is to examine the right of the critics to detach single passages from a context which claims for them a

* *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, Prologue, xxi.

† *Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaja*, 4.

place in the work of the early prophets. Joel raises no such direct claim for itself, and, besides, the trend of critical opinion toward a late date for this prophet is of earlier origin than the general reconstructive movement in prophetic criticism with which we are now concerned.

I. AMOS.

We begin our review with the Book of Amos. The first passage that comes under consideration is chap. i. 2: "Jehovah roars from Zion and utters his voice from Jerusalem." The prominence here given to Zion and Jerusalem is obnoxious to the critics, because, on their hypothesis, the temple did not obtain its prerogative of being the central sanctuary and the one dwelling-place of Jehovah until after the Deuteronomic reform. Hence the verse is suspected by some,* while others attempt to put upon it a weakening interpretation. Wellhausen thinks that, as a Judean, Amos would naturally select Zion as the place from which Jehovah's judgment proceeds. From the standpoint of the critics themselves there is a serious objection to this. If, as is continually asserted, the temple on Zion was the seat of a cult not essentially different from nor better than that practiced at such shrines as Bethel, Gilgal, Dan, Beersheba, and against which Amos so sharply polemicizes, it must have been simply impossible for the prophet to identify Jehovah in any way with this centre of idolatry.† For, according to v. 5, Jehovah is not to be found at Bethel, Gilgal and Beersheba. For this reason no other interpretation will suit than that which finds in the words a reference to Zion, not as one among the many high places of the land, but as the divinely chosen sanctuary, whence the foreign nations, and even the northern Israelites, had to expect the advent of Jehovah for judgment.‡ It cannot be denied, therefore, that the passage is a stumbling-block to the critical theory, and Cheyne may well express surprise at Wellhausen's accepting it in 1892 without question. But it is equally impossible to eliminate the verse as it is to weaken the sense, for the suffix in אִשִּׁינֵנו, wherever it occurs in the subsequent verses, would then remain without antecedent.§ Besides

* Cheyne's Introduction to new edition of Robertson Smith's *The Prophets of Israel*, xvi.

† Cf. Guthe, *Das Zukunftsbild des Jesaia*, 22.

‡ Hoffmann, *Z. A. W.*, iii, 96, and Gunning, *De Godspraken van Amos*, 16, would have Amos think of Jerusalem as the Davidic residence in which the ideal unity of entire Israel had its centre. But the judgment on the surrounding nations, and indeed on Judah itself, has no apparent connection with the political idea of Israel's unity.

§ Hoffmann's proposal (*Z. A. W.*, iii, 97), to take אִשִּׁינֵנו as Hiph. of יָשַׁב, "I will not allow it (*i. e.*, the people) to dwell," is artificial and has found no acceptance.

this from the later standpoint the contents and form of the statement are too innocent for an intentional interpolation.

Greater unanimity prevails among the critics in regard to the late insertion of chap. ii. 4, 5, the indictment of Judah. This passage has been thrown out by Duhm,* Oort,† Stade,‡ Cornill,§ Wellhausen,|| Cheyne.¶ The case is a highly instructive one, because more openly than elsewhere the motives of the excision are here professed by the critics. Oort says: "Of the Thorath Jahwe, not in the sense of Jahwe's *instruction* but of his *law*, no mention can have been made until after Deuteronomy, and Kheza-bhim, 'lies,' did not acquire the sense of 'idols,' until after monotheism had become prevalent. . . . The expression has no meaning until after the exile." Here then are two facts at variance with the modern hypothesis,—a reference to the Thora as the recognized rule of national life, and a reference to polytheism in language which clearly implies that the unreality of all gods besides Jehovah was no longer a novel perception in Amos' day. It might be said, perhaps, that in regard to the former of these the newest critics are somewhat oversensitive, for it is quite possible, although not natural, to limit the sense of Thora here to "ordinances of civil righteousness," as Robertson Smith does,** or to prophetic instruction, as others propose, and so to reconcile the genuineness of the passage with the modern view. Kuenen even admits that the words are most naturally understood of a written Thora, and yet professes to find no reason for denying them to Amos.†† This might be a tenable position if the prophet did not explicitly refer to the Thora as the rule of Judah's national life, from which the fathers already had departed; for the two clauses of his indictment are obviously parallel. There is surely no place in the critical hypothesis for the recognition of so ancient a written law, with such unqualified claims on national obedience. And, as regards the second phrase, "the lies after which their fathers did walk," it is inadmissible to give this the sense of "deceitful superstitions in general," as Robertson Smith again is inclined to do; for the expression "to walk after" is regularly used of the service either of the true or of foreign gods,‡‡ and "lies" is synonymous with אֱלִיל, תְּהוֹ, הַבֵּל, שָׁוָא, all designations of idols expressive of their unreality. It should be

* *Theologie der Propheten*, 119.

‡ *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, i, 571.

† *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, xiv, 116; xxv, 125. ‡ *Einleitung*, 176.

|| *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, v, 71.

¶ Introduction to new edition of Robertson Smith's *The Prophets of Israel*, xvi.

** *The Prophets of Israel* (new edition), 399.

†† *Hist. Krit. Onderzoek*, i, 174.

‡‡ Cf. Isa. ii. 3; 2 Chron. xvii. 3, xxi. 12, xxii. 3, xxviii. 2.

observed that the prophet employs the term without explanation, evidently expecting it to be understood of itself, which excludes his having coined it for the first time; and terms of this sort do not as a rule become common property until the conception they express has been thoroughly assimilated by the popular consciousness. There is no denying, then, that in regard to this passage also those critics who reject it are the most consistent and clearly in the right within the limits of the hypothesis. Its most plausible interpretation is such that the modern view will not bear it. And yet it is equally undeniable that these verses are not only in their place here, but cannot be removed without disturbing the context. The meaning of Amos' introductory discourse is that Jehovah will punish Israel more than the heathen, according to chap. iii. 2. This applies both to Judah and Ephraim, but, as between these two, Judah is the relatively less sinful, and, therefore, fitly receives its place in the indictment between the heathen nations and northern Israel, for which latter the climax of the charge is reserved. It was impossible for the prophet in this connection to pass over Judah entirely, for Oort's view that its condemnation was implied in that of Ephraim and needed no separate mention is rendered improbable by chap. iii. 1, vi. 1, 2, ix. 11,—passages of which the two former at least are critically beyond suspicion. Finally, not a single reason of any weight, literary or otherwise, has been produced, except the above-stated *a priori* ones, to impugn the genuineness of the passage. Wellhausen, to be sure, thinks that a rejection of the Thora of Jehovah is not a sufficiently concrete sin to be referred to in connection with the phrase, "three transgressions or four." But it is self-understood that the rejection of the Thora involved a series of single acts of transgression.

The passages iv. 13, v. 8, 9, ix. 5, 6, are of one nature and together fall under the critical judgment. They are excised for Biblico-theological reasons connected with the development hypothesis, by all the critics quoted above as rejecting ii. 4, 5. That these verses break the connection between what precedes and follows is true in so far only as they might be omitted without causing a perceptible gap; but the same is true of a great number of passages whose genuineness is doubted by none. In all three places they serve to lend force to the prediction of judgment by declaring the transcendent greatness of Him whose the judgment is.*

* Robertson Smith well remarks: "In each case the appeal (to Jehovah's Lordship over nature) comes in to relieve the strain of intense feeling at a critical point in the argument" (*The Prophets of Israel*, new edition, 400). Cf. also Hoffmann (*Z. A. W.*, iii, 103): "[These passages] enable us to divine what the prophet saw before his eyes and is soon to mention by name." Wellhausen

It may be said that v. 8, 9, from this point of view, form the climax of ver. 6, from which they are now separated by ver. 7. Even if this were conceded, a simple transposition of vers. 7 and 8, 9, or the excision of ver. 7* would have to be preferred to the removal of vers. 8, 9. But closely looked at, the case does not call for any of these remedies. The participle **הַהֲכִיִּים** in ver. 7 belongs as descriptive enlargement to the object **לְבֵית־אֵל** of ver. 6 and is naturally immediately subjoined to the latter, like unto the connection between ii. 6 and 7, whereupon the subject of ver. 6, **הַיְהוָה** receives a similar descriptive enlargement in vers. 8, 9, the whole forming in this way a chiasmic construction.† The real ground of the exception taken to these passages lies in their advanced doctrine of the nature and attributes of Jehovah, which presupposes a fully-matured and long-established monotheism, thus upsetting the critical notion that the monotheism of the prophets was evolved out of their ethical idealism. Here Jehovah appears as the Creator and Ruler of nature, the omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient God, conceptions which are not supposed to emerge until the exile in Deutero-Isaiah or at the earliest in Jeremiah. The editor, says Cheyne, “had the same conceptions of the divine nature . . . as the later writers in general.”‡

The phrase, “sin of Samaria,” in chap. viii. 14, § is declared a later correction by Wellhausen, whom Cheyne follows.¶ “The sin of Samaria,” says the former of these critics, must mean the calf of Bethel. But Samaria, he reflects further, never stands with Amos for Israel. Consequently the prophet cannot have written it. The whole difficulty vanishes if we consider that the cult of Bethel was

appeals to Hos. xiii. 4, where the Septuagint has a passage of similar character which is clearly an insertion. But it does not follow from this that the passages in Amos are to be placed on the same footing. For (1) that in Hosea fails in the Hebrew text; (2) it does not fit psychologically into the context as the verses in Amos do; (3) it may be easily explained as an imitation of the latter.

* Kuenen and others propose to throw ont ver. 7 as an intrusion from vi. 12. But the latter passage is only partly similar.

† König, *Einleitung in das A. T.*, 304. König observes that an interpolator would hardly have inserted the verses in a place apparently so inappropriate.

‡ Kuenen and Robertson Smith here also take a conservative position without fully realizing, it seems to me, the importance of the fact that such ideas were not merely natural to Amos himself, but that he could likewise assume familiarity with them on the part of his hearers. Kuenen compares Mic. i. 2-4, but the expressions in Amos are stronger.

§ The elimination of v. 26 by Wellhausen and Cheyne and that of viii. 11, 12, by numerous critics, among these even König, is not directly connected with the development hypothesis. The former of these passages will be fully discussed in a later article.

¶ Wellhausen proposes to substitute “the sanctuary of Bethel.”—*Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, v. 12.

¶ In Robertson Smith's *The Prophets of Israel*, 401.

in a special sense the cult of the royal dynasty and, in so far, of the capital Samaria. This is required by Amos vii. 13, and receives confirmation from Hosea x. 5. What actually determines Wellhausen in rejecting the phrase is its inconsistency with his opinion that Amos condemns the sacrificial cult *in toto*. If this be so, then the prophet cannot have called a single feature, such as the calf-worship, sinful. Would it not be better to reason in the opposite direction, that, since Amos disapproves of this particular part of the cult, he did not oppose it on principle or as a whole?

The conclusion of the Book of Amos is the largest and most important section that has fallen under the condemnation of the newest criticism. Some would remove vers. 11-13;* others include in the post-exilic addition vers. 8-10 and 14, 15.† The grounds for this opinion are without exception drawn from the critical hypothesis. They are as follows: (a) The restoration of Judah and the Davidic dynasty is here predicted, and in ver. 8 "the sinful kingdom" (= Ephraim) is by implication contrasted with the better kingdom (= Judah). Wellhausen pronounces this "a plump Judaism." The clash with the modern theory arises from this: that the latter makes the comparative estimate placed upon Israel as apostate and upon Judah as in possession of the legitimate cult a product of later historical development, beginning with the Deuteronomic reform, to impute which to Amos would involve from its standpoint a gross anachronism. But, if we place ourselves upon the standpoint of the historical Amos as reflected in his prophecy, there is nothing abnormal in such a comparative judgment. As has been shown, the structure of the introduction to his book likewise presupposes that Judah is less sinful than Israel, and indirectly this is confirmed by the fact that there is no trace in ver. 5, or viii. 14, of any polemic against the cult and sanctuary of Jerusalem, which is even mentioned in i. 2 as Jehovah's dwelling-place. The whole matter, therefore, simply resolves itself into the question whether the religious and Messianic difference between Israel and Judah is entirely a Judaistic fiction by which the outcome of history was later artificially accounted for, or has a substantial basis in pre-exilic history itself? So long as no other evidence for the late origin of this prophecy is forthcoming, Amos must remain a witness for the latter view and, in so far, against the critical hypothesis.‡ (b) The chief Biblio-

* Schwally, in *Z. A. W.*, x. 227.

† Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, v. 91; Smend, *Alttest. Religionsgesch.*, 133, 184; Cheyne, Introduction to new edition of Robertson Smith's *The Prophets of Israel*, xv.

‡ We pass by the argument that ver. 11 cannot be by Amos because it regards the Judean captivity as past. This is the customary denial of the possibility of

theological reason for the attack on these verses is their incompatibility with the conception of Jehovah's righteousness attributed to Amos by the modern theory and said to be found in other portions of his book. The specifically new thing in Amos' prophecy, we are reminded, was his sacrificing the national to the ethical element in Israel's religion. He is believed to have preached for the first time that Israel must perish because Jehovah is supremely righteous. Now in the passage before us the national element, thought to have been discarded, asserts itself with 'great vigor. Amos, the critics conclude, cannot have thus stultified himself; * cannot, to speak with Wellhausen, have made milk and honey flow from the cup of Jehovah's wrath. Obviously, this reasoning has force only if we assume that Amos' conception of Jehovah was so one-sidedly ethical as to leave no room for the exercise of grace beyond the judgment. It would be easy to show that a number of passages, whose genuineness has not been hitherto disputed, bear witness to the contrary. This Amos of absolute logical consistency, to whom grace and righteousness not only cannot go together but cannot even succeed one the other, is a pure philosophical abstraction, and not a psychological reality. There is only this much truth in the critical contention that Amos so exclusively views the judgment as righteous retribution as to lose sight of it almost entirely in its reformatory aspect. Consequently, while fully aware of its limits and unable to close his prophecy without giving an outlook into the better future, he does not bring into causal connection the judgment and the restoration. Righteousness and grace are cleanly separated, whereas with Hosea they interpenetrate, the judgment becoming the instrument of discipline. This is the psychological explanation of the fact that no allusion is found in vers. 11-15 to the conversion of Israel. (c) Another feature which has been supposed to indicate the late origin of this section is the individualism expressed in vers. 9, 10, in the distinction between the righteous and sinners and in ver. 15 in the phrase "thy God."† According to the critics, all preëxilic prophets consider the nation and not the individual the subject of religion. But this trait is fully protected by other passages in Amos, § to which no critic has as yet taken exception,

supernatural prediction. Besides it overlooks the fact that "the breaches" represent the tabernacle of David as still partially standing. Cf. Cornill *Einleitung*, 176, who here sides with Kuenen against the other critics.

* Wellhausen characterizes the contents of vers. 13-15 as "roses and lavender instead of blood and iron."

† Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, v, 94; Smend, *Alltestam. Religionsgesch.*, 184.

‡ Cf. chap. iii. 12, v. 3, 15.

so that in order to eliminate all individualism the expurgation would have to be much more thorough. Its occurrence simply proves that the real Amos does not fit into the critical scheme of development.

II. HOSEA.

The Book of Hosea is thought to have been even more extensively interpolated than that of Amos. This was to be expected in advance, since this prophet is more versatile and many-sided than his Judean companion, and it is proportionately more difficult to adjust him to any preconceived programme of teaching. In Amos there is at least the undisputed sway of one idea forcing everything else into the background, rendering it possible for the critics to claim this idea as the sole content of his prophetic consciousness, to throw upon it an emphasis exclusive of all other truth, and to remove by a few excisions what little may crop out of a different nature. Nothing of the kind is possible in Hosea. Even after all the manipulation to which the latter's prophecy has been subjected, the critics are compelled to admit that it anticipates trains of thought on the whole identified with a later stage of development. Another feature of Hosea to be remembered in this connection is the abruptness of his style. This abruptness of style, says Cheyne, "made it easy for editors to work in fresh passages;" but he seems to forget that such a characteristic may as easily become a temptation for our present-day critics to scent insertions where there are none, as it is supposed to have been for the editors to work in the same.

The centre of attack is the Messianic prophecy ii. 1-3 in connection with i. 7, iii. 4, 5 in part,* iv. 15, viii. 14, all of which contain references to Judah, and reveal more or less partiality for the southern kingdom and the Davidic dynasty, a feature already observed in Amos, but especially noteworthy in a prophet from Ephraim. The natural explanation of these statements lies in the Messianic promises given to David (2 Sam. vii) and in the prerogative of Judah as possessed of the true sanctuary and relatively less apostate than the northern kingdom. But for these two facts, as has been shown already in connection with Amos, there is no place in the modern hypothesis. Belief in the special election of Judah and the Davidic dynasty is assumed to have sprung from the events under Hezekiah, the destruction of Samaria and the salvation of Jerusalem as predicted by Isaiah, and still more from the Deuteronomic reform a century later. Hosea, on the

* The words "and David their king" in ver. 5 are rejected by Wellhausen and Stade; the corresponding words in ver. 4, "without king and without prince," in addition by Cornill; the whole fifth verse by Oort (*Theol. Tijdschr.*, xxiv, 362).

other hand, is said to have rejected on principle every form of the kingdom, the Davidic dynasty included, as apostasy from Jehovah. Because later readers found his expectations of the future on this point out of harmony with the type of Messianic prophecy which dates back from Isaiah, they supplied the deficiency by interpolations. The abrupt transition from threatening to promise in i. 9, ii. 1, is held to be a sure sign of such editorial expansion of an original prophecy. As this canon is quite generally applied, we shall have to inquire more fully into its merits, which may be best done in connection with certain prophecies of Isaiah, included among the later additions to that prophet's work almost on the strength of it alone. In reference to this concrete case in Hosea, we observe that the presence of chap. ii. 1-3 where they stand is required by the symmetrical structure of the first part of the book, which consists of three divisions each, beginning with the prediction of judgment and ending with promise.* It is true that chap. i-ii. 3, differ in this respect from the two other sections—that the disciplinary purpose of the exile does not here appear as the mediating thought between threatening and promise: but there was no need at the opening of the prophet's book to explain immediately the inner nexus of these two broad aspects of his message: it was sufficient to introduce them side by side by way of prelude, the sharp contrast serving admirably to bring out in strong relief the distinct features of each. Elsewhere also Hosea startles the reader by the suddenness and boldness of his transitions (cf. xi. 7, 8, xii. 3, 4, 5). On this view it is unnecessary to look for any other connection.† Some critics think that ii. 1-3 anticipate the ideas of the latter half of chap. ii, that the reference to "the day of Jezreel" can be understood only on the basis of the etymology given in ver. 25, that the change of Lo-Ammi to Anmi and of Lo-Ruhamah to Ruhamah in ver. 1 renders the similar change in the ver. 25 superfluous,—all of which are said to be indications of the secondary character of the sus-

* This symmetry is destroyed by Steiner's and Knenen's proposal to take away the harshness of the transition by placing ii. 1-3 after ii. 25. There are other serious objections to this arrangement, chief among which is that in their new position the transposed verses would be a weak repetition of what immediately precedes. Cf. especially ver. 25 with ver. 1. See Giesebrecht, *Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik*, 215, whose five reasons, however, are not all equally convincing. Nevertheless, the above-mentioned proposal has the value of showing that to cautious criticism there is a wide difference between the recognition that a passage may have become displaced and the readiness to infer from every apparent want of connection that a strange hand must have been at work.

† Calvin and Hengstenberg assume a reference to Gen. xxii. 17, xxxii. 13, as to promises which would in no wise fail of fulfillment, notwithstanding the casting off predicted in ver. 9. See the latter's *Christology of the O. T.*, i, 210.

pected passage.* On a closer view of the matter it will be seen that these points are not well taken. The thoughts of ii. 1-3 remain entirely within the terms of the first chapter, in which the *political* aspect of the judgment stands in the foreground. Here the prophet's oldest son symbolizes, by his name Jezreel, the place where *the kingdom of the house of Israel* is to cease and *the bow of Israel* is to be broken (vers. 4, 5). To this corresponds in ii. 3 "the day of Jezreel" as a day of national victory and conquest, the day of battle in which the reunited Israelites and Judeans meet their foes. Everything in the context is subordinate to this theme and should be interpreted in accordance with it. Jehovah's having no mercy upon the house of Israel and his having mercy upon the house of Judah, His being Judah's God and no longer Israel's God, have their primary reference to the gift or withdrawal of the divine saving help in war. Consequently ver. 7, referring to the salvation of the southern kingdom in the Assyrian crisis, is entirely in place here.† To the same cause must be ascribed the indirect way in which the captivity is introduced, simply as the background for the national restoration, so entirely different from the manner in which it is treated in ii. 4-25 and in chap. iii. The marvelous increase of the children of Israel also is preparatory to their organization into the great army which ver. 2 represents as marching up from the land to fight the day of Jezreel.‡ Even the future king is not defined any further than in this military capacity, as "the head" which the children of Judah and the children of Israel shall appoint themselves. Finally, this is the point of view from which the prophecy mentions the reunion of the two kingdoms. The "for" of ver. 2 indicates that all these various features are dwelt upon to produce some adequate idea of the great-

* Giesebrecht, *Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik*, 215.

† Giesebrecht (*l. c.*) thinks that there is a conflict between i. 7, which promises the salvation, and ii. 2, which presupposes the captivity of Judah. But unless "the land" in the latter passage be understood to mean the land of the exile (so Giesebrecht), there is no direct reference to the captivity of Judah at all. Besides this, is it not a fact that Isaiah also predicted both the final destruction of the southern kingdom with the exile of its inhabitants and the temporary deliverance of the same in the Assyria crisis? If the two representations are inconsistent, why did not the interpolator consider them so? Or if they appeared harmonious later in view of what had actually come about, why should they not have appeared so beforehand in the prophetic vision of the future? Giesebrecht further objects to the clumsy phraseology of i. 7, "Jehovah will save Judah by Jehovah their God." But the disapproval of reliance upon the external instruments of war to the detriment of trust in Jehovah is a thoroughly Hoseanic thought and the peculiar phraseology simply serves to accentuate this idea.

‡ The "going up" is here taken in the sense of N^{ah}. ii. 2; 1 Kings xv. 17. The land is not that of the captivity, but Canaan. See Nowack, *Der Prophet Hosea*, 14.

ness of "the day of Jezreel." In so far as the same thoughts reappear in the sequel of chap. ii, they assume an altogether different color from the central idea of the second discourse, that of the religious and ethical marriage between Jehovah and Israel. Hence the symbolism of Jezreel is changed from that of "the day of battle" to that of the people *sown unto Jehovah in the land*, their increase being viewed not so much as a means to swell the Messianic army, but rather as a result of the mystical union between Jehovah and Israel. In agreement with this the reversal of the names obtains here a far more profound and tender meaning than was the case in ii. 1-3.

The favorable opinion of the Davidic house expressed in some of these passages is said to be irreconcilable with Hosea's attitude elsewhere toward the kingdom in general. The places where the kingdom is referred to in condemnatory terms are i. 4, vii. 3-7, viii. 4, x. 3, 7, xiii. 10, 11.* Of these the first is primarily directed against the house of Jehu, but the cessation of the kingdom is at the same time a punishment for the house of Israel, no doubt because, on a principle elsewhere also recognized by Hosea, the judgment strikes first those institutions which have been to Israel the chief instruments of sinning; this is confirmed by the juxtaposition of the kingdom, the idols, the high places in viii. 4 and x. 7, 8. In viii. 4, the words, "they have set up kings, but not by me, princes and I knew it not," are most naturally understood of the entire succession of kings in the northern realm, from Jeroboam onwards; because of the obviously close connection in the prophet's mind between the self-willed making of kings and the making of idols. Chap. xiii. 10, 11, favor the same view, for the repeated "taking away" of a king given in the divine anger must refer to the frequent removal of dynasties and individual princes, which was one of the chief sources of weakness in the kingdom of the ten tribes. So far, then, nothing indicates that Hosea extended his condemnation beyond the kingdom of Jeroboam and his successors. Whether he went further than this and included the kingdom of Saul depends on the view taken of chap. ix. 9 and x. 9: "They have deeply corrupted themselves as in the days

* Chap. iii. 4 might be supposed to reject the kingdom as such, on the view that the words "and David their king" are a late insertion, for in this case it might be claimed that all the things mentioned here, by being deprived of which Israel is to be punished—king-prince, sacrifice-mazzebah, ephod-teraphim—were to the prophet's mind equally sinful. Even so, however, it would seem a straining of the point to make him reject these things in the abstract. No more could be safely inferred than that he considered them sinful in the form in which Israel used them. On the other hand, if the words "and David their king" are genuine, it follows immediately that Hosea excepted the Davidic kingdom from his condemnation.

of Gibeah;" "O Israel, thou hast sinned from the days of Gibeah." The context of the latter passage is so obscure (and possibly corrupt) that its reference can hardly be ascertained, and the former, though standing in a perfectly clear connection, leaves us equally in doubt concerning the events it alludes to. What little light there is to go by would seem to fall on these passages from the history related in Judges xix-xxi. But even if Wellhausen and Smend should be correct in rejecting this interpretation and in understanding "the days of Gibeah" of the days of Saul's appointment to the royal office, this could create no prejudice against the kingdom of David, whose origin was altogether different. The rejection of the whole northern kingdom together with the kingdom of Saul is rather favorable toward the recognition of David's house as legitimate. On this point Hosea is in entire harmony with the judgment of the historical books which the critics are accustomed to represent as colored by Deuteronomistic ideas. Consistency would require not the excision of such clauses merely as favor the Davidic house, but the removal of all disparaging references to the kingdom of Saul as well as to that of Jeroboam and his successors, on the ground of affinity with the Deuteronomistic philosophy of history. From our standpoint we consider it remarkable that while the condemnation of the Ephraimitic kings (and possibly of Saul) is explicit, no passage can be quoted from Hosea in which the Judean kingdom is referred to in similar terms.

No argument against the passages favorable to Judah can be drawn from those that coördinate it with Israel as equally sinful. The statements of this character appear in the second division of the book, so as to justify the inference that the prophet changed his opinion owing to a change for the worse in Judah's religious condition under the reign of Ahaz. And it is to be observed that in the later chapters no commendations of Judah occur, so that with the exception of this one change the judgment expressed is a perfectly consistent one.* The interpolator who is supposed to have inserted the favorable passages did not feel any discrepancy between them and the other series, else he would not have stopped short of expunging everything to Judah's discredit. Why then should Hosea have been unable to express both opinions in successive periods? There is, moreover, one statement in favor of Judah which is entirely above suspicion so far as the context is concerned, and for the insertion of which precisely at that place

* Chap. xii. 1 is the only apparent exception to this. But the text is very obscure and may be corrupt. Cornill, in *Z. A. W.*, vii, 285-289, proposes to read instead of *וְיִשְׁמַח בְּקִרְשֵׁי יְהוָה*, "and is faithful with the Holy One," *וְיִשְׁמַח בְּקִרְשֵׁי יְהוָה*, "and is joined with Kedeshim."

no imaginable reason can be assigned—chap. iv. 15. The only things breathed against it are that Judah ought to have been addressed (Wellhausen),* or that the style is weak (Cheyne),—the former an arbitrary restriction upon the prophet's rhetorical license, the latter wholly a matter of taste.†

Another passage here to be considered is chap. v. 15–vi. 4. Commenting on it, Cheyne says that the ordinary view, according to which these words are dramatically put by Hosea into the mouth of Israel as expressive of a superficial conversion, is unsatisfactory. They are rather an earnest expression of faith, and zeal and were inserted by a late writer who was thinking of his own times, not of Hosea's, and failed to realize what was natural and possible in the latter. This is but a variation on the well-known theme that an eighth-century prophet cannot express ideas or speak in a tone considered by the critics characteristic of a later development. The difficulty is all the greater since in this case the prophet speaks not in his own person, but impersonates his people. Now it is certainly true that, if the words were "an earnest expression of faith and zeal," it would be hard to understand how Hosea could put them upon the lips of the degraded and apostate people so vividly portrayed on every page of his book. But this difficulty is wholly of the critic's own making. The explanation which understands these verses as the confession of Israel *only superficially converted* by the first blow of Jehovah's withdrawal, is the only one that suits the context. Although a certain earnestness is not to be denied in them, there are other features which fully justify the charge of superficiality (actually made by Jehovah in ver. 4): the Israelites expect the return of Jehovah too soon, "after two days," "on the third day," and too confidently, "his going forth is sure as the morning;" ver. 3 still reflects the fatal influence of the naturalistic conceptions, Jehovah's return being compared to the processes of nature in point of necessity. The connection with ver. 5, which Cheyne finds imperfect, leaves nothing to be desired. The Perfects are historical and describe how Jehovah has responded to similar premature and transitory conversions in the past by severer judgments.‡ Now, taking for granted

* There would be much more cause to expect that a late writer would address Judah, his only audience.

† Giesebrecht (*Beiträge zur Jesaikritik*, 214) tries to break the force of iv. 15 by the suggestion that the statement may be a mere rhetorical one in the sense of "both need not have sinned; one could at least have obeyed; but both are equally condemnable." But that the prophet means to be understood literally follows from the subjoined warning that Judah should not come to Gilgal neither go up to Beth-Aven.

‡ Giesebrecht seeks to save the depth and spirituality of the words by making them expressive of a wish of the prophet, a view which destroys the connection with what precedes and follows alike.

that the conversion of which the words are the expression lacks depth and permanency, and is not psychologically inconceivable in such a people as the Israel described by Hosea, so that on this score we have no reason to doubt the genuineness of the passage,* it should none the less be urged that in a formal point of view it presents great difficulty to the critical conception of the character and the historical antecedents of popular religion among Israel in Hosea's time. The state of mind revealed in this confession no doubt is deficient in true spirituality, but the language in which the sentiments are clothed reflects a relatively high degree of religious culture and maturity such as points back to something quite different from the primitive religion of Israel as described by the critics. Long ago it had been urged from the conservative side that such a religious past could not have produced the forms of expression of which the early prophets avail themselves and which must have been intelligible to the people. The force of the argument is now indirectly acknowledged as often as an attempt is made, like the present one, to get rid, on the plea of interpolation, of modes of thought and language deemed unnatural and impossible at thus early a period.

Hosea shares with Amos the fate that his prophecy is left without a conclusion by the newest criticism. Wellhausen and Cheyne both deny the genuineness of chap. xiv. 2-10. The latter finds these verses akin to the writings of the age which begins with Jeremiah; the spirituality of the tone is surprising; to understand Hosea we must omit them; to have added to the stern warning in xiv. 1 would have robbed it of half its force. Against this *a priori* reasoning it should be sufficient to call attention to the numerous points of contact between the suspected verses and the main body of Hosea's book. Ver. 2 reflects the prophet's well-known judgment on the worthlessness of external sacrifice; ver. 3 contains a reference to the two principal forms of sin against which elsewhere his polemic is directed, political pride and idolatry, and besides expresses together with ver. 4 the principle of Jehovah's free forgiving grace; while in vers. 5-8 the nature blessings so long abused by Israel to the injury of true religion are represented as mere symbols and instruments through which Jehovah's personal love is communicated to Israel,—all Hoseanic ideas to the very core. The whole piece is so entirely in the most characteristic vein of Hosea, so clearly the outgrowth of his fundamental conceptions, so absolutely required to round off his book harmoniously, that the later redactor would have had to possess not only a literary skill greater than that of the prophet himself

* For parallels cf. ii. 9, v. 6, vii. 16.

to compose it, but also an unusual degree of historical sense to reproduce so well a remote situation.

A number of minor interpolations have been assumed by individual critics, the most important of which are viii. 1^b, 12, 14, xii. 1^b. The first of these deserves attention because the words it is proposed to strike out contain the significant combination of covenant and Thora, and the second because it is attempted to eliminate the reference to the Thora as existing in written form. In both cases the critical excision strikes at elements obnoxious to the development hypothesis.*

The degree of reliability of the critical judgment in some of these instances may be inferred from the widely distant periods to which the Judaistic interpolations are assigned by the various critics. Oort thinks that the redactor belonged to the reign of King Josiah and that the purpose of his new edition of the prophecy was to induce the northern Israelites to reform their religion in the spirit of Deuteronomy and to recognize the Judean authority. Giesebrecht assumes that the interpolations were written towards the close of the exile. Still others make them post-exilic.

PRINCETON.

GEERHARDUS VOS.

* Chap. viii. 1 is called in question by Wellhausen, *Prolegomena* (second edition) 443. In *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, v, 17, the words are retained in the translation. It is also rejected by Krætzschmar (*Die Bundesvorstellung im A. T.*, 114). According to Oort (*Theol. Tijdschr.*, xxiv, 505), chap. viii. 12 is possibly from the Deuteronomistic redactor.