

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE V.

PROPHETIC TESTIMONY TO THE PENTATEUCH.

BY THE REV. HENRY HAYMAN, D. D., ALDINGHAM, ULVERSTON,
ENGLAND.

I.

IN dealing with the objections of current criticism to the genuineness and relative antiquity of the Pentateuch, it seems best to meet them in their most popular form. Of this in the following pages the lectures of Professor Robertson Smith on "The Old Testament in the Jewish Church," are taken as a type well known. There can be no more important section of the whole area of evidence by which these objections are to be tested, than the testimony of the prophets of Israel and Judah. At the same time that they do not absolutely prove a much higher antiquity than that of their own age, yet so far as they prove this latter, they render highly probable a much higher one. To put the question thus opened briefly: If the Pentateuch be substantially older by even half a century than the close of Uzziah's reign, it must be vastly older. There is no period of the monarchy since the earlier part of Solomon's reign to which it can even with plausibility be ascribed. But that reign, rich in administrative and centralizing power, shows no trace of nomothetic energy. The earlier reigns are too largely warlike struggles, first for existence and then for supremacy, for such energy to have been developed. What we know of Samuel's personal practice is too largely antithetic to the Levitical norm for us to regard him as a possible author of it. This antithesis arises from contemporary events and their influ-

ences, chiefly indeed from the divorce of the ark from its sanctuary. Besides which a sanctuary, claiming to be central, under a fixed and inherited priesthood of divine origination, and with fixed rules and customs of *cultus*, is what meets us on the threshold of Samuel's personal history, and points backward to a series of some ages of continuity. No one would think of ascribing such a work to the highly disorganized period of the Judges. The question of origin is thus thrown back between Joshua and Moses; and to ascribe it to Joshua is simply to make the whole record in the literal sense preposterous. These are the reasons for attaching far more than the mere weight of contemporary testimony to the evidence furnished by the prophets.

Of these the professor asserts, that "they deny that these things [sacrifice and ritual] are of positive divine institution, or have any part in the scheme on which Jehovah's grace is administered in Israel. 'Jehovah,' they say, 'has not enjoined sacrifice'" (p. 288). He holds that such passages as Isa. i. 11 *seq.*; Amos ii. 10; v. 25 prove his contention. Let us examine them. Isaiah says: "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? . . . When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand [i. e., the sacrificial fat, blood, incense, etc.]? . . . Incense is an abomination; . . . new moon and Sabbath, the calling of assemblies. . . . When ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you; yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear: your hands are full of blood."

Now it is clear that all the items here enumerated stand precisely on the same footing. Therefore, if sacrificial blood and fat and incense are not of divine institution and required of Jewish obedience, neither is the Sabbath, nor even prayer itself. What it proves of any one it proves of all. But the Sabbath is acknowledged by the professor as a part of the earliest code, delivered in the wilderness; and without prayer all access to God, whether ritualistic or not, is

impossible. Therefore Isaiah does not reject the Sabbath or prayer as divinely appointed and required; and therefore he does not reject sacrifice and ritual as of similar authority. What Isaiah means is very simple; viz., that so long as the worshipper's "hands are full of blood," judgment neglected, and the relief of oppression despised, so long will no worship of whatever kind, and however sanctioned, be acceptable to Jehovah. Amos ii. 10 seems a wrong reference, as it relates merely to the historical facts of the Exodus. But in iv. 4, 5, we find a passage which is probably intended. "Go¹ to Bethel, and transgress; to Gilgal, and multiply transgressions; and bring your sacrifices every morning, and your tithes every three days (or years); . . . for this liketh you, O children of Israel, saith Jehovah." One may notice here by the way a testimony to the centrality of worship as recognized by Amos. For what else is the condemnation of Bethel and Gilgal, as places where to offer worship was only to "transgress" and to "multiply transgressions," instead of obtaining pardon? This is further shown in v. 4, 5, "Seek ye me, and ye shall live: but seek not Bethel,² nor enter into Gilgal"—with a doom pronounced on each locality—"Seek Jehovah, and ye shall live." Thus Jehovah and the life which he promises could not be found at these local shrines, although each hallowed for ages by ancestral sanctity. The whole of the passage (iv. 4, 5) is probably indeed ironical, as exhorting to that which in Jehovah's sight is valueless, although popular and prevalent. But the reason is again evident. The worshippers of Israel are rebuked in ii. 6-8 for oppression, extortion, impurity, and profanation; again in v. 7, as "turning judgment to wormwood, and casting down righteousness to the earth," and again for exactions, bribery, and corruption in v. 11, 12. In fact, the teaching is plainly that of Isaiah repeated, some of whose very phrases,

¹ This seems to me to express better than "Come" of A. V. and R. V. the force of the Hebrew verb, which includes "come" and "go."

² Bethel is also specially threatened in iii. 14.

as that "feasts" and "solemn assemblies" have become detestable (cf. Isa. i. 13, 14), are reproduced in Amos v. 21. The contrast between the observance of ritual and the neglect of "the weightier matters of the law," is pointed, again and again, by each prophet in turn, and the lesson, that without the latter Jehovah abhors the former, is a perpetually recurring theme. But all this proves nothing about the sanction on which either duty rests; or rather suggests, from the constancy of the parallel, that the sanction for *both* is the same. If the law positive was *not* deemed divine by the prophet, and the law moral was confessedly so, why should he be at the pains so perpetually to co-ordinate the two?

Our professor continues, "It is impossible to give a flatter contradiction to the traditional theory that the Levitical system was enacted in the wilderness. The theology of the prophets before Ezekiel has no place for the system of priestly sacrifice and ritual." And in connection with this I return to Amos v. 25, or rather to the whole passage, 21-27, "Though ye offer . . . burnt offerings, . . . I will not accept them. . . . I will not hear the melody of thy viols. But let judgment roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty¹ stream. Did ye bring unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years? . . . Yea, ye shall take up [or, "ye took up," Acts vii. 43] Siccuth your king and Chiun your images. . . . Therefore will I cause you to go into captivity." On v. 25 his comment is, Amos reminds the people that they offered no sacrifice, etc., to Him in the wilderness during those "forty years of wandering." But can the prophet indeed be understood to mean that sacrifice in the wilderness was neither performed nor required? Waiving for a moment the question of a special priesthood with exclusive hieratic functions, can we really suppose sacrifice the fundamental fact of worship, traceable continuously

¹ Rather "a perennial stream"—one which never fails.

everywhere else in the Old Testament, to have stood blank during those forty years? that no altar to Jehovah was raised nor sacrifice offered, Levitical or other? That is what the comment assumes, and its enormity becomes manifest as soon as stated. Besides, it is flatly against Ex. xx. 24, a recognized and admitted portion of the earliest legislation, where "an altar of earth" and "sacrifice thereon" are distinctly enjoined; and equally against xxiv. 4, 5, a passage relied on as proving the popular, as against the Levitical, function of sacrifice. There "Moses builded an altar . . . and twelve pillars . . . and there young men of the children of Israel offered . . . unto Jehovah." The passage in Amos is not without obscurity, but at all events it refers to a practice and says nothing of a command; i. e., it says nothing of the point at issue. Assuming it to mean that these forty years went by without sacrifice, it could never prove that sacrifice was not then enjoined and required, but only that a disobedient people neglected a known duty. It is to be observed also that even this depends on the question implying a negation. But interrogatives of eager remonstrance have not always a negative force;¹ indeed, the opposite force is not seldom their tenor.

We are also referred to Isa. xliii. 23 *seq.*, and to Jer. vii. 21 *seq.*, as proving the absence of the system of priestly sacrifice and ritual before Ezekiel. I give, as before, the key phrases only. Isaiah says (22-24), "Thou hast not called upon me, O Jacob, . . . thou hast not brought me the sheep of thy burnt offerings. . . . I have not burdened thee with meal offerings, nor troubled thee for incense . . . no

¹ Compare, e. g., the following questions (Elijah to Jehovah), "Hast thou also brought evil upon the widow . . . by slaying her son?" (Elijah to Ahab), "Hast thou killed, and also taken possession?" (Ahab to Elijah), "Hast thou found me, O mine enemy?" (1 Kings xvii. 20; xxi. 19, 20.) In any of these a negative would ruin the sense, and more such instances might be quoted.

spice cane nor sacrificial fat. No: thou hast wearied me with thy sins." That the prophet does *not* here speak of the wilderness and the Exodus, seems plain from the earlier verse 18; where, after an allusion in verses 16 and 17 to the Red Sea divided and Pharaoh's "chariot and horse" overthrown, he pursues, "Remember ye *not* the former things, neither consider the things of old." Something of recent experience is therefore pointed at, and most probably, I think with Delitzsch, the sojourn in Babylon is here ideally conceived, as it was later realized in fact, as a period of altar worship intermitted. But the cessation of some known and accustomed ritual, whether necessitated as by that exile, or relinquished through other causes, is certainly intended. The lamb of the morning and evening sacrifice, its meal offering, the fat and the perfumery of the incense, all the leading elements of the Levitical prescribed service, are here noted as forming *no* part of "Jacob's" service, as rendered. But, if they had not been familiar from established usage, these very terms in which the remonstrance is conveyed would yield no adequate idea to the hearers. There is indeed another possible interpretation of these words (besides a third, of which I will speak presently), although I think it can hardly be carried consistently through the whole passage. This is, that the honor of the stated sacrifices is withheld from "me" (Jehovah of course is speaking), in order to be bestowed on idols.¹ But if this be adopted, it makes no difference as regards the above view. The force of the enumerated elements of a stated and normal ritual is the same upon this interpretation as upon the other. Whether the customary offerings were intermitted, or were alienated to idolatrous service, that they *were* customary is equally plain. And the evidence in favor of *an* established and

¹ It is in favor of this view that in verse 22 the object pronoun "me" has both the emphatic form and the emphatic place, i. e., it is not a verbal suffix merely, but a distinct word from the verb and precedes it: "Not on me calledst thou, Jacob," gives the strict value of the Hebrew.

known norm of service of which they were the elements is equally clear. But it should again be noted that, of a distinct priesthood with exclusive privilege and duty, the passage says nothing. The one point which would have any bearing on the professor's argument is by Isaiah, as before by Amos, left blank. And here, again, I cannot but urge, that to attempt to prove from it the absence during the pre-Babylonian period of *all* sacrifice and offering whatever, seems an outrage on all known facts and tendencies. To sum up, as regards the professor's thesis, the passage proves nothing whatever, and if it could prove anything, would prove too much. But it is possible to apply a yet slightly different interpretation to these words of Isaiah, which I can exhibit most clearly in connection with those of Jeremiah above referred to, to which I now pass on.

Jer. vii. 21-23, "Thus saith Jehovah, . . . Add your burnt offerings unto your sacrifices, and eat ye flesh. For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices: but this thing I commanded them, saying, Hearken unto my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people." Now here we have an apparent denial of sacrifice as being commanded at the period of the Exodus. But here again we may refer to Ex. xx. 24 and xxiv. 4, 5, in proof that this apparent meaning cannot be the real one. The real one is undoubtedly the same as that of Hosea vi. 6, quoted twice with approval by our Lord, in Matt. ix. 13 and xii. 7, "I desire mercy, *and not* sacrifice," i. e. *rather than*.¹ It is simply a strongly marked case of the negative of preference, just as in the precept (John vi. 27), "Labor *not* for the meat that perisheth, *but*," etc. It exalts the vital union of the will, through obedience, with the divine will; and, in order to exalt this, it sinks the other

¹ So the LXX. precisely here, *θεος θελω η θυσιαν*, and so in the parallel clause here, "and the knowledge of God *more than* burnt offerings."

element of outward ritual out of sight. So, I suppose, are many of the negatives of both the Testaments to be understood; and instances of this will probably occur to most. This further throws a possible light on the words of Isa. xliii. 24, "But thou hast made me to serve with thy sins, thou hast wearied me with thine iniquities." And therefore a paraphrase of that whole passage may perhaps be, "Thy sacrifices and offerings are to me as if they were not; the sins, etc., which attended them have vitiated the whole service and effaced it utterly. The law under which I made thee serve was one of loving obedience rather than of formal ritual. The latter without the former becomes a slavish burden. As such, I will have none of it, and I never imposed it. Meanwhile, your sins remain unexpiated, a burden upon me, your God." And to this view of Isaiah's meaning I on the whole incline.

I shall have more to say about the Psalter hereafter, but one of its statements is so apposite to the present argument that I anticipate it here. In Ps. xl. 6, we read, "Sacrifice and offering thou hast no delight in. . . . Burnt offering and sin offering hast thou not required." The *obvious* meaning of the passage here is to confirm the professor's view of Jer. vii. 21-23. But the Psalter is allowed, nay rather ostentatiously proclaimed, to be the service book of the *second* temple. As such, and so far as it is such, it belongs to the post-Ezraic period, and reflects its ideas. But the Levitical system of "sacrifice, burnt and sin offering," was confessedly then, at any rate, not only current, but dominant. Nay, the words "sin offering" are held by critics to belong to a late stage of ceremonial development, and therefore to stamp the psalm as belonging to the same advanced school of sacerdotal thought. If this view is correct, the full-blown Levitical system must have been in force at the date of this psalm, and yet it is only mentioned—for there is no other mention of sin offering in the Psalter—to be set

aside with this emphatic negative as "*not* required." If such a negative is consistent with the post-Ezraic currency and dominancy of that system, why need we find any inconsistency of that system with the similar earlier negatives of Isaiah and Jeremiah? If that system is denounced or renounced by these prophets, then it is equally denounced or renounced by the post-Ezraic writers; which amounts to an absurdity needing no refutation.

The course of my argument in respect to prophetic testimony has been guided so far by that of the other side as set forth by one of its ablest advocates. It is proper, however, to enter more methodically on the examination of each greater prophet or group of prophets separately, in quest of the evidence which they contain either to the fact of a written Torah, or of their express or implied testimony to particular books or individual precepts of the Pentateuch. And here, for reasons of argumentative economy, instead of giving Isaiah that precedence which is his due, I will review briefly the earliest and leading group of the minor prophets, with some few illustrative references to their fellows and successors.

II.

The prophets Hosea and Amos, together with Micah, date themselves as nearly contemporaries (Hos. i. 1; Amos. i. 1; Mic. i. 1), and for our present purpose may be taken as being so. The outlook of all three expressly includes the northern kingdom, while Hosea is almost exclusively limited to it.¹ From them we therefore gain a wide horizon of observation. To some passages in Hosea and Amos I have already referred, owing to their special enlistment by the critics on their side (Hos. vi. 6; viii. 12; Amos ii. 2, 6, 8, 10; iv. 4, 5; v. 4, 5, 11, 12, 21-27). To some of these I propose recurring

¹ Professor Wellhausen (*History of Israel*, Engl. Trans., p. 417) considers all references to Judah, as a kingdom, in Hosea and Amos to be interpolations. He states no grounds for this view; but the references are so few as not appreciably to affect the argument offered above.

when taking stock of the evidence which all three furnish in reference to a written law as existing and recognized, to any general knowledge of any of the earlier books, and to the existing state of religious and moral observance. The Torah is referred to by Hosea (iv. 6; viii. 1), being paralleled by "covenant" in the latter passage. Such parallelism implies a close affinity yet a differentiation of the terms. A covenant may be, as some recorded in Scripture are, oral merely, ratified by solemn oaths and attested by impressive ceremonies (2 Kings xi. 17; Jer. xxxiv. 18). The addition of law to covenant in such a context suggests that the differentiation is made through some element which adds objectivity and permanence. And when we come to a distinct mention of writing in connection with the Torah in viii. 12, the element so required seems imparted by writing, and thus the idea completed. This last passage is obscure, as Hosea often is, to the grammatical critic, yet speaks its purpose plainly: "Though I write for him [Ephraim] thousands of my Torah, yet as alien they esteem it,"¹ may be taken as representing it.

The "thousands" or "myriads" may here be taken, like the Latin *sexcenti*, for any indefinitely large number—such a number of copies, as, if made, would give superabundant assurance of universal familiarity. They yet deem it alien. The indignant astonishment which this treatment of the Torah roused in the prophet, shows that it was not set aside for lack of knowledge, but known only to be rejected. Multi-

¹This seems to be more natural and adequate than the Revised Version, "Though I write for him my law in ten thousand [precepts]." There is no "in," just as no "precepts," in the Hebrew, and the *keri* reads י כ ך, the construct form. If I say, "They printed thousands of the Declaration of Independence," printed being the modern analogue of wrote, any one taking the words simply would understand thousands of *copies* of it. I take the words of Hosea in this their simple force, which the introduction of "precepts" seems to me to spoil. To multiply "precepts" within the law could have no tendency to popularize it, and might by the incumbrance of redundancy have the opposite effect.

plying copies would add nothing to its notoriety; but the inference is, that copies enough existed for teaching and reference. Let us now look back to chapter iv., in which Hosea begins the detail of his indictment against Israel. After an awful catalogue of public and private enormities (ver. 1, 2), and impending devastation denounced (ver. 3), people, prophet, and priest are united in sin, but on the priest rests the heaviest doom of wrath (ver. 4-6). "My people are destroyed for lack of *the* knowledge. Because thou hast rejected *the* knowledge, I also will reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest unto me. . . . Thou hast forgotten the Torah of thy God." The emphasis given by the definite article is wholly missed in our versions. It points obviously to the special "knowledge" which "the lips of the priest should keep" (Mal. ii. 7), as something objective and external, independent of the priest, who is bound to know, remember, and teach it.¹ But people and priest alike prefer darkness to light and therefore one doom awaits both, as having "left off to take heed to Jehovah" (verse 10), whose will the Torah embodied. Public officials, lay and clerical, are arraigned for malversation of justice. They have converted it to a mercenary machine ("snare . . . net") for their own greed, with popular consent or connivance (v. 1). The abandonment of the Torah of Jehovah and his statutes is expressly charged by Amos against Judah, and some special breaches of it are alleged against Israel (Amos ii. 4-8). The perversion of "judgment" is a theme of denunciation both to Amos (vi. 12) and to Micah (iii. 9); cf. also Amos v. 12. The witness given above by Hosea to the Torah as a public fact, current in a written text, must be taken as coloring and con-

¹This is what Wellhausen, *al. sup.* p. 395, expressly contradicts:—"It [the Torah] continued to be an oral decision and direction . . . only a power and activity of God, or of the priests. Of this subject there can be no abstract; the *teaching* is only thought of as the action of the teacher. There is no Torah as a ready-made product . . . accessible to every one." This seems to me utterly inconsistent with the prophet's words above.

ditioning all the utterances of himself and contemporary prophets on the subject. Language in itself vague and general, and equally suitable to oral tradition, acquires thus a preciseness and definiteness. The written Torah is the basis on which all the denunciatory detail of offences rests. Nor should we forget the words of Isaiah (viii. 16), "Bind (the) testimony, seal (the) Torah among those taught of me;" and again (ver. 20), where some verb of exhortation seems dropped in the abrupt urgency of style as "[Take heed] to Torah and to testimony: if they speak not according to this word, no dawn [of hope] for them":—words which unequivocally attest the objective standard of an external code. For how else could it be "bound" and "sealed" and adduced as a test of obedience? The notion of an abstract Torah, whose only concrete is the utterance of a priesthood, over and over again condemned for perverting, forgetting, and ignoring it, is not only absurd in itself, but contradicts the plainest utterances of these prophets. Thus also the institutions to which they refer, or which they imply as existing, might, from the language used, be supposed to rest on mere custom and traditional observance. But where they are found embodied in the written law as we have it, it seems only reasonable to assume that the reference to such institutions is a reference to what that law prescribes. Therefore when Hosea (iv. 2) denounces "swearing and breaking faith, and killing, and stealing, and committing adultery," in which he nearly follows the order of the Decalogue, one may infer that the third, sixth, eighth, and seventh of its precepts are implicitly referred to. When he speaks of "feasts, new moons, . . . Sabbaths, . . . solemn assemblies"¹ as to "cease" (ii. 11); and when Amos declares these as kept, to be offensive to Jehovah, we may as reasonably infer an implicit reference to precepts enjoining these observances,

¹The word for these is the same as in Lev. xxiii. 36; Num. xxix. 35; Deut. xvi. 8, where such assemblies are enjoined.

(for which see the last note,) although we see that their observance in the letter whilst debased and vitiated in practice justly drew down the prophet's rebuke. Notice also the highly suggestive question of Hosea ix. 5: "What will ye [the people] do," he says, after foretelling their expulsion from the Holy Land into Egypt and Assyria, "in the day of the solemn assembly and in the day of the feast of Jehovah?" These observances had become so deep an element of social life, that that life would be wholly dislocated and resourceless. Such an appeal shows an all-pervading sentiment which might no doubt arise from mere traditional custom; but taken in connection with the above evidence in favor of a written Torah, points back to it as the real source whence arose the practice out of which this sentiment sprang. Of course the practice roots the sentiment, just as in the case of our own Christian festivals. To what vile degradations have not Christmas Day, Easter, and Whitsuntide been subjected? The practice of keeping them in some fashion has sunk into the heart of various Christian races. *How* they are kept, depends on the religious standard of customs and places. But still the observances themselves rest on the written record of the facts which they commemorate, not more clearly in the case of the modern Christian, however nominal his Christianity, than in that of the degraded Hebrew of the prophet's period.

On some details of the festival directory I shall further have to dwell. The special points of contact with Pentateuchal covenant, whether by direct breach of it or by hollow and formal observance, which these prophets offer, may next be noted. By "Covenant" I understand those fundamental ideas of allegiance exclusively to Jehovah, his worship and his appointed shrine, which lie at the root of all detailed precepts. The basest and foulest idolatry, depicted under images of whoredom and adultery, are manifest counts in their indictment (Hos. i. 2; ii. 2 foll.; iii. 1; iv. 10-12, 17;

v. 3, 4; vi. 10; ix. 1; xiii. 2; xiv. 3, 8; Amos. v. 26; Mic. i. 7; v. 13); while the "Baalim" are specified by Hosea (ii. 17; xi. 2; xiii. 1), and other idols, perhaps Moloch, by Amos (v. 26). The "Asherim," as also "the statutes of Omri and works of Ahab's house," implying the abominations introduced by that dynasty, are denounced by Micah (v. 14; vi. 16), who has also a word against divination and witchcraft (iii. 7; v. 12).¹ But the most remarkable and emphatic testimony of all, perhaps, which these prophets utter, is that against the high-place worship, of which several popular provincial centres are arraigned by name, but which had fixed its seats even in the capitals Samaria and Jerusalem. Thus Micah in what "he saw concerning" those two cities, says, "What is Jacob's transgression? is it not Samaria? What the high places of Judah but Jerusalem? (Mic. i. 1, 5.) Amos foretells a "visitation" on "the altars of Bethel;" with which he joins Gilgal and Beersheba, "the high places of Isaac" and "sanctuaries of Israel" (that evil legacy of "the house of Jeroboam," vii. 10).² All these are to vanish before the plumb line of desolation, and leave a dead level of emptiness,—such seems the purport of the imagery used (Amos iii. 14; iv. 4; v. 5, 6; vii. 7–9; viii. 14; cf. Isa. xxxiv. 11),—while the proverbial invocations, which localized sanctity at Samaria and Dan, are doomed to silence and effacement (viii. 14). There can be little doubt that "the altar," of which the ruined "chapters and lintels" are to fall on the heads of the worshippers, is either that of Bethel,—whence the prophet had been barred by its priest, it should seem under the royal mandate,—or else that of Samaria itself, the head of "the sinful kingdom," the kingdom founded

¹It seems likely that the group of lowland towns united in the denunciation of Micah (i. 10–15), were either seats of some special idolatry or high places with their usual propensity for that degraded cult.

²Of course the reference may be to the reigning king of that name; but it seems more natural to refer it to him who "made Israel to sin," the first of the name.

in a false worship which from first to last it retained (ix. 1; cf. viii. 10 *seq.* and ix. 8). Hosea details the more popular features of this worship as follows: "Sacrifice on mountain tops, . . . incense upon hills, under oak, poplar, etc., shades," attended, he adds, with grossly sensual depravity in the rites. He denounces Gilgal and Bethel (here degraded into Beth-aven, or house of vanity), the calf-worship, either there or actually in Samaria, the "multiplication of altars" and "pillars," numerous as "the heaps" (of stones gathered out) of "the furrows of the field," and alike marked out to be "smitten" and "spoiled" (Hos. iv. 13, 15; v. 8; viii. 5, 6, 11; ix. 15; x. 1, 2, 5, 11; xii. 11). For these sins Samaria is specially doomed, as "wedded to her two transgressions," in which the calves of Dan and Bethel are intended. For these her "inhabitants are in terror," her "king cut off," her "high places, the sin of Israel," cast down, with thorn and thistle overgrowing their sites. The despair of their votaries is depicted by an image borrowed by the seer of the Apocalypse, and the very priests are to sing the Ichabod dirge of their own shrine (Hos. x. 2, 5-8, 10; cf. Rev. vi. 16). The calf-worship extends to the "kissing" of them by the sacrificers, after the fashion of heathen devotion, early and late;¹ and the calf is borrowed to symbolize the northern kingdom, which was founded in its worship (iv. 16; x. 11). Under Hosea's hands the image grows into a "heifer that loves to trample out (the corn)," but on whose neck the yoke is fixed, taming her thus to be a beast of the wain, with minor accessories of the ploughman and the clod-breaker.² If any be surprised at my dwelling on

¹ Cf. Lucret. i. 317-318, *Signa manus dextras ostendunt adtenuari Saepè salutatantum tactu.*

² The word 'ol, "yoke," seems to have been lost here, by its likeness to, or rather in unpointed Hebrew identity with, the preposition 'al, "upon," next following; cf. Hos. xi. 4, where the two words concur "as one who removes a yoke upon their jaws." Thus in x. 11, "I have passed or fitted a yoke upon the stoutness of her neck; I will make her a wainbeast; Judah shall plough," etc., gives a consistent flow of imagery. In iv. 16 Israel had been already likened to "a stubborn heifer."

these details, it is in consequence of the astounding statement of Professor Robertson Smith, that "the prophets never rebuke the non-Levitical character of the popular worship;" that "they tax the people with idolatry and immoral sins, but have nothing to say of Levitical routine violated." The fact, as I shall further show, was that Levitical routine was going on all along at the authorized centre in Jerusalem,—often, no doubt, marred by gross deviations and novel corruptions, but still showing a representative correspondence with its Levitical norm. But yet more, the professor urges that "the prophets are indifferent to the law of sacrifice," (with this I have dealt already,) "and *perfectly tolerant of high-place worship.*" Now if the details cited above, denouncing high places as such, and the most notable of them by name, and the sacred city itself as a mere group of them, do not prove the contradictory of the words I have italicized, I do not see how it can be proved by human language. Yet again the professor says: "The reformers of Israel strove against the constant lapses of Israel into syncretism, or the worship of foreign gods, but they did not do so on the ground of the Levitical theory of Israel's absolute separation from the nations." But when we read (Hos. vii. 8), "As for Ephraim he mixes himself among the peoples, . . . strangers have devoured his strength," we find, it seems to me, the point of view which has escaped the professor. Of course I am ready to admit that no "Levitical theory" is formulated by the prophets. But as they appeal to a Torah, statutes, and the like, so they rebuke the breaches of them. There can be no Levitical theory apart from the Torah and its statutes. These forbid high-place worship. The prophets, I have shown, denounce that worship and those places, and that copiously and frequently. Isaiah, whose testimony to a written Torah has been incidentally mentioned, says (i. 29), "They shall be ashamed for the oaks which ye have desired, and . . . the gar-

dens which ye have chosen;" and speaks (lxv. 3) of "sacrifice in gardens and burning incense upon bricks" as "a provocation to Jehovah's face,"—all unquestionable elements of that popular religion, of which the prophets are said to be so conspicuously tolerant.¹ And here I must make a brief digression. One of the professor's proofs that the Pentateuchal law was unknown to the prophets rests on the use of the ritualistic symbol, rendered "pillar" in the Revised Version, with "obelisk" in margin, for the Hebrew *matzzebah* (plural *oth*). It is among the items of Canaanitish idolatry, repeatedly proscribed as such in the Pentateuch, and devoted to destruction by the Israelitish conquest (Ex. xxiii. 24; xxxiv. 13; Deut. vii. 5; xii. 3). Besides this, the erection of any such "pillar" by the side of the altar of Jehovah is expressly forbidden (Deut. xvi. 23).² On the contrary, he urges, both Hosea (iii. 4) and Isaiah (xix. 19) recognize the "pillar" as legitimate, which he seeks to confirm by various historical examples of its use in fact. I will consider these first. Joshua (xxiv. 26) sets up a "great stone" as a "witness" under the "oak or terebinth" at Shechem.

In 1 Sam. vi. 14 a "great stone" is mentioned as existing in "the field of Joshua the Bethshemite." In chap. vii. 12 we have Samuel's own "Eben-ezer." In 1 Kings i. 9 occurs "the stone of Zoheleth . . . beside Enrogel," where "Adonijah slew sheep," etc. In chap. vii. 21 we have the "pillars Jachin and Boaz" in Solomon's tem-

¹The "eating of swine's flesh and broth of abominable things" (Isa. lxv. 4) is a plain outrage of any Levitical theory that can be deduced from the Pentateuch. Into such vile accessories the high-place worship tended ever to degenerate. The accessories and the principal fact are here denounced together (see again *ib.* v. 7) but there is no mention of idols or strange gods in the passage.

²The same word is used of the votive monument set up by Jacob (Gen. xxviii. 18, 22) and of the "twelve pillars" set up by Moses beside "the altar" in Sinai—pre-Levitical therefore—in Ex. xxiv. 4. It indicates a custom common to the early patriarchal and to the Canaanitish worship. Comp. also Gen. xxxi. 45–52, the "heap" and "pillar" of Laban and Jacob.

ple. The curious fact is that in no one of these does the word *matstzebah* occur, and that in the last passage the word rendered "pillar" is totally different, being the same as that used for the pillar of cloud and fire in the Exodus. Indeed, except in the case of this example from the temple, the obvious suggestion is that they were natural monoliths taken as marking in simple early times the spots where they lay, and therefore capable of a commemorative¹ use, either *in situ*, as in Joshua's case, or by being expressly moved and erected, as in Samuel's. I wonder why the "great stone" which Saul bade the people "roll unto him" again as a witness, viz. against their illicit doings, is not added to the list (1 Sam. viii. 33). Being closely associated with the "altar" built by Saul at the same time (ver. 35), its identification with a *matstzebah* would at any rate be plausible. Nor need the "one stone" on which Abimelech massacred his seventy brethren have been left out (Judg. ix. 5, 18). If any sizeable stone at which anything is done is a *matstzebah*, one stone is obviously as good as another in such an argument. The *matstzebah* proper is always spoken of as distinct from the altar, not as the altar itself; unless its extemporized use by Jacob when a homeless fugitive, referred to in the note above, be taken as a standard, which would be obviously absurd. The Jachin and Boaz pillars are architectural, although of metal, and probably supported a porch of stone.² Some have supposed them to be adaptations of some Tyrian design used in a temple of Melkarth. But as there is no suggestion of anything but a structural function in their case,—to which indeed the names obviously point,³—least of all of any ritual function, this antiquarian conjecture does not affect the question. One might as well claim as *matstzeboth*

¹ Absalom sets up a *matstzebah* (so in Heb. 2 Sam. xviii. 18) as his own memorial stone.

² So we have "a porch and pillars" (1 Kings vii. 6) as adjuncts of "the house of the forest of Lebanon."

³ *Jachin*, "He will establish;" *Boaz*, "strength therein."

the two pillars which Samson pulled down. Nor, indeed, is there any one of the professor's alleged instances which has a better claim to the title.

I come next to the prophets. Isaiah (xix. 19) predicts "an altar to Jehovah in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar (*matztzebah*) in the border thereof to Jehovah. And it shall be for a sign and a witness unto Jehovah of hosts in the land of Egypt." But the altar and the pillar would thus have been miles away from, and out of sight of, each other, the former in the heart of the country, the latter near Rhinocolura. The purpose of the latter is expressly defined, "for a sign and a witness." It is to be a sacred landmark in token of Jehovah's suzerainty, and its local remoteness from the altar measures its remoteness in use from any ritualistic function.

Next, Hosea says (iii. 4), probably as realizing the captivity and deportation of the ten tribes, that they "shall abide many days without king, and without prince, and without pillar, and without ephod or teraphim." But when we look at the context with its symbolism of harlotry, which signifies of course idolatry, (cf. v. 3,) "Thou shalt abide for me many days; thou shalt *not play the harlot*," etc., and read on, "*for* the children of Israel shall continue many days without," etc., etc., we see at once that the "sacrifice" and accompaniments of "pillar, ephod, teraphim," are all idolatrous or illicit; and in the kingdom of the ten tribes so they were. So far from Hosea's sanctioning them, he expressly condemns them. The "king" and the "prince" involving the ruin of the state, the rest involves the ruin of the apostate church. The whole fabric, built up, as we know it was, in schismatic rivalry, was to be effaced together. This is a curious sample of exegesis in a man of the professor's undoubted learning.

And the above view harmonizes at once Hos. iii. 4 with x. 1, 2, which the professor's view sets in hopeless discord.

In this latter place Israel is rebuked for the multiplied "altars" and "goodly pillars" of which they are "found guilty," and both of which the avenger is to "smite" and "spoil." So far from these prophets, and especially Hosea, being at variance with the Pentateuchal precepts, Isaiah is consistent with them and Hosea expressly confirms them.

The reason for his enumerating the ceremonial items lies, no doubt, in the fact of their being familiarly known, as used in the popular ritual of Samaria and Bethel, where they probably confronted the public eye. Zechariah, it may be added (x. 2), mentions "teraphim" as commonly used to obtain prognostics of the weather, but certainly with a tone of censure rather than approval, and therefore in harmony with Hosea.

One may further add, that, if the marginal rendering of the Revised Version, "obelisk," be accepted for *matzzebah*, there is an obvious propriety in a monument taking that form on the border of Egypt, which is pre-eminently the land of monumental obelisks. I think that the attempt to establish a discord between law and prophecy on this point completely breaks down.

[*To be concluded.*]