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INTRODUCTION

One receives something of a shock to come upon passages in the Old Testament which refer unmistakably to human sacrifice. Even the prophetic opposition which furnishes the setting for this hideous practice, does not fully answer the questions which arise. It is needful to examine the blood rites of ancient peoples generally, and of the Semites specifically, and to grasp somewhat the kinship bonds of gods, men and animals, before one can feel that such sacrifice was normal to Israel even in their national crisis. A kind of scientific basis for such a custom is produced in the mind by a study of blood rites among many peoples.

Having secured such a basis, this study attempts to answer two questions: (1) To what extent was human sacrifice practiced at different periods of Israel's history, and (2) what was the probable relation of this practice to Yahwism? The answer to the first question begins with a survey of that period in which the child-sacrifice cult was thoroughly established and traces back from this time to the origin of the practice. The second question calls for a study of
Yahwism in its essential features during the time of
the prophets and under their patronage, and at the-
time of Israel's birth as a nation.

This twofold study uncovers a popular inclination
in Israel to adopt the forms of the lower nature
religion in which human sacrifice would be normal.
The inability of the prophetic party to stamp out
these lower forms from among the people, who mingled
freely with unsubdued Canaanites and neighboring
peoples, made possible the development of the Molech
cult in opposition to the more ethical and spiritual
Yahwism. But nothing in the nature of Yahwe nor
the religious conceptions in worship offered to him
permit of his being related to Molech or of being
regarded as a God who required human victims in
sacrifice.
SACRIFICIAL WORSHIP

"For the life (nephesh-vital principle or soul) of the flesh is the blood" (Lv. 17:11). As sacrifice is the centre of all ancient worship, so the shed blood is the centre of sacrifice. Backward races of the present, and in all probability, primitive man as a whole, are alike in believing that the most potent and intimate fellowship with deity is secured by the offering of living blood. While all materials which are useful for human food have been offered to the gods, the deepest mysteries of sacrificial worship are connected with blood-letting. Schultz does not hesitate to speak of ancient sacrifice as shedding of blood, as if all other sacrifices were secondary and derived from this. The stone or tree as the abode of deity, on which the blood was poured, is transformed into an altar, an idol and a temple; blood-letting expands into blood rites, the communal meal, the priesthood, and covenant bonds; but through all this development the mind clings with holy awe to "the life thereof which is the blood". Gen. 9:4. In this sacrifice "they have offered up life, that mystic power enshrined in blood, the deepest, holiest
secret of creation". (Bushnell, Vic. Sac. II, 69).

The fact of bloody sacrifice, either in original or derived forms, is practically universal in the religious life of the race. Jevons draws the conclusion that "the earliest form of sacrifice may probably be taken to be the sacrifice of an animal followed by the sacrificial meal". (Intro. to Com. Relig. p178). At least this is the regular form of sacrifice in the ancient world as we know it. "Here, therefore, we have to deal with an institution that must have been shaped by the action of general causes, operating very widely and under conditions that were common in primitive times to all races of mankind". (W.R. Smith, Rel. of Sems. p 240). To this he adds, "the godward side of the ritual is summed up in the shedding of the victim's blood". "The most solemn act in the ritual is the shedding of blood". "This therefore, is the crisis of the service". (p 321).

The efficacy of shed blood over other forms of sacrifice is suggested in the story of Cain and Abel. Likewise the mystic life released in the shed blood compels the attention of deity; "Thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground". (Gen. 4:10).
Among the Greeks and Romans there is constant reference to the practice, and in crises, to the holocaust. Among agricultural peoples who lived largely on grains and fruits, all slaughter of animals is sacrifice to deity. Among hunting and nomadic peoples, certain totemic species of animals are reserved as sacred or sacrificial animals.

Durkheim traces religious rites among backward races of the present and finds various blood rites, by which an appeal is made to the Powers for the increase or continuance of totemic types of plants or animals or of human life. "They believe that vivifying influences go forth from spilled blood." "It frequently happens among the Arunta that when a man is sick or tired, one of his young companions opens a vein and sprinkles him with his blood to reanimate him." (Elem. Forms of Relig. Life, p. 331-2). "Just as the Arunta or Dieri sprinkles the sacred rock or the totemic design with blood, so in the more advanced cults, the blood of the sacrificed victim, or of the worshipper himself, is spilt before or upon the altar." Trumbull in his "Blood Covenant," (p. 22-29) writes of the force of the blood covenant among African tribes and among Syrians and Arabians
where the sacred use of blood is still recognized. Among the Jews the law against eating blood indicates its sacredness (Lev. 7, 26).

For our purpose it is enough to glance at this wide-spread use of blood as central in worship and its potency in compelling the attention of the gods. The crude idea of Ghillany and Daumer that wherever blood was spilled there the gods flocked in hunger for blood, seems inadequate even for the lowest races. Everywhere there is a survival of the mystic idea that shed blood releases life and that the gods hunger for the life. Hence "In the body of the victim the blood came to play the most important part as the expiatory force." (Toy, Intro. to H. of R. p. 487). Among other ancient peoples, the Semites and among the Semites, the Hebrews made bloody sacrifice the center of worship for communion with and aid from their deity.

THE MOTIVE OF SACRIFICE

Behind the fact of sacrifice one seeks the native meaning but the primal meaning is hidden in the human motives which express themselves in many forms. One may hold that this inherent impulse of the human heart is a command or revelation of the Creator and
at the same time seek a scientific basis for the origin and development of sacrificial rites. W. Robertson Smith in his "Religion of the Semites" rejects the simple gift theory as the adequate basis for sacrifice. Tracing the vital relationship of animals, men, and gods, he regards the communal meal as an expression of kinship produced by blood bonds. Members of the tribe, their god, and totem types of animals were bound together by shedding the blood of one member of the group and by eating the victim's flesh together. Often the flesh was eaten raw and warm in order that the living blood might enter into all members of the tribe. "Those who sit at meat together are united for all social effects; those who do not eat together are aliens to each other." (Relig. of the Sems; p. 269.) In this way new kinship was formed among men and new ties with deity begun, and in this way old ties were strengthened or restored.

This raises the rite of bloody sacrifice far above the mere presentation of gifts. And there seems no reason why this mystic element in life blood may not have been in the thought of primitive man. Life has been released for the god and the blood of
a sacred animal has been shared by all members of the tribe. Mystic, potent union has thus been produced. But Durkheim sees in this a gift also. He thinks it always presupposes that the worshipper gives some of his substance or his goods to his gods. He explains it thus; Each year nature dies. Will it revive? Draught, pestilence and famine destroy. Will the food and the sacred species or totem types survive? Blood is offered that the god may continue these types. There are many traces of the oblation of blood where the communal meal is lacking. He argues, therefore, that there is no reason for claiming that the idea of oblation is a late development. They have given in the poured blood the most precious gift known. Paton cites examples of pouring blood on a stone or a tree without any communal meal and concludes "Such cases point to a wider conception of sacrifice than that put forward by those who would deduce all sacrifice from one origin." (N. Intr. Ency. 17: 412). L. Marillier thinks he finds the rite of sacrifice to consist of the releasing of life in the shed blood, whether clansman or foreign victim, whether totem or other animal. (Ency. Brit. "Sac.") H. Hubert and M. Mauss regard the imparted
sanctity of the victim, rather than the common meal or tribal blood in those who eat together, as the original center of sacrifice. This seems altogether too complex for primal impulses in worship. Thomas, in the same article, says in criticism of these suggestions, "The only unity, perhaps, is the effort to put the divine into communion with the profane human by means of an intermediary, the victim." Schultz further adds, "The blood of the victim, as the life of the animal, establishes a community of life." (AJT, IV, 257). He also refers to the time when "the relation to their god is essentially physical—and blood the life vehicle, for establishing a unity of life among men and between men and their god." (p. 266). Kamphausen thinks that in oldest times "the offering was considered food for the gods." (Ver. Menschenop. p. 36). But the statement of Westermarck needs to be added that not only the blood as food but the \textit{related} spiritual life goes to serve the gods. (O. Mor. Ideals, 440).

While the idea of a gift and the idea of kinship by a communal meal are doubtless elements in the original impulse of sacrificial worship, they need not exhaust the native feeling of the worshipper.
The craving for unity with the higher powers and the feeling that the life element in blood could secure or even compel deity to give aid is everywhere present. Other offerings might be made, various customs might develop, but central to all else are the blood rites; human covenants; cutting of the flesh at funerals to strengthen the departed, offerings to ancestors, blood rites in youths' entrance into manhood, circumcision, oblations at seed-time and harvest, and the more regular forms of bloody sacrifice, reveal a belief in the potency of blood which is supreme in man's loftiest relationships with each other and with deity. The needs which the earth often fails to supply led them to seek from the hidden powers or gods who ruled the earth the satisfaction which they craved. To these they offered life that life might be produced or continued or increased.

The trusted efficacy of blood for these purposes is still seen in India. Gait tells of a childless woman in Muzaffarnagar who, in 1870, killed her neighbor's son and drank the blood, hoping thus to be vitalized for child birth. He records three cases of bathing in blood shed in this way, in the United Provinces during 1909, and of two such cases in the Nasik
District of Bombay, (Hastings Ency. R. & E. VI, 582-3.) Probably this potency of the life blood in securing from the unseen powers behind nature, that which would aid life or ward off that which would destroy life, is as near as we can come to the original motive of sacrifice.

THE VICTIM

Our next inquiry is concerning the victim whose blood is to be offered. Nothing is made of the pain of the victim, nor of its death, in early religion. There were certain types of sacred animals, however, from which the victim was drawn. "Sacrifices were drawn from animals of a holy kind, whose lives were originally protected by religious scruples and sanctions; and in support of this position a great mass of evidence can be adduced, not merely for Semitic sacrifice but for ancient sacrifice generally." (W. R. Smith, R. S. 289.) Such animals were sacred to men and to their god in the bonds of kinship. In Babylonia and Assyria "the sacrificial animals were usually of the male sex: they had to be without defects, strong and fat, for only the unblemished is worthy of the gods. Only in the rite of purification were female animals
allowed, and only in the lesser ceremonies could defective animals be used." (Cath. Ency. XIll,311.) Victims killed by aliens could not be eaten by the tribe, nor in many cases animals which were not drawn from the chosen group. In later times animals become clean and unclean, but originally sanctity and uncleanness are the same thing. In the earliest times it would seem that all animals were sacred and all slaughter was sacrifice. A kind of hunger for life, or the necessity of being revived by life-blood, caused the gods to require a victim from time to time, according to Curtiss (Prim. Sem. Relig. 224.) He quotes a saying that "every household must have its death, either man, woman, child or animal." By the sacrifice of an animal or some fitting substitute this death might be prevented. In a similar way the requirement of the god in other matters was met and calamity averted. Thus, crops were insured, famine stayed, wars won, and benefits secured to the clan or tribe by giving satisfaction to the mystic needs of deity.

Now, "among animal sacrifices, as man is the best animal, human sacrifices have always held a prominent place." (N. In. Ency. XV, 288.)
If animal blood strengthened or persuaded the gods, human blood was regarded as more potent. From this viewpoint and from the fact that human sacrifice has not been as common among savages as among semi-savages, it is more probable that human sacrifice was derived from or parallel to animal sacrifice rather than that animal sacrifice is a substitute for the human. (Westermann 436.) The more exalted the victim, the greater would be its efficacy in averting the anger or gaining the favor of the gods. Hindu priests of the present and the ancient Romans with other primitive nations, believed that if the victim were of enough importance and perfect enough, the gods could not resist. In great crises even chieftains or kings were offered. Such condition could hardly arise until strong nations were developed and great calamities encountered. The simplicity of primitive life would find satisfaction in a much simpler form of sacrifice and a victim drawn from the domestic or totem group would be adequate. (Brinton, Prim. Peoples, 189.) (Driver, Com. Gen. on Issac, 221.) Likewise great nations would sometimes offer large numbers of animals and, after burnt offerings were introduced,
the whole victim or victims might be burned. Westermann suggests that human beings were offered for success in war, stopping epidemics and famines, for rain, crops, favorable winds and safety at sea, for preventing the death of important individuals, for promoting fecundity, in foundations of buildings, and as servants to dead rulers. (Chap. 19.) While in later times it seems to have been the size or the worth of a gift it does not seem probable that this was reckoned with in early sacrifice. The superior worth of human life-blood might be readily felt, especially in the case of a member of the clan. There is nothing to show that the firstborn was a victim of superior importance in early sacrifice generally. Likewise, the idea that the victim carries away sin in atonement is a later conception. Wherever nations have advanced far enough to preserve history and wherever backward races of the present are studied, animals are regarded above other objects of sacrifice and human victims are the most efficacious offerings that can be made to the gods. It is evident everywhere that offerings of portions of the body, animals branded with the image of a human
being, and images made from mixed blood and meal, are mere substitutes for an original practice, when human victims were sometimes used.

THE GENERAL PRACTICE OF HUMAN SACRIFICE.

The widespread evidences of human sacrifice among ancient people generally is significant. Ever­

istus Hader opens his book on human sacrifice among the Hebrews with these striking words: "Among the ancients it is a universal fact that the favor of the gods was gained or the lost favor restored by human sacrifices: a fact which is written with bloody letters in the history of mankind and one which lays open the deepest pulse of their religious feelings and thoughts." Westermarck declares that we meet with human sacrifice in the past history of every so-called Aryan race, (OMI 434.) Crowley states that "there are few races and few religions which can show a history free from the stain of human sacri­

fice." (Hast. Ency. R. & E. VI, 840.) Brinton agrees with this, "Traces of human sacrifice are discovered in the early history of even the noblest religions and the rite extended so widely that scarce a cult can be named in which it did not exist." (RPP,
189.) Toy specifically names Egypt, Phoenicia, Carthage, Moab, the Hebrews, Arabs, and Arameans among earlier peoples who practiced this custom. Among later nations he mentions India, China, Scandinavia, Germany, North American Indians, and especially Mexico and Peru. A large portion of Mader's book traces human sacrifice among the neighbors of the Hebrews and W. R. Smith makes it clear that the practice was common among the nature-religions of the Semites generally.

Cicero and Pliny speak of decrees in their time to prohibit the practice in Rome. Plutarch quotes references of Euripides to sacrifice of this kind among the Greeks and cites a Roman parallel. "Marius, finding himself hard put to it in the Cymbrian war, had it revealed to him a dream that he would overcome his enemies if he would sacrifice his daughter, Calpurnia. He did it, preferring the common safety before any bond of nature, and he got the victory."

(Plut. Morals, Quest. 83, Vol. II.) Merivale states that the Romans affirmed that human sacrifice had been abolished by the elder Brutus but he finds at least three occasions where such victims were de-
manded at a much later date. (Note. Vol. II, 416.) It is significant that the early gladiatorial combats were indulged only at funerals, as an offering in honor of the dead. (Arnold, II, 134-5.) The tendency in the literary days of Rome was to abolish the practice especially in cultivated circles. In writing of the practice among other peoples, the Romans of the cultured circles were not anxious to speak of the practice among themselves where laws had been made against it. "There is no dispute about human sacrifice in the earliest times of Rome. The Etruscans, who are believed to have had no small share in the Roman religion, show on their monuments the sacrifice of human victims." (T. Thayer, Inquiries con. H. S. among Rom. p. 470.) But Marivale recognizes that "the practice creeps back again for private and personal objects and is associated with magical ceremonies." (Note to Boyle Lectures.) Specific cases, where prisoners, foreigners, and the self-immolation of citizens become victims are mentioned by Thayer. The conclusion seems forced upon us then, that the practice was at times followed publicly in time of distress and that it was fairly common among the uncultured for private and commun-
ity needs.

The cultured mind of the Greeks condemned human sacrifice, yet fear or calamity often caused them to return to this practice, reference to which frequently appears in their legends. The legend of Iphigenia is most familiar. Neoptolemus urged the sacrifice of Polyxena on the tomb of Achilles in order to obtain favorable winds for the return of the fleet from Troy. In his famous cleansing of Athens, Epimenides the Cretan caused a youth to be sacrificed. (Pearson, in H. Ency. R&B, IV?848). Several authorities in Greek literature affirm that culprits were kept at public expense to be used as victims in case of famine or calamity. This brings together in an interesting way the punishment of crimes and the satisfaction of deity. At the temple of Apollo in Leucas, a criminal was thrown from the cliff into the sea each year. At Rhodes there was an annual offering to Chronos outside the gates. Athens, in observing the Thargelia, had a similar rite. Increasing culture led to the use of substitutes which in themselves point to the original custom of sacrificing human victims. The very naturalness with which so many of the Greek writers refer to the custom is one of
the strongest evidence of its common practice in the early times of which they wrote. "When the sacrifice of an Athenian maiden was required to stay a famine, a certain Embaros promised to give his daughter, but dressed up a goat in her stead and sacrificed this at the altar". (Phil. Paroem. I, 402). Such references speak clearly for human sacrifice and for its substitutes. Such substitution appears widely distributed among many peoples.

Among Orientals, wherever civilization was little advanced, human sacrifices were common. In the Kalska Purana of India it is stated, "by a human sacrifice attended by the rites laid down, Deva remains satisfied for one thousand years and by the sacrifice of three men one hundred thousand years. By human flesh the goddess Kamakhya's consort, Bhairava, remains pleased three thousand years. Blood consecrated turns to ambrosia". (Hat. Ency. IV, 850). There are many temples at which such sacrifices were common a century ago. Children were sacrificed at the time that crops were sown and were offered to the river and earth demons. Vigorous steps had to be taken by the British Government to suppress the
practice. About the year 1780, when the gates of Tavoy in Burma were erected, a victim was put into each post hole and the post thrust down so that the blood spurted up at the sides. Killing children and drinking their blood or bathing in it was often practiced to produce conception by childless women. Religious suicide often took place in the hope of rebirth into some higher form. These modern practices suggest the motives that would be common at a similar grade of civilization in any period of the past.

In Japan when the most ancient documents were written, the memory of human sacrifice was still fresh in the minds of the historians. The monsters of the thick forests, and demons everywhere in earth and air, had thus to be appeased.

Among the Chinese, while their altars never reeked with the blood of beast or man, traces of human sacrifice are fairly common, especially in connection with the funerals of kings. Ssu-Ma-Ch'ien mentions a ruler, Wu of Ts'in State, who made sixty-six people follow the dead duke, Ch'ing, into the next world. A nephew of this prince had one hundred and seventy-seven sacrificed at his death. Among these were
three brothers. The philosopher Micio during the third century B.C. inveighs against this extravagance in burials. (DeGroot, Hist. Records, II, 669). The Tartar dynasty especially practiced it and there are evidences that it was used in building the great wall. (Ball, Hast. Ency. VI, 845). In 954 A.D. an emperor of the Chou dynasty gives orders that his funeral shall be simple and that no one shall be injured. (Parker, China Rev. 25: 259). In recent times victims have been offered in building bridges, gates and public buildings. In 1900 an official offered a victim to his drum in starting for the war.

The Chippewa Indians, suffering from an epidemic, regarded it as a punishment and set adrift the most beautiful girl of the tribe upon their river that in her drowning the epidemic might be stayed. (Dorman, Prim. Supers. 208). The Peruvians sacrificed children when unfavorable weather threatened the crops. "The Chukchi in 1814 sacrificed a respected chief to stay an epidemic which was destroying men and reindeer". (V. Wrangell, Polar Sea, 22). "The Germans of old laid it down that in time of famine, beasts should first be slain and offered to the gods. Did this bring no relief, then men should be slaugh-
tered, and if still there was no aid from on high, the chieftain of the tribe himself must mount the altar, for the nobler and dearer the victim, the more pleased were the gods". (Brinton, Prim. Peoples, 188). In the Baltic states, the Slavs sacrificed a Christian each year by lot to Svantovit. The head of John of Mecklenburg was fixed on a lance and offered to the god Radegast. (Helmhold, Chron. Slav.). Human sacrifice was vigorously practiced by the Mexicans until a recent date. Many instances of substitution occur in which human blood is offered without death, but this is recognized as a simple effort to deceive the gods. "Scarcely an author attempts to estimate the yearly sacrifices throughout the Empire as less than twenty thousand and some carry the number as high as fifty thousand". (Prescott, H. Conq. of Mex, 38).

Among the Pawnee Indians a maiden was sacrificed yearly to the morning star.

Such a universal distribution would indicate a common cause working in the mind of man in his relation to deity and his conception of the efficacy of human blood in securing help. Peters thinks that human sacrifice is not necessarily the original form of all sacrifice and he connects it, not so
much with the special Arabic and Hebrew forms as
with a very general idea, liable to crop out among
any people; an idea which permits the god to demand
the dearest possession of men". (R. of Hebs. 69).
Such a survey as the foregoing creates a kind of
scientific basis for judging the meaning of recorded
facts concerning human sacrifice among any particu-
lar people. The value of human blood in sacrifice,
the need of blood in persuading deity, and native
feelings, in the face of calamity, are fairly perman-
ent factors among people generally.

HUMAN SACRIFICE AMONG ISRAEL'S NEIGHBORS

It can be safely held that human sacrifice was
known among the neighbors of Israel throughout the
period covered by Hebrew history. The Old Testament
writers deal with substantial facts when they speak
of this as a "heathen horror" (2 Ki. 16:3, 21:26).
Mader's attempt to find the source of Moloch wor-
ship in Egypt seems futile, but his investigation
carefully traces the practice among several of
Israel's neighbors. Some familiar passages in the
Old Testament point to the practice. In 2 Kings 17;
24, 31 the colonists transported from Sepharvaim
are said to burn their children in the fire to Adrammelek and Anammelek. 2 Kings 3:27 mentions the sacrifice of his son by the king of Moab. In time of seige he is offered to the god Chemosh on the walls of the city. The practice is referred to in numerous passages as an abomination of the inhabitants who were driven out before the invading Hebrews. (Dt.18:12, 2Ki.16:3, etc.).

Outside the Old Testament, evidence is not wanting to prove the existence of human sacrifice among Israel's neighbors. The following statement concerning Egypt seems warranted; "The testimony of certain Greek and Latin authors, based apparently on tradition and corroborated by indirect references in certain Egyptian writings and by scenes represented in tomb wall-paintings, seems to indicate that the practice was observed, at least in a modified or symbolic form, down to late historical times". (Hast. Ency. R. & E.). Westermarck suggests that patricide and infanticide appear often without any thought of sacrifice. (Orig. M.I.383). But Steindorf, in describing typical burials, brings out facts which indicate a religious significance in all such matters. He describes a tomb as follows; "the tomb further
contained several small tombstones of women, dwarfs and even of dogs. These had been buried at the same time as the monarch: and it is not too much to assume that they had been his favorites during life and had been slaughtered at his funeral". (Relig. An. Eg. 141).

This idea of trying to serve and provide for a departed monarch is closely associated with the effort to please and meet the needs of deity by bloody sacrifice.

Diodorus Siculus (1:88) speaks of the king of Egypt as having sacrificed red men, usually foreigners, as such men were not to be had in Egypt. A fragment tells the same fact and adds that, having been burned, their ashes were scattered to the winds. Evidence points to the sacrifice of a maiden each year to insure the rising of the Nile. The fact that no clear inscriptions on the monuments tell of such a practice is thought by some to be sufficient grounds for denying its existence but others see in it simply the ignoring of the familiar. One inscription, at least, does give a striking account which points directly to the custom. On the tomb of Seti I, there is a description of men attempting to revolt against Ra whose wrath was appeased by a
human sacrifice and a draught mixed with human blood: his resolve is also mentioned in which animals are to be substituted for human victims. (Nashville, Old Eg. Faith, 298). Much of Madsen's argument that the custom in Israel was brought from Egypt, is contingent upon certain questionable dates, but his attempt brings out strong evidence that children were sacrificed and probably burned, to Osiris and other deities. The absence of any shock or surprise where single instances of this sacrifice occur, is fair evidence that those who recorded them were familiar with it as a general practice.

Concerning Assyria and Babylonia, Toy thinks that there is no evidence to prove the custom of human sacrifice in the latter but concedes the possibility of it in Assyria. (Intro. H. of Is. 489). In the Assyria known to history it may have been limited to certain regions and it may have been associated with justice and punishment, but its existence and religious significance is secure. One passage which has been made much of in the past was thought to read, "the son is burnt on the high places" but should probably read "grain is burnt in the heat of the sun". (Hast. Ency.). But Ball describes a cer-
tain seal which clearly indicates a knowledge of human sacrifice. The following figures appear; (1.) a priest holding a sceptre in both hands, (2.) a divinity holding in one hand a sceptre and a curved sword in the other, flames burst from his shoulders and behind him is an altar with vegetable offerings, (3) behind this figure are two men in leopard skins with arms raised to strike. (4.) Between them is a kneeling man with a head dress. There are flames above and a bird of prey approaching. One of the figures holds back his head and the other pulls aside the beard as if to free the throat. (P.S.B.A.14:149). Even though this may be the punishment of a criminal, the religious offering of a victim to deity can hardly be mistaken. Then, there are minor references found in Assyrian writings in which captive boys and maidens are reported to have been sacrificed along with slaves and sheep. Human sacrifice would be normal, from our scientific basis, to such gods as were worshipped; for instance Raman, Ishtar, and Ashur, gods of storm and war and kinship.

Human sacrifice is known to have existed among the Phoenicians. Porphyry mentions that they sacrificed to Saturn, in times of war, famine or pestilence,
those most dear to them. (Sil. Ital. 4:765). At Carthage there was the yearly sacrifice of a boy chosen by lot. Kamphausen refers to an incident where the Carthaginians offered three hundred boys. (p62). Eusebius also refers to the Phoenicians offering their dearest to Chronos.

The Saracens, who had until recent date, advanced but little from the station of their early ancestors, offered young and beautiful captives. Where these were lacking, a young and faultless camel was substituted. (Smith, R. Sems. 362). Nilus (Nar. VI) tells of the narrow escape of his own son, who had been stolen by the Saracens and prepared for sacrifice between the setting of the morning star and the rising of the sun. His captors overslept and he was spared. There is every reason to see in these more recent sacrifices the survival of an original custom.

But among that group of nations even more intimately associated with Israel, by language, ancestry and contact, there is strong evidence that the custom was fairly well known. We have the account in 2 Kings 3:27 of the conditions which led to the sacrifice of his son by the king of Moab. It does
not appear as an unusual procedure, either to the Moabites or to the Hebrews. Among the Ammonites there is no statement concerning human sacrifice in the scanty records. Much of the discussion which has been advanced to prove that child sacrifice in Israel was transported from Ammon, arises from the god-name Milkom being related to Molech. But there is no real success in identifying this god with the Molech of the Hebrews, neither can it be shown that children were offered to Milkom. The religion of the Ammonites did possess that element of nature worship, however, which would make human sacrifice a normal factor. And there was intimate association between the Hebrews and these neighbors, even to the erecting of a temple to Milkom on the Mount of Olives (I Ki. 11:7, 33). Kamphausen thinks that in earlier times these nations lived on the same religious level. A study of this whole group in the light of the Abraham-Ishac, Moabite, and Jepthah stories along with the blood rites of nature worship, would give the inquirer a strong impression that human sacrifice was a well known, if not a common, practice.

The Canaanites, with whom Israel was in much closer contact than the Old Testament records would
suggest, seem clearly to have been familiar with this rite. Human sacrifice is one of the abominations of the nations which "Yahwe drove out before Israel". Excavations tend to confirm this record. At Megiddo, a girl about fifteen years old, had been slaughtered and her body built into the wall. The excavations about Gezer and at Ta'annek are suggestive though not absolutely convincing. Macalister has described a cemetery in the temple area near Gezer and made the claim that his findings there are sure proof of infant sacrifice. The bodies of children were found in jars and a cistern near by contained the skeletons of animals, children and adults along with refuse from the temple altar. Wood claims that this is no proof and that "even children could be buried in the temple area by use of a jar". (B. World 36:166). But signs of burning on some of the bones and the presence of animals and children together would indicate the strong probability of sacrifice. Dussand makes a special study of this subject and finds sufficient ground for thoroughgoing belief that human sacrifice was common among the former inhabitants of Palestine. (L. Sac. Hum. c. l. Can. 34:77-109). The fact that Jerusalem was not conquered
until David's time and that in building the temple 153,000 Canaanites are said to have been employed, makes it certain that the religious practices of these partially subdued people would be well known to Israel. (Paton, Can. Infl. on Rel. of Is. 205 ff).

Perhaps this is sufficient to sustain the general statement of Dillman, "Human sacrifice, and especially child sacrifice, was widely spread among the Canaaneans, Phoenicians, Carthaginians, and Egyptians, and among the Moabites and Ammonites who were akin to Israel. It was also practiced among Aramean and Arabian peoples". (Crit. Com. Gen. II). While this evidence does not prove anything for Israel, it removes any surprise, when the practice is found in Israel, that it should have crept across the borders or risen up from the native people of the land. And it will remove any question as to where the knowledge of the custom might have arisen. Unless the religion of the Hebrews was sufficiently exalted throughout Israel to resist the rites of these cults they would be likely to slip into general practice. From this viewpoint, too, the opposition of the prophets is easily understood.
That the Hebrew people did actually practice human sacrifice, both before and after their national organization, is clearly stated in the Old Testament records. The familiar account of Jepthah's immolation of his daughter in accordance with a former vow is recorded in Judges 11. The account of Hiel setting up the gates of Jericho by the deaths of his oldest and his youngest sons, given in 1 Kings 16:34, is doubtless in accord with the ancient custom of building youths into walls and gates as a sacrifice. This incident relates itself to a curse pronounced upon Jericho by Joshua (Josh. 6:26) and probably crept into the records along with the fulfillment of the curse. The slaughter of the priests of Ba' al on Carmel by the prophet Elijah, while in some phases a religious act, does not seem to be a human sacrifice but rather an execution of justice in religious matters, (1 Ki. 16:40.) Hanging up the seven sons of Saul before Yahwe is regarded by Gillany, Mommert and others as human sacrifice. It seems rather an example of blood revenge as an ancient law in human relations in which blood is efficacious in satisfying both the tribe and their
god that justice has been done. (1 Sam. 15:15.) It is an example of the Ban rather than a distinct offering to deity, (Mader, d. Mo. d. A. H. 130.) Daumer in his early study of this subject with Gillamay, goes so far as to see human sacrifice on a vast scale in connection with the account of David's altar at the threshing floor of Araunah (II Sam. 24:16.) He manages to get ass-worship out of the likeness of the Hebrew word for ass to this name, Araunah. Then in the plague or slaughter which occurred he sees a great festival with many human sacrifices. But this only shows how far a subject can be carried when one is willing to make the facts bend to his preconceived theory.

But numerous allusions to the sacrifice of human victims, especially of children, are to be found at a later date. This practice centered in a place called Tophet in the valley of Hinnom just outside of Jerusalem and the offerings were made to the god, Molech. This deity is somewhat obscure both in the form in which he is represented and the place which he filled in the thought and life of the people. The name is mentioned only seven times and in one of these (1 Ki. 11:7) it should doubtless read Milkom. The other
references are II Kings 23:10, Jer. 32:35, Lev. 18:21, 20:2, 3, and 5. Jeremiah 49:1, 3 has Malcam which may not refer to a god but a king. Yet there seems to have been a god to whom these sacrifices were made, known to the Hebrews as Melech (king) and called by the prophets Mokech with the pointing of the word Bosheth (shame.) (Jer. 11:13.) Other passages refer clearly to the practice and the place without specifically mentioning the name of the god; usually with the phrase "caused their children to pass through the fire." (Kamphausen, 14.) Of Ahaz it is said, "But he walked in the way of the kings of Israel, yea, and made his son to pass through the fire, according to the abominations of the nations, whom Jehovah cast out from before the children of Israel." II Kings 16:3. A similar reference to him is made in II Chron. 28:3. The same sin in charged to Manasseh in II Kings 21:6 and II Chron. 33:6. It is mentioned as a cause for the destruction of the Northern Kingdom in II Kings 17:17, which would indicate that the custom was introduced into Judah from the north as many foreign customs were, and that it antedated the time of Ahaz. A vivid picture of Tophet in action is given in Isa. 30:33, II Kings 23:10, and Jeremiah 7:31, and these
passages bring together the names Molech, Tophet and Hinnom with the practice of burning the children in the fire. A passage in Jeremiah 19:5 is interesting, as an exception, since here Ba'AL and not Molech is the god to whom the sacrifice is made. Ezekiel mentions the practice in Chap. 20:26 and refers to it along with other forms of idolatry in 23:37. This idea of "passing through the fire" is not simply a lustral rite by which children were passed between fires or leaped over the fire or were held above it. It is the familiar term for burning children in Tophet—probably meaning oven or fire-place—to Molech and perhaps to other deities. (Moore, Ency. Bib.) Ezekiel 16:20-21, speaks of the children as "devoured" and adds, "thou hast slain my children and delivered them up, in causing them to pass through the fire unto them." This is not simply a reference to the fairly common rite of purification by fire as mentioned in Numbers 31:23. The combined evidence of these passages makes it clear that from a time before Ahaz down to the reform of Josiah and even to Ezekiel's time when the Hebrews were made captives, this horrible practice was familiar to the people and was opposed as an open, prevalent shame. Its headquarters were near
the temple in Jerusalem and the practice was sanctioned by some of the rulers of the nation.

Indirect evidence in the historical records of the Old Testament are also fairly numerous. Concerning the Abraham-Isaac account, Marti says "The memory that in the matter of child-sacrifice, the Hebrews once stood on a level with the other Semites and Canaanites distinctly shines through the narrative. But it is equally clear that a higher faith must have been common property in the Israelitish community before it could reflect itself in such a story in the legends regarding Abraham." (Rel. of O. T. 153.) The very protest in such a story would indicate an early practice with a tendency to lapse into the practice again. The account in its present form, when the historical background of the written record is considered, would suggest the probability of an effort to separate Israel from this practice among Semitic neighbors (Gen. 22.) The recognized claim of Yahwe to the first born is generally considered as having some reference to an earlier practice of sacrificing the oldest son, (Ex. 13:12.) The law of redemption might be taken to suggest the same,
The feeling that the first-born belonged peculiarly to Yahwe, and the implication that he might claim what belonged to him as a sacrifice, can hardly be overlooked in the Old Testament. Just what cause produced this feeling is not very clear. A special birth right and a larger share in the inheritance was given to the first-born. Whether this social superiority of the first-born arose from Yahwe's claim to them, or whether his claim and the special birth right arose from a deeper cause is an open question. It is fairly certain that the first-born were regarded the most sacred to Deity because the clan blood flowed purest and strongest in them. The best of the parents' life blood was imparted to the first-born. (W. R. Smith, 395-400.) Perhaps this and other causes may have set aside the first-born as more precious to deity.

Kamphausen thinks that Yahwe's claim to the first born of animals was derived from his earlier claim to the first born of men. But this is of little importance since the problem here has to do with the whole law of firstlings (Ex. 13:13, 22:28.) All blood
sacrifices, in and about Palestine, were drawn preferably from firstlings. But this is no special reason for supposing, as some have, that a time existed when all first-born children were offered and that at some later time animal firstlings were substituted. When animals were sacrificed, they were chosen from a sacred type and preferably the first-born from among this type. If the occasion called for a human being the first-born child was selected. When the occasion was sufficiently crucial it might call for the sacrifice even of the king's first-born. The superior value of the first-born prevailed alike in sacred and social relations, and the tendency has ever been to offer the gods the best.

The records present the interesting account of Yahwe's slaughter of the first-born of Egypt and his sparing the first-born of the Hebrew at the time of Exodus (Ex. 13:15.) Kuenen thinks that this is not historical but is simply one explanation of the law of redemption in which substitution is made for human sacrifice (R. of I. 239.) He agrees with the common view that the whole law of firstlings points back into Semitic history and to surrounding customs in which first-born children, as well as animals,
were frequently offered in sacrifice. Much of the Hebrew attitude toward the first-born and their legislation concerning redemption resulted from this Semitic custom of the past and of their neighbors. They retained the superior value of the first-born to Yahwe but secured a substitute when a sacrificial offering was called for.

It may be a fair claim that in some vague past circumcision was adopted as a substitute for the slaughter of the victim, though more likely it was a bloody rite by which youth was admitted to the rank of manhood. Exodus 4:24-26, where Yahwe is about to slay Moses and the son is circumcised by Zipporah, is suggestive of substitution but would permit of other interpretations as the passage is obscure. Macalister says "The sacrifice is a representative one, a part being given for the redemption of the rest." (Hast. Bib. Dict.) Schultz says, "By an overwhelming majority modern scholars suggest a religious motive." (O. T. Theol. I, 195.) When the Hebrew nation and religion came into being, circumcision was a form by itself, and quite apart from the regular forms of worship by sacrifice. Its religious significance for the Hebrews rather connected itself with
national life than with the distinctively religious. All of these indirect references have to do with the past and point vaguely to customs prevalent among the ancestors of the Hebrew people. The "devoted thing" (herem) and the example which Samuel set in hewing Agag to pieces "before Yahwe" (I Sam. 15:33) are not technically sacrifices but show the relating of all such judicial acts to the deity. The same is true of the hanging up of the seven sons of Saul (II Sam. 21:9.) Even in these judicial acts deity is concerned, but it is significant that in the hanging at least the shedding of blood does not have its usual place as in regular sacrifice.

EXTENT OF THE PRACTICE.

From this fairly wide range of facts, briefly surveyed above, we are to seek the answer to two distinct questions which constitute the problem of human sacrifice among the Hebrews, (1) to what extent was human sacrifice practiced in Israel, and; (2) what was the relation of this practice in Israel to the legal religion of the Hebrews.

As to the extent there are certain boundaries of time which naturally limit the duration of the practice. After the exile there is no evidence of
the practice and it is commonly agreed that human sacriflce in every form had been abolished. While there is no definite period to mark the beginning of the practice among the ancestors of the Hebrews, only an indirect interest attaches to it, so far as we are concerned, before the time of Moses and the birth of Israel's religious and national life.

The greatest activity of this cult seems to have extended over a period of approximately a century and a half preceding the captivity. The historical records of the time and the language of the prophets indicate this as a feature in the abnormal effort to secure divine help against oppression at the hands of the great neighboring powers. A special form of this general cult developed in which the burning of children in the fire to Molech (Melech) was the regular sacrifice. From the time of Ahaz at least, the practice was so well established that neither the prophets nor the kings who were enthroned by their efforts, were able to eradicate the evil. References in Ezek. 16:20-21 and in Jer. 19:4-5 indicate that all such efforts had failed down to the time of the exile. The headquarters of this cult in the "valley of the sons of Hinnom" is clear enough evidence of its
national standing. With several of their kings sacrificing to Molech and with this form of worship thoroughly established at the national capital; with the practice even creeping into the Temple of Yahwe in Jerusalem (Jer. 19:4), there seems no reason for limiting the extent of the practice except among the prophetic party. The magical appeal of blood sacrifice among ancients in general and among the Semites in particular, makes it probable that the people in general would adopt such a custom very readily when once it had been thus sanctioned.

It is difficult to understand, therefore, how Addis (Heb. Relig. p 42) can say, "We may however confidently assert that human sacrifice was never common among the Hebrews." Every indication in the existing records as well as in the science of religions would point to the fact that in Judah, from about 734 B.C. to the exile, human sacrifice to Molech rivaled Yah-wism. While this would not greatly affect the more popular religion of the common people, it would tend to make even their minor sacrifices and religious observances more desperate in their appeal until as in India, the shedding of human blood for other pur-
poses than national defence would not seem extraordinary. While the attacks of the prophets are against the sanctuary in Tophet and against the rulers, there is no evidence that the cult was strictly confined to this sanctuary and the capital of the nation. The "high places" with their idolatry and witchcraft "under every green tree" (I Ki. 14:23, Jer. 2:20, 3:6 & 13, Ezek. 6:13, etc.), would indicate the prevalence of natural religion, in which human sacrifice would be normal. There is every reasonable indication that Molech worship had fastened itself upon the religious life of Israel at this time. Both the positive statements concerning it and the negative evidence in the decline of Yahwe worship, together with the scientific grounds which would make it normal at this time, make it clear that during these one hundred and fifty years of national calamity and fear this extreme form of natural religion was practiced in an effort to secure divine help, or even compel it. It was during this period that the prophets rose sheer above the magic power of bloody sacrifices and called for inner sacrifice and personal worth. For this period there was a distinct form of human sacrifice, a sanctuary, a priesthood, and a sufficient strength
in the movement to rival Yahwism.

Going back from this period to the earlier part of the divided kingdom, the name Molech disappears from the records and Ba'الism is the chief rival of the regular worship of Yahwe. References to human sacrifice are few in number and when mentioned they are not confined to any sanctuary nor to any deity. So far as any records are preserved, there is no convincing evidence for a distinct Molech worship in Israel previous to the time of Ahaz. With him human sacrifice took on a prominence that it had not possessed before and soon developed into the established cult as we have seen it.

It is important to consider whether Ahaz adopted Molech worship as represented in the Biblical records or whether it was introduced by him or by others about his time. We know that in connection with alliances made with powerful nations he freely introduced various forms of idolatry. The religious literature of the past makes clear that the worship rendered to the gods of allied nations was common. But Ahaz seems to have gone further and erected a foreign altar on the site of the old one (II Kings 16:10-16.)
He stands out in the writings of the prophets as the first to offer his son as a sacrifice among the kings of Israel in that he "caused his son to pass through the fire". There is every evidence here of a revolt against the more spiritual religion of the prophets and a return to extreme forms of natural religion by which the gods are forced, as by magic, to aid men. The entanglements of Judah with other nations and the distress and danger of the times are reasonable causes working to this end: confidence in the older religion and the prophetic program was waning under these conditions. It seems probable, therefore, that at about this time in Israel, Molech worship became an established cult. Ahaz, being an aggressive king in making foreign alliances and introducing the worship of the gods of allied peoples, would stand out for the whole movement much as Luther stands out for the Reformation. But did human sacrifice originate with him? Was it introduced from outside or was it the normal evolution of former religious practices under new conditions? Was it a new religious cult or an old one revived and changed? This brings up the whole question of Molech worship as a distinct cult in the latter part of Israel's national history.
Those who have sought its origin outside of Israel have traced two main lines of evidence: (a) the origin and use of the name Molech or Melek, and (b) the practice of human sacrifice, especially the burning of children, among people associated with the Hebrews early and late.

It is commonly understood that the name Molech is the regular word, Melech or Melek, with the vowels of the word Bosheth (shame) given it by the prophets. Thus it appears in the prophetic literature in a modified form. The effort to trace the origin of this cult by this name has exhausted all god-names in which, or in connection with which, the letters m l k appear. The real problem is to find a distinct god by this name, to prove that child sacrifice was the regular form of worshipping this god, and that this god was introduced to Israel so as to transfer the essentials of the cult among a new people. Such evidence as can be gathered to this end is scarcely satisfying.

Some have thought that Melkart of Tyre is to be associated with Molech of Israel and that this alliance was the real basis of introducing the new cult. Baudissin argues that the Hebrew has Molech
instead of Melek on account of its derivation from Melkart. As a god who did not find their state the Hebrews avoided the direct name, Melek. He would have the Molech worship of the later kings of Israel simply a wider use of the Ba'al religion introduced at the first by Ahab. From Ephraim this particular phase of Ba'al worship passed into Judah which was always inclined to follow the northern kingdom. (Mader, 86).

There might be some grounds for holding that Molech worship was in some ways developed from certain forms of Ba'alism, but that it was a development of that particular form of Ba'alism which was introduced from Tyre by Ahab or that it was in any definite way connected with the worship of Melkart is not made clear. It was not Melkart but Kronos to whom child sacrifice was made among the Tyrians. Jer. 19: 5 mentions Ba'al as the deity to whom such sacrifice was made but at this period there is reason to believe that human sacrifice might be offered to any leading deity. Moreover, since the female god Astarte was often called Meleketh, Queen of heaven, it would not be strange to call Ba'al, the male lord, Melek. But this would in no way connect Ba'alism with Mel-
In trying to identify Melkart with Kronos, in the effort to prove that child sacrifice was offered to Melkart, there is little enough evidence. Lagrange quotes Sophocles (Trach. 126) as speaking of King (Basileus) Kronos but to twist this Greek word for "king" into a god by the name of Melek or Melkart and then into the Molech of the Hebrews is decidedly questionable. Kronos is never called by a name which would identify him with the distinct god-name m l k. Furthermore "in all the human sacrifice of the Phoenicians and Carthaginians, Melkart is not once named" (Mader, 87).

Another source from which the origin of Molech worship has been thought to come has been the Ammon- itish god Milcom. Against this view is the fact that a temple was erected in Solomon's time on the Mount of Olives and dedicated to Milcom. This temple probably stood until Josiah's reform when Tophet was destroyed (II Ki. 23:13). If this is true then Milcom and Molech would be worshipped near Jerusalem at the same time, and would argue strongly against their identity. But even among the Ammonites themselves, we have seen, there is no certainty that Milkom was
worshipped in this way. Nor is there reason for supposing that the religious customs of the Ammonites were in any large degree transferred to Israel. In Moab, where child sacrifice is known to have been offered to Chemosh, this name Melek seems to be unrelated to the practice and the god. All of which tends to produce the idea that child sacrifice among Israel's neighbors was not offered exclusively, at least, to a god by the name of Melek. Likewise when a god is called by that general name, child sacrifice does not seem to be the particular form of worship which he demands.

Mader develops the idea extensively that human sacrifice was introduced from Egypt. He refers to a Hebrew jar found in Jerusalem on which the names Set and Melech are joined together and to an Aramaic inscription which has Osiris-Melech. He also finds use made of the name on the Tel-El-Armarna tablets (p94). He makes much of the reference in Ex. 20:26, 31 to human sacrifice in the wilderness and thinks that the gods brought out of Egypt might have been connected with this form of worship. But Marti well says that while the Israelites touched Egyptian life they were northern Semites and followed the customs
of their ancestors. (R.O.T. 29). Kamphausen adds that the history of Egypt is as much opposed to the sacrifice of human victims as is the history of Israel. It is very doubtful if, at the time the Israelites were in Egypt, human sacrifice was at all common. So far as proving anything from the reference in Ezekiel and the Pentateuch, Mader cripples his whole argument by departing from the regular historical interpretation of dates and of religious developments. All that he really points out is that one more nation with whom Israel came into contact, occasionally offered human victims in sacrifice and that they sometimes applied the general name Melek to certain of their gods.

That some traces of human sacrifice are to be found in Assyria and Babylonia is generally accepted. Since the aggressive period of child sacrifice in Israel came at a time when they were brought into vital association with these nations it is quite natural to seek the source of the worship in the East. While the name m l k can be found in conjunction with god-names in these countries, there is no trace that any of these gods were worshipped in Israel. Astarte might be called Melecheth but no human sacri-
Office is offered to her. The only real encouragement that this view finds is in the names Adrammelech and Annammelech, gods to whom the Sepharvites offered their children by burning after they had been transferred to their new homes in Israel. But the Hebrews were in the midst of the practice before these colonists arrived and there is no indication that they had been in contact with them before. The custom would doubtless have been mentioned had it been used in Assyria and Babylonia in any general way. Here it is mentioned as peculiar to these colonists. And even here the emphasis cannot well be placed upon Melek in the compound names, since it seems only to indicate the kingly qualities of these deities. The gods Adram and Annam do not appear among the deities known in Assyria and Babylonia.

The general use of the word m-l-k in connection with the names of gods, rulers and in compounds of private names, would suggest that there was no distinct god of that name among the neighbors of Israel to whom human sacrifice was made, nor that such a form of worship to a god of that name was adopted by Israel from outside. The name Melek is not generally connected with human sacrifice and its more common
use seems to indicate the kingship of deities whose regular name was also given. It would be natural, then, for Israel to call Yahwe their king at times (Ps. 44:4, Isa. 6:5, Jer. 10:10). Kuenen thinks that Melek, "king" was applied to deities in the same way that Ba'al, "Lord", is repeatedly used. (1, 250). Mader cites two inscriptions from Punic literature which show that Ba'al was in some cases called Melek also. (p95). It is safe to say that no god by this name, to whom human sacrifice was the distinctive form of worship, was introduced into Israel from any of her neighbors as the origin of the Molech cult. The name, outside of Israel, has nothing particular to relate it to child sacrifice and in the Old Testament the name is connected with this practice not more than eight times. Israel called that god to whom they offered their children their King (Melek) because in the thought of his worshippers he was their strongest leader in their crisis. It stands in opposition to the kingship of Yahwe and the more spiritual religion of the prophets and is a return to the inferior nature-forms of persuading the gods.

Our second question has to do with the origin
of Molech worship (in Israel), by tracing the practice of human sacrifice, and especially child sacrifice by burning, apart from the name Melek. Did Israel adopt human sacrifice from her neighbors? We have already noticed that human victims were offered to tribal gods by peoples with whom Israel had dealings. Did Israel take over the practice from others and elevate some minor deity to kingship, to whom they offered their children? Some (Ghillany, Daumer, Momsen) would make Yahwe himself the Molech to whom such sacrifice was made. But regardless of the deity or the name, can the custom he traced among the neighbors of Israel and from the neighbors into the religious life of Israel?

This argument seems reasonable. The disasters of this period had shaken the confidence of some of the rulers as to the ability of Yahwe to protect his people. The gods of the neighboring peoples were proving themselves stronger. Foreign gods and foreign altars were consequently introduced. Alliances were made with neighboring peoples and this made possible the bringing of offerings to their gods, on altars within Israel, without offence to the established religion. Is it not very probable that child
sacrifice was introduced at this time along with other religious practices? Gilmore says there was "distrust of winning divine favor by ordinary means. Emergency might warrant the offering of children to any god". (New Schaf.Herz.450). He mentions several passages which refer to child-burning without naming the deity (Ps.136:37, Isa. 57:5, Deut.12:31,18:10, Jer. 7:31,19:4-6, Ezek.16:21,20:26,31,2 Ki.17:31). Disasters proved how heavily the wrath of Yahwe rested on Judah.(G.F.Moore,En.Bib.). The prophets urged that it was not the amount of sacrifice which was offered that brought divine favor (1 Sam.3:14,26:19,Mic.6:7, Amos 5:22). The passage from Micah is particularly illuminating,"Will Yahwe be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first-born for my transgressions, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" It is clear from such opposition that there were those who depended upon such offerings for divine help. But did they bring this custom into Israel from outside?

If Israel's powerful allies were practicing child sacrifice at this time in a notable degree, and if it could be shown that the custom was new in Israel about the time of Ahaz, the solution of the
problem would be easy. But strangely enough, there is no certainty that the neighboring peoples, either allies or enemies, were particularly active along this line at the time. The example from Moab (2 Ki. 3:27), comes much earlier. The allusions of the prophets refer not to their neighbors but to the former inhabitants of the land. Nor is there any such struggle as would be natural; such a struggle for instance as took place between Elijah and Ahab when the worship of the Tyrian Ba'el was introduced (2 Ki. 18). In the descriptions of the Egyptian and Babylonian offerings during this period, this extreme form of sacrifice is not recorded by the prophets or by other writers. From these nations, if from anyone, we would expect the Hebrews to adopt the custom, because of their superior power and success.

Mader thinks "that the origin of the Hebrew Molech worship can be explained by the surrounding idol worship of heathen people, and according to the opinion of the sacred writers, must be sought in Egypt". But even so he goes back to a time much earlier when the custom was introduced into Israel and makes his statement in opposition to the claims of some that Molech worship developed out of Yahwism.
In the same way it could be argued that at some time in the past this custom developed out of the nature religions of almost any of Israel's neighbors. But the adoption of child sacrifice as a specific cult cannot be traced definitely to any or all of Israel's neighbors. Doubtless the influence of all these nations inclined the Hebrew people to settle back from the more spiritual religion of the prophets and within the inferior religion which they adopted child sacrifice might be offered to any deity. But the more one ponders the religious conditions in Israel from the time they entered Canaan until the period of national calamity, there appears to be strong reason for believing that such a cult could develop within Israel itself without on the one hand coming from the outside, and on the other without being developed from Yahwism.

Kamphausen quotes from Wellhausen, "the cult pertains to the Canaanitish influence upon Israel" (Kamp.17). It seems more reasonable to say, from a scientific as well as from an historical point of view, that the cult pertains to developments within that form of natural, magic religion which was common among the Canaanites, Israel's neighbors, Israel's
ancestors and the religion of the Semites in general with all other early peoples. That this lower type of religion continued in Israel throughout her national history, rivalling Yahwism and even becoming a part of the original Yahwism, is everywhere suggested in the historical records. Some interesting statements appear in Kuenen's History of Israel (226-232). "The Semites prefer to think of their gods as rulers of nature. The names by which they denote them usually express the idea of Might (E) Shaddai and Dominion (Ba'al, Adon, Molech)." "From the written records which have been preserved for us in the Old Testament we are acquainted with three forms of Yahwism. These three forms are, the Yahwism of the people, of the prophets and of the law. The people acknowledged and worshipped other gods besides Yahwe. The prophets saw in Yahwe the only God. The law, finally, must be regarded as a compromise between the Yahwism of the prophets and the popular religion". This seems a perfectly fair estimate of the facts behind the records and it is with this popular religion, kept alive in Israel, that reckoning must be made when the great crisis comes and confidence in Yahwe is shaken. The constant struggle of the prophets
against Ba'alism, witchcraft, necromancy, sorcery and finally with all their idolatry connected with the high places speaks loudly for such a conclusion.

It is now in order to continue an examination of the extent to which human sacrifice was practiced in Israel, having to do now mainly with its extension in time into the earlier periods of Hebrew history.

Nothing can be more certain than that the prophetic ideal of Yahwe religion as inaugurated by Moses, could not tolerate human sacrifice in any form. But there came to be long before the time of the literary prophets a corrupted form of Yahwism. In the conquest, the former inhabitants were not wholly destroyed and from the period of the Judges down to the close of the national existence there was idolatry, and a turning to the religion of the land continually. Three passages (Dt. 12:30 f, 18:10 and 2 Ki. 16:3) even speak of the whole Molech worship as coming from the former inhabitants of Canaan. The example of Mesha (II Ki. 3:27) would indicate that in crises the practice was well known among Palestinian tribes. Cornill in discussing the beginnings of Hebrew religion as distinct from other Semitic religions "finds in Gen. 22 a renunciation of that child sacrifice
which was a holy institution among the Canaanites." (Kamp. 12.) The corruptions which Josiah sought to overcome were not original evils in the Yahwe religion nor simply developed ideas, but were reforms that aimed to eradicate evils which had crept in through long contact with native religions. "They did not destroy the peoples, as Yahwe had commanded them, but mingled themselves with the nations, and learned their works, and served their idols, which became a snare unto them. Yea, they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto demons, and shed innocent blood, even the blood of their sons and their daughters, whom they sacrificed unto the idols of Canaan; and the land was polluted with blood." (Psa. 106:34-38.) The custom of wall sacrifices and the cistern at Megiddo, where there is at least strong suggestion of human sacrifice, (Wood, Bib. World, 36:166) would bear out the truth of this reference. Likewise the general Semitic customs as previously cited would indicate the nearness of this inferior religion of the Canaanites to the life of the Hebrews. Lev. 18:3 forbids Canaanitish practices even from the standpoint of the law, which was not as strict as the prophets. Kamphausen well says, "What the lords and
people feared and practiced may be separated from what the Mosaic religion taught." (p 56.) "The most superficial reader of the Old Testament does not require to be informed that the Israelites were prone to idolatry from the earliest times up to the Babylonian captivity." It has been admitted on all sides that human sacrifice was not only common among the Israelites in times of national apostasy, when they imitated the rites of the Phoenicians and the neighboring peoples, but that the old worship of the Canaanitish aboriginees was never completely eradicated from the land. (C.H. H. Wright, Isa. and Other Sud. 124-126.) The Molech worship as a whole "must be regarded not as a foreign cult but as a development within the Yahwe cult of Canaanitish use." (Peters, R. of Nebs. 250.)

From these facts we gather that the popular religion in Israel was a corrupted form of Yahwism previous to the time of Ahaz and that the mass of people generally knew little of the prophetic efforts to keep the religion of the Temple and the capital city true to the more ethical ideas of the Yahwe religion. Among the forms of idolatry into which
the people would naturally fall, there would be no objection to human sacrifice to secure help from the gods in times of extreme adversity. It is even possible that there was a fixed form of child sacrifice which the Israelites found on entering Canaan and suppressed by them. "At their entrance into Canaan, the Israelites found there the worship of a deity to whom children were sacrificed (Dt. 12:30-1, II Ki. 16:3) probably, likewise, called Melek." (R. of I. p 250). Kamphausen thinks that something of Molech worship continued down from the time of the Judges. (p 73). While it is difficult to prove anything definite along this line, it seems a trustworthy conclusion when the drift of the records, the later developments, and the general practices of Semitic nature religions, are considered. While it was not the state religion of Israel, nor probably a separate religion with a distinct deity, child-sacrifice seems to lie in the background of the popular religion to be used in times of unusual need. The people in general, who believed that shed blood persuades the gods, were in no condition of mind to revolt against such a practice and there are no indications that they did so when these sacrifices ap-
pear in earlier times. That it was a common practice is very doubtful, but that it would be resorted to, by communities in common danger on occasions, seems normal to the civilization and religions beliefs of the time. As such the practice lived in Israel, outside the state religion at first, and chiefly among those who mixed with Canaanitish tribes, from the time of the Judges to the captivity.

During the time of the Judges we have two striking examples of human sacrifice which tend to confirm the preceding conclusion; that is, "in antiprophetic circles human sacrifice was not unknown." (Buhl, Schaff-Herz. 119). The sacrifice of his daughter by Jepthah (Judges 11) and the sacrifice of his sons by Hiel (I Ki. 16:34, Josh. 6:20) indicate the state of mind which prevailed apart from prophetic influence. It seems a little strange that these accounts should be admitted to the sacred records of the Old Testament, but one is the fulfillment of a curse pronounced in the name of Yahwe and the other is the fulfillment of a vow to Yahwe. It is this rather than the fact of a human sacrifice which brings them into the records. They are admitted in spite of their outstanding opposition to the prophetic
attitude. One wonders how many more might have been recorded if the records of the time had been kept with reference to this extreme form of sacrifice.

In the case of Hiel we read, "In his days did Hiel the Bethelite build Jericho: he laid the foundation thereof with the loss of Abiram his first-born, and set up the gates thereof with the loss of his youngest son Segub". Inasmuch as a similar curse had been uttered by Joshua when he city was formerly destroyed, some have argued that the loss of the two sons was by accident and intends to teach the fulfillment of the curse by Yahwe. But knowing the widespread custom of building children into walls and at the foundations of buildings, bridges and city gates it seems probable that we have here the remnant of an account of that kind. Before the account would be admitted by later generations to the written records it would be robbed of its heathen form as a pure sacrifice in building. It seems wholly improbable that two accidents of that kind would happen to the chief's sons while working on the building. One might argue that this is not a regular sacrifice and is very unlike Molech worship, but as a religious act it becomes a part of that physical
form of worship in Semitic nature religion, which we recognize as basal to the whole custom of human sacrifice. The taking of human life to remove the curse and win the favor of the gods is fairly clear. Archaeology confirms the practice among many peoples. "at Tell Mutesellin, (Megiddo) a girl of about fifteen had been slaughtered and her skeleton built into the foundation of the wall. Skeletons of newborn babes were found in the corners of houses, in or near the foundations." (Ency. R. & E. Hastings, Hum Sac.).

It is quite possible that Hiel was influenced by Canaanitish custom or that it had lived from the past among the Semites generally. The offering may have been made to Yahwe in a degraded form of worship which had come to exist on the outskirts of Israel, or it might have been made to some local deity. As the account now stands it would seem that the former is the more probable. At any rate it was a normal sacrifice for the times and locality.

The account of Jepthah goes back still farther into the life of Israel and presents what may be called a regular form of child sacrifice among primitive and backward Semites. The sacrifice was vowed
to secure help from Israel's God in a war campaign. The vow was fulfilled at a sanctuary. The daughter of a chieftain was the victim and her death was bewailed annually, probably in that locality. (Judges 11). Analogies are not lacking. The case of Mesha (II Ki. 3:27) in offering his son on the walls of Moab is familiar. There was a yearly sacrifice of a boy chosen by lot in Carthage. (Pul. Comment. by Hervey, p 125-6). Prophyry quotes the Phoenician custom of sacrificing to Saturn one of these most dear to them, in time of war, pestilence or draught, (Hervey 126). The various accounts of Iphiginia among the Greeks and the substitution of other victims in later accounts, is an example of ancient religious procedure. (Inter. Ency. X-744). Lyall in Ancient Egyptian Poety (p 38) quotes, "Al-Mundhir had made a vow that on a certain day in each year, he would sacrifice the first person he saw. "Abid (a poet) came in sight and was accordingly killed and the altar smeared with his blood." These instances will certify that Jepthah's act was in keeping with ancient belief in the face of extraordinary conditions which demanded help of the gods.

The outstanding fact in the record of Judges
ll, are as follows; The desperate situation of the
Israelites in the region of Mizpah because of the
Ammonites; the recall of the banished Jepthah to be
their leader; the vow of Jepthah to offer whatever
first came out of the doors of his house to meet him;
his sorrow at seeing his daughter at the head of a
procession coming from his house; the respite of two
months for the daughter to bewail the prevention of
motherhood; and the fulfilment of the vow, followed
by the annual festival of four days.

The normal interpretation of the record would
seem to be that as little as possible was made of
the real sacrifice and the necessity of keeping a
vow made to Yahwe is emphasized. But D. Kimchi in
the twelfth century and other Christian exegetes
after him, have sought to explain away the sacrifice
of a human victim. In some arguments a substitute
is offered; in others the maiden is dedicated to the
temple; in others both ideas are urged.

Mader sums up well the objections in the ac-
count to such a conclusion. (P 152).
(1) The old translation in the Vulgate has
a human sacrifice.

(2) The Hebrews would not say of an animal,
"come out to meet."

(3) An animal would not come out of the house.

(4) Animal sacrifice on such an occasion would have been brought daily and in large numbers.

(5) "It shall belong to Yahwe" would not be used of animals.

(6) It was natural for his daughter to do this. 9 Ex. 15:20, l Ki. 13:6).

(7) The sorrow of the father would be meaningless without a real sacrifice and a human victim.

(8) The daughter would not ask for a two month's period of mourning unless she were to die motherless.

(9) Temple service without sacrifice would leave the whole account meaningless as an effort to secure help, so also would be the weeping of the virgins annually, and the fulfillment of the vow.

(10) The fathers held to an actual sacrifice. Kamphausen adds that temple service would not exclude marriage and declares that Hebrew Grammar will not admit the substitution of "it" for "her" in v. 39 (440). Hervey (Pul. Com. 126) well says,
"Nothing but our own horror, which they did not share, can lead one to try to bend the account to mean more than human sacrifice." In the light of facts which a scientific study of ancient religions produces, there seems no reason for demanding of this group of people at Mizpah a status of religious belief and feeling above that set forth in this record.

Here is, then, an outstanding example of a practice, within the bounds of Israel, which causes no revolt even at a leading sanctuary. How extensive this practice was in Israel or among their neighbors, we have no way of knowing. But it clearly shows that the custom, fairly common among the religions of the time, was not unknown to Israel. Under certain conditions it might easily be developed among the people, opposed by religious leaders in Israel, and practiced as a separate cult from Yahwism. At least there is a fact to be reckoned with in the later outbreak of human sacrifice. The outlying groups of Israel's population had mingled freely with the inhabitants of the land and their religious practices after many years would not be far above the common level, though they might retain the name and certain features of a former Yahwism. Any fair estimate of
the life and conditions of Israel in Canaan during
the first centuries will make it clear that they
did not need to go outside to import human sacrifice
nor did it need to spring from within that Yahwism
begun by Moses and continued by the prophets.

While there is no direct need for tracing back
further into the national life, this practice of
human sacrifice, in order to establish its origin
within Israel itself, it will be interesting to glance
at the extent of the practice in the earlier days.
The period beginning with Moses and running through
the time of the Judges is made by Ghillany, Daumer
and others a time of unusual activity in human sacri-
fice. They assert that Moses and Aaron offered them-
seves. All battles, on entering Canaan, are assumed
to be offerings to Jah-Molech. All deaths by vio-
ence in the wilderness and all punishment by death-
penalty are the same. Moses offered his own son
(Ex. 42:4f). (See Num. 13-14, Josh. 8:23-9, Gillany
679-722). Facts and their real causes are so arbi-
trarily handled that the conclusions need no serious
consideration. There is every reason to believe
that while that portion of the Hebrews, who were
united in the wilderness under Moses, were entering
Canaan, they had a fairly pure religion. The place of Moses as founder of the national life and of the national religion and the proclamation of the prophets that they were teachers of the Mosaic religion, is sufficient to show the more spiritual element in early Yahwism. It is also true that all religious movements at their beginning are more simple and spiritual. It was the Mosaic precedents which the prophets used against all idolatry and the more magical elements of physical worship.

Mader (p 34) does not think that Biblical criticism has changed the date of four passages (Lv.18:21, 20:2-5, Dt. 12:31, 18:10) so as to invalidate their proof of human sacrifice in Egypt at the time of Moses. He also makes much of Ezek. 23:19-21 and of the carrying of household idols out of Egypt. But a definite proof of human sacrifice in Egypt from these passages is impossible. Likewise it is impossible to prove that it was brought out of Egypt by the wandering Israelites. Moreover the date of the passages would seem to reflect much later times and conditions than those which could be associated with the exodus.
While there is no certain evidence that human sacrifice was not practiced in Israel under Moses or by tribes to which they joined themselves before entering Canaan, there is absolutely no evidence that it was practiced. On the other hand the later developments of the Hebrew religion and the inherent superiority of that religion which was so vigorously connected with its founder, Moses, seems to indicate opposition not alone to this extreme form of nature worship but to incline ever towards the moral and spiritual rather than the purely physical elements of worship. The earliest codes which are ascribed to these founders of the national religion do not belong to a religious stage in which this practice would be normal and legitimate. The prophets built on the teachings of Moses and not on Canaanitish cults, but rather in opposition to these. Kamphausen (p 20) asserts that the hypothesis that Moses was largely influenced by the priests of Egypt is exploded and thinks it perfectly right that one must go back to Moses for the real principles of opposition to Molech worship, since Moses was opposed to heathen practices of which this could become a part. It seems clear,
then, that human sacrifice was not practiced among these founders of the Hebrew national life and religion. Equally secure is the assertion that the early Yahwe religion, as inaugurated by this great leader, did not have within it the germ of this hideous cult. The absence of evidence that it prevailed in Egypt and the natural abhorrence to it, if it did exist there, by these founders of Israel, leave little ground for the claim that it was brought out of Egypt. Later generations, corrupted by contact with foreign peoples and foreign religions, drifted into worship contrary to this early religion. These Canaanitish influences are sufficient for the development of the practice, even though the original Yahwism and the later prophets stood far above it.

Any examination of the period before Moses must deal with general Semitic conditions only. This only is significant, that among the patriarchs to which the Hebrews pointed back in their religious history, there stands at the summit the man whom they claim had broken with human sacrifice. That it had been known among early Semites and backward Semites of a later day has been our conclusion from the evidence given. But that there had come a break with the practice in
certain Semitic tribes and in opposing the cult in later times, religious leaders referred to this break by their ancestors, is a natural conclusion. Whether the break came as far back as the time of Abraham, or came later and was then connected with this outstanding patriarch, is of little concern for us. The story must have been long among the Hebrews inorder to appear as it does in their national history. (Gen. 22). Certain it is that the break had come before the time of Moses. This ancient practice, at whatever period it existed prior to the time of Moses, could not have carried itself over so as to affect deeply the period of the prophets. A memory of the time when human sacrifice was practiced by ancestors who had at one time broken with the practice, could not be as potent for producing this cult in Israel as was the contact of these disorganized tribes in a new land, living in daily association with backward Semites. A change in the religious practices of these Hebrew tribes, as they absorbed the Canaanitish population by intermarriage, and forms of service, was sure to take place. Added to this was the contact with neighboring tribes of their own racial heritage. Out of this lower religion of the people in and about
Palestine, with perhaps faint memories of the past, the occasional practice grew into a cult, having crept up from the people even into the royal house.

RELATION OF HUMAN SACRIFICE TO YAHWISM

Having traced the practice of human sacrifice within the bounds of Israel during their earlier history, the next step is to note the relation of this practice to Yahwism, the legitimate religion of Israel. For Kuenen this requires a study of Yahwism only from the time of the prophets, since he holds that they are the creators of the Yahwe religion. In this case Molech worship would be one of the cults which the Hebrews found in Israel at the time of their invasion and one which was hard to eradicate from the practice of the people. But as we have noticed, the prophets do not think of themselves as creators of a new religion. (Knudson, Bea. Lights 23).

Nor can the origin and development of Israel's national life be adequately explained without the existence of this higher religion, from the time of Moses, as a factor. We must, then, look over the whole field of Israel's early history again to see if human sacrifice was offered to Yahwe at any time: whether Molech and Yahwe are related in the thoughts
of the people: and what relation human sacrifice came to hold, if any, to the legitimate worship of Yahwe.

Our first difficulty arises in trying to define exactly what the legitimate religion, or what pure Yahwism, is. Kamphausen says, "what the lords and people feared and practiced must be separated from what the Mosaic religion allowed and taught". (56).

Even the prophetic writings make it clear that other religions and deities divided honors of worship with Yahwe among the people. H. P. Smith (p 70) speaks of the probability that many gods came to be worshiped at the same sanctuary and the worship due to each came to be reckoned as phases of the worship of Yahwe. "There did come to be long before the literary prophets, a false Yahwe worship in Israel". (Kamp 18). This indicates an original Yahwism, somewhat obscure, and the reformed Yahwism of the prophets, besides corrupted forms of the religion among the people and even at the sanctuaries. From these sources it is not easy to deduct any clear cut idea as to the nature of Yahwe or the legitimate forms by which he was worshipped.

A fairly clear conception can be gained, however,
from the prophets, which will give in a general way the Hebrew conception of Yahwe and the prevailing conception of the requirements in worshipping him. Enough is given, at least, to answer in a fairly clear way the questions which our subject raises.

In the first place, Yahwe is known by the prophets as the same ethical God which was the supreme religious conception of Israel from the time of Moses. He was not to be represented by an image nor thought of on the level of nature deities. His very residence in Horeb, and his manifestation as power, separate him from nature deities. He stood above the appeals of magic, for the prophets, and required moral excellence rather than abundance of sacrifice. (Isa. 1:10-15). Mere blood and fat could not buy nor compel his favor. Such a God was by his very nature above the appeals of human sacrifice, and in the opinion of the prophets, children so offered were offered to heathen gods and demons (Ps. 106:37). Necromancy, magic and divination were abominations which he did not tolerate (Dt. 18:11). By such worship as the prophets required, Yahwe was lifted out of these forms and ceremonies and conceptions of nature worship in which human sacrifice would be thought to
have supreme efficacy.

And yet this is the very period when the practice reached its culmination in Israel. The people, and the rulers even, sacrificed their children to some deity whom they probably called the Melek or King; by the prophets changed to Molech or Moloch. To what deity was this offering made? Certainly to no deity whose nature and qualities rose to the heights of the prophetic conceptions of Yahwe. Nor was it offered in connection with that worship of Yahwe which the prophets championed and regarded as the only true and original worship of Israel. Yet this abominable practice crept finally into the temple itself (Jer. 19:4, Lev. 20:2-5). Did the people and their rulers sacrifice children to Yahwe? That might be, but it would be a much corrupted form of Yahwe worship. For we can hardly escape the conclusions reached above that the religion of the people in general was a mongrel religion made up of elements drawn from Ba'alism, Astarte worship, and the worship at local shrines. It is exceedingly doubtful if the worship of the "high places", where the native cults of Canaan had been worked over into a worship acceptable to Yahwism, was made with any
distinct idea of deity in mind beyond the image and the name. Any god might be Ba'el (Lord) or King (Melek). Thus they might sacrifice their children to Ba'el (Jer. 19:5), or to idols (Ezek. 23:39). Josiah's reform broke down many altars about Jerusalem where foreign gods were worshipped from the days of old (II Ki. 23:13). In this conglomeration of religious practices, it is not probable that the worshippers, either people or priests, kept the gods distinct except as they had different images and different names. Their offerings might be made to Ba'el or Yahwe or local deities but the idea back of their worship was a general, vague idea of deity. They did not have in mind that conception of God which was possessed by Moses and Samuel and Elijah and the literary prophets. Thus the ordinary forms of nature worship might be carried on in the name of the God of the prophets or in the name of some local deity at one of the local shrines. In such worship, human sacrifice might not be foremost, just as it was not foremost in the religion which Elijah opposed, but it was a cult, as was Tyrian Ba'alism, in which human sacrifice would be a normal, extreme form of worship in a crisis. Human sacrifice in Israel apart
from worship under the influence of the prophets, would be little else than a superstitious appeal to the lords or powers of nature, or to the king of the heavens. When national dangers increased and calamity threatened the nation, distrust in the prophets and the religion which they represented grew and the extreme form of appeal became common. It seems very doubtful if under these conditions the appeal was ordinarily made to the God for whom the prophets stood. Rather did the vague conception of deity in the minds of the people take on the name Melok and the cult organized itself in the valley of Hinnom.

What at first was an occasional practice in connection with lower ideas of worship came to be a separate cult, standing as one of the chief opponents of Yahwe worship in Israel. The two forms of worship seem to have been carried forward side by side for some time, especially after the time of Ahaz. Molech worship and Yahwe worship seem never to have mingled. Before human sacrifice came to be the regular form of worship to a separate deity, it might have been offered to other gods including the popular conception of Yahwe. Never is there a trace of its being offered to Yahwe in the worship of Him as established and
maintained by Moses and the prophets. Under Jephthah the act seems to fall in corrupted forms of Yahwe worship. When in later days the practice is carried into the temple, it seems to have been in opposition to the prophetic religion, and under royal patronage.

But whence came the god Molech and the hideous practice by which he was worshipped? The theory that such a deity by name, or such a form of worship, was introduced bodily from outside, seems a futile search. There are all the forces within the popular religion as reflected in the times of Samuel and Elijah and the period of the prophets, as well as in the historical background of the Judges, to account for the development of human sacrifice into the Molech cult.

The fundamental Ba'alism as held in Canaan, the worship of Ashtarte (Melecheth) Queen of heaven and the traces of sun and fire cults in connection with the worship of Ashtarte and Ishtar, with all the subordinate deities connected with these forms of worship, furnish a religious background from which such a cult could arise. (Jer. 7:18, 44:17-19, I Ki. 11:5, 33, II Ki. 23:15). (Kamphausen p 16). It is significant that Jer. 19:5 mentions that "they built high places of Ba'al". In 32:35 he speaks of Ba'al as Molech. II Ki. 23:10
declares that Tophet was built to Molech and not to Yahwe. Old Testament history is full of protest against the wandering of the people of Israel to an idolatry which prevailed among them. It is from the midst of this "idol worship" in Israel and about Israel that the cult springs.

The image of Molech cannot be associated directly with any god of the past, much less with the conception of Yahwe. The place of sacrifice is at the "oven" where the refuse from the temple was burned and suggests that fire was an important element of the worship which this deity required. Tophet, before the vowels were changed, seem to suggest this place simply. That form of worship which "waited for the day of Yahwe" (Amos 5:18) and sought to compel divine intervention seems fully represented in this extreme practice.

But could not the roots of this practice and the origin of this deity be traced to early conceptions of Yahwe and early practices in worshipping him? Cannot Molech be identified with Yahwe in the earlier days when the latter appeared as a pillar of cloud (Ex. 14:19), the burning bush (Ex. 3:2), or the fire on the tabernacle (Ex. 40:38) if Molech is a kind of
fire god? As the prophets developed the older religion towards moral Yahwism, did the lower elements of the old religion and the magic elements of worship become degraded into Molech worship? Can the idea of Molech be found in original conceptions of Yahwe?

Gillenay would make the slaughter of the priests of Ba'Al by Elijah, a great human sacrifice feast. And the offering was made to a God who answered by fire. (I Ki.19:3-8). He also makes the death of Uzzah (II Sam.6:6) a sacrifice, Uzzah himself being a priest. The ark is the very centre of a human sacrifice cult and wherever it goes there is slaughter and terror. So blindly does the God of the ark slaughter for himself that he kills anyone that suits his fancy. Such is the wild assertion of one who fits the accounts to a preconceived theory. Such a god might indeed pass readily into the Molech of later times. But there is no real evidence that Yahwe was peculiarly a fire god. He might almost as readily be called a water god since he withholds rain (I Ki.17-1) and divides the sea (Ex.14:26). Nothing but blind determination would assign the slaughter of the Ba'Al priests, or the "herem" or the fulfilment of justice as in the case of the seven sons of Saul, to sacrifice to Yahwe.
Likewise the hewing up of Agag before Yahwe does not bring Yahwe into association with Molech or make him a God thirsty for human blood and eager for human sacrifice. It was crude revenge fitting the thought of the times.

The only satisfactory explanation of the nature of Yahwe in the earlier periods, as glimpses of him appear, is that he is the same national God under whom the Israelites established themselves in Canaan; to whom Elijah returned in his conflict with growing Ba'alkism; and whom the prophets exalted in their developed ideas. At the first "we must beware of thinking that the distance between the Hebrew religion and the religion common to the Semites was very great and quite discernable by outward signs". (Schultz O.T.Th. I,109). But from the first there was a loftier conception of the deity to whom ordinary sacrifice was made, which took of the best from the old Semitic religions and grew them into ethical values. The religion of Moses was vitally connected with the past but it also added new elements of law which would forbid that Yahwe was ever developed from Molech or Saturn or that these were naturally associated with him. There is nothing to indicate any
real break in the conceptions of Israel's God from the time of Moses to the later period of the prophets. "From what has come down to us it is clear that they (the prophets) stood as representatives of the morals, customs and faith of the past". (Knudson, Bea. I. of P. p15). Likewise there is nothing in the known religion of Canaan from which the prophets could build the ideas of Yahwe. All religion connects with the past and considering the obstacles, the period from Moses to the prophets is not too long for the working out of that higher idea of religion, which beginning with Moses, developed the higher conceptions which he gathered from his forefathers into the still higher conceptions of the prophets. There is no room for so radical a change in the nature of Israel's God as vital connection with Molech would require. Had Israel entered Canaan on a level with the inhabitants there would have been no struggle between Yahwism and Ba'alism. As it was the struggle was between a lower and a higher, a physical and a spiritual conception of deity.

But would not the Jepthah account indicate that Yahwe worship was on the level of Canaanitish religion? Was not the sacrifice made to Yahwe at a sanctuary
set aside for his worship? Could not such a god easily
become the Molech of later times? If our survey of
the corruption of the religion under which the tribes
entered Canaan and organized themselves so as to pro-
duce later a national existence, is correct then there
is room for very much inferior worship in which an
act such as the records attribute to Jepthah would
be quite normal in the face of their crisis. Was
Jepthah's sacrifice to the God of the prophets? That
would not be possible at this early time and under
his leadership. Was it to Yahwe as worshipped by the
early followers of Moses? The answer seems to be that
it was to Yahwe only in name. But was it not at an
established sanctuary of Yahwe in Israel? It must be
recognized that we are dealing with times before the
priesthood had been developed. The earlier religion
was preserved chiefly about the ark and the taber-
nacle before the temple was built. Sanctuaries already
in the land were taken over by Israelitish worshippers
and at them an impure Yahweism was practiced. It
needs no unusual imagination to picture the change
which would normally take place as a compromise of
the invaders with the native peoples at these sanctu-
aries. The name of Israel's God is retained but a
people constantly inclined to backslide from the high ideals of Moses, while he leads them can hardly be expected to retain his ideals of worship when he is no longer with them and pagan forms of worship are everywhere.

Add how the fact that Jephthah had been an outlaw and had been among those whose whole life would indicate the crudest kind of nature worship: that he had been called back under desperate circumstances: that the situation called for extreme appeals to deity: and that no clear conception of distinct deities was held at this time but rather a vague appeal to elemental forces in nature, and the true situation becomes clearer. "The heathenish character of Jephthah's vow is apparent." (Mader 159). Such conduct before Israel's God early or late, does not appear again and here not at a time or place where true Yahwism is prevalent. There is every evidence of the same kind of worship here as was offered later by Mesha. (2 Ki. 3:27). It is a vow to give whatever deity shall select for himself as a sacrifice, in order to win the deity's favor and there is nothing clearer in Jephthah's mind than to win the favor of that deity which has the interests of this section
of Israel at heart. Yahwe was the name of the God under whom he was to fight, but he himself knew little or nothing of those higher ideas that centered in the worship of Yahwe from the beginning. (Cam. Bib. Judges 149). "He had lived in the circle of Syrian and Ammonite superstitions." (Lang, Eid. & Judges). "It is not possible to draw out of the account that human sacrifice was orthodox in the Yahwe cult." (Mader, 159). "Probably neither Jephthah nor the majority of those whom he led knew that it was contrary to the Mosaic religion." (C. H. H. Wright, Isa. & Other Hist. 155).

But even if Jephthah would be in a position to make such a sacrifice, why did not the people restrain him, or at least give evidence that it was a shocking violation of their religious beliefs and practices? Kuenen (R. of I. 308) answers; "The Israelites in consequence of their settlement in Canaan adopted the religious ideas and practices which had hitherto been foreign to them." "There were traditions of past pre-Yahwe religions and present influences of anti-Yahwe religion. Yahwe was the tribal God of Israel during the period of the Judges and by very contact was worshipped under different forms, but
from the beginning the Yahwe religion had higher elements which were able to resist even the Ba'al temptation." Jephthah represents but one phase of the general corruption of the Israelitish religion at the time of entering Canaan.

It is evident, however, from this account that the practice of human sacrifice in and about Israel was not unknown during the period of the Judges. Otherwise it could not have been acceptable to the people at a sanctuary of Yahwe. But there is no suggestion of the god Molech here. Neither do the facts suggest that this was true Yahwism for that period or that it was the original condition from which the Yahwism of the prophets sprang. Rather does the teaching of the prophets call for a religion which survived this chaotic period of heathen contact and religious corruption and maintained vitality enough to rise sheer above these lower forms of worship. The whole line of traditions indicate a definite Israelitish religion in contact with the religions of Canaan. The struggle with the lower order is recorded. (Deut. 4:19, II Ki. 23:5, Jer. 8:2, Job 31:26). "Many cities remained Canaanitish. Jerusalem was not
conquered till David's time. Other gods were worshipped there. U R U means "light" and combines in the name Jerusalem. YeReHo, the moon, is found in Jericho. Yahwe triumphed over the Ba'alim or Powers of Canaan by absorbing them. But when the others had disappeared it was evident that Yahwism must be purged of much contamination that it had contracted in its career of conquest." (Paton, Can. Infl. on Heb. R. 224). We fail to find any reason for assuming that human sacrifice was an original part of Yahwism, that Yahwe was regarded as a God in any way similar to Molech, or that the origin of the Yahwe religion was such that Molech worship could be developed from it. The period of the Judges was for the most part a period in which the religion of Israel was corrupted by contact, taking over sanctuaries and "high places" in the name of their God but also taking over many customs of the native peoples and their religion which produced a false Yahwism. And it was just this false Yahwism, or mongrel product of mingled religions, which constituted the worst enemy of that religion under which Israel possessed the land and maintained their national and religions place in the world. It was out of this mongrel religion that all
those magic and idolatrous practices arose which the prophets condemned. Out of this also came that extreme form of idolatry, and magic religion which developed into the Molech cult.

But a complete study of the relation of this cult to Yahwism, and of Molech to Yahwe, requires an examination of the Yahwe religion at its initial stage in the time of Moses. We need not pause long over the wild statement of Gillany and Daumer that Moses and Aaron were priests of the cult whose worship required human sacrifice and that they offered themselves in suicide. They have absolutely nothing but their own imagination as evidence. But what was Yahwe to Moses and his followers? How was he worshipped as they were entering Canaan? Whence the conception of such a deity and the origin of this more potent religion?

Of this period Peritz says, (O. T. Hist. 64), "while many details are uncertain, the essential parts have become remarkably confirmed, namely, the residence of the Hebrew tribes in Egypt, the person and leadership of Moses, the exodus with the crossing of the Red Sea, the covenant at Horeb-Sinai, and the political and religious organization at Kadesh."
The beginnings of Hebrew religion differed not so much in form as in a new content. The religious background of these tribes must be that of the Semitic peoples in general. (Welh. p 52). The Priesthood and ceremony of later times was not yet developed. The comparatively small group coming out of Egypt, united with other desert tribes to form the new nation and the new religion. (Ex. 3 & 18). Of this united company Davidson says: (O. T. The. 8) "Israel was a numerous people, whose past had made it not a homogeneous but a composite nation." That this group was under the leadership of one by the name of Moses and that it was his leadership which gave the nation its religious standards, is generally accepted. The prophets assume the deliverance and religious leadership of this man. All J, E, and P codes ascribe to Moses the origin of the Israelitish nation and religion. No such compact as that found in Exodus 3; 13-18 would be called for if Yahwe had been the God of the Hebrews from the earliest times. (H. P. Smith H. of Is. 48-9).

"The call of Moses conveys three essential facts, (1.) the Midianite environment whence came the inspiration of Moses; (2) the new element in the re-
ligion of the Hebrews, represented by the name Jehovah; (3) the personal element in the experience of Moses through whom the new religious truth was transmitted to his people." (Peritz, 68). Throughout the history of Israel, the Kenites which were one of the unifying tribes, remain stalwart defenders of the Yahwe religion.

It cannot be altogether certain that other minor deities, with images, were absolutely objectionable till times much later that that of Moses. Davidson says that while Yahwe was supreme "he was one god among many" (p 63). The ark and tabernacle would signify that a kind of monolatry existed in which the central worship of Yahwe was something of a spiritual idea as well as an image conception. It is doubtful if the leadership of Moses overcame completely this common custom of honoring and worshipping other deities. But that there was in the religion of Moses that which steadily opposed idol worship and the worship of many gods cannot be easily mistaken. "The whole history of Israel is filled with this internal conflict between the strict worshippers of Yahwe and those who showed a leaning to other gods."
It would seem that for Moses, undertaking his task and thrilled by new religious truth, there must have been that conception of God which ever remained central in Israel's religious thought. For the God who was to lead them the people were urged to forsake the gods of Egypt and all other gods except the "I Am" who was to be their God.

That many fragments of older Semitic religion were brought down in story and adopted from the past or from neighbors, must be recognized in the records. Spiritism, still common among the nomads, is indicated by their conception of sacred trees (Gen. 13:18, Ex. 4:13) where their dead were buried (Josh. 24:26). The religious mind of the times is indicated also by the burning bush (Ex. 3:2), the budding rod, the sacred stones and hills, and the altars at sacred spots. Heaps of stones and pillars received the blood poured upon them for the resident deity and local divinities were common long after the Yahweh religion was well established. (Ex. 4:24-6, Josh. 5:13-15). (H. P. Smith, 13-38). "There is no evidence that Moses wished to abolish the worship of the minor deities, the clan and family gods, which were already naturalized among the people. The demand that Yahweh
alone should be worshipped belongs to a later period." (H. P. Smith, 61). Moses could not have been a monotheist in our sense of the word. But including the probable ideas common to his followers and the new discoveries of religious truth which Moses possessed, there is no ground either in the facts recorded or the results that followed for assuming that Yahwe was a God requiring human sacrifice on any occasion. He doubtless received the ordinary sacrifices commonly made by simple nomadic peoples. He might be the storm god of the hills, or the mystic god of the burning bush, or the god of battle but he was vastly more than this. He was the God of a united people, stronger than other gods, demanding higher worship and represented in higher forms than images of ox or serpent. Whatever there might have been in the worship of lesser deities which would tend towards the lower forms of worship from which human sacrifice would arise, this element was opposed to the worship of Yahwe. It is exceedingly doubtful if in the simple happy life of the nomads before they became settled and agricultural peoples, there was a call for such an extreme form of worship or sacrifice even in the
early clan worship. It would be rather an outgrowth of complex conditions and corrupted ideas in later developments. The crises in which the favor of the gods was doubted had not appeared in this new religious and national undertaking. I cannot therefore believe that in the religion of Moses at the first there was anything akin to human sacrifice, unless it might be the form of circumcision which was an adopted form carried over from the past, and too far away from human sacrifice in the time of Moses to be more than a national sign.

Exodus 6:3 states that Yahwe had not been known by the new name among the ancestors. Yet it is assumed that something of his nature had been known. Davidson thinks "that the name, although it received new currency and significance in connection with Israel from Moses, is far older than his time." (p 49). But when new attributes of a god were discovered it was common among the ancients to change the name. "Hebrew tradition, however, reveals no trace of the idea that Jehovah was worshipped by any tribe except Israel." (Davidson, 37). Yet it is assumed that Moses drew on past religion, not so
much from Egypt as from the new inspiration that came from the simple religion of the desert peoples.

Putting together, then (1) the common religion of nomadic peoples, (2) the conception of God at the highest which was preserved among the patriarchs, and (3) the new elements and new name connected with the past in the time of Moses, one gets some vague conception of what kind of a Being that would be under whom Israel was liberated from Egypt, augmented in the desert by other tribes and established in Canaan as a nation with a national religion. Forms of worship, conceptions of Yahwe, developments of the people, and preserved traditions forbid the assumption that at this initial stage, Yahwe was on a plane where human sacrifice was normal or that Moses was the kind of a leader who would found a religion on such a principle.

Kamphausen makes much of the impossibility of reconciling the spirit of the Mosaic religion with human sacrifice, when scientifically considered. He thinks the religion of Moses was an unbroken development of old religion. (p 38). He recognizes that the true religion of Israel was many centuries un-
False religion was ever a menace and complexities with mingled peoples arose. But some conclusions can be fairly well drawn in the absence of exact records. (1) The beginnings of religion are pure and simple. In calling into existence a nation and a national religion, Moses had in mind not many gods but one God. (2) His conception of that God was above the plane of the clan and nature gods which were commonly worshipped by local tribes. "Moses established among them the worship of one God, Jehovah." (Knudson, Bea. Lights, 11). He was not simply "a God of nature but a God of history." (3) There is ground for tracing the corruption of the Yahwe religion in later history but no ground for assuming that it was on a low nature plane at the beginning. (4) The later ethical and historical conceptions of Yahwe look back to centuries of higher religious conceptions which are related to the God of Moses and the religious laws which he introduced.

In his conception of a God of power who was adequate for the task undertaken, Moses had drawn from the best of the past, the simple faith of the present and with the higher mental training and per-
ception of religious truth, had taken religious leadership which overshadowed all the past and directed the course of the future. The God of his mind and faith was not the kind of a God who required human sacrifice nor was he a God in anyway like the later conception of Molech.

Our conclusion is that Yahwe as an imageless deity, interested in Israel's deliverance and appearing as a God of storm and fire and power and spiritual presence, was not directly associated with any other god. The forms with which he was worshipped, were the regular sacrificial rites and feasts of the simple desert tribes. A religion of this type, which could in a comparatively short time develop into the religion of the early and later prophets, was not founded on the basis of nature worship alone and was not centered in a God to whom human sacrifice would be normal. The religion of Moses and the God of Moses belonged to another order from that in which these things had their birth.

Only a glance is needed at the religion of the patriarchs upon which the religion of Moses drew to some extent at least. Was human sacrifice a feature of the patriarchal religion of Israel's past?
Kamphausen says, "there was a time in which human sacrifice was in vogue by those ancestors who through Moses are related to the Hebrew people or the people of Yahwe and indeed by those same forefathers or pre-Mosaic Hebrews who had not advanced yet to the patriarchal stage". (p 25). The story of Abraham-Isaac points to a break with the custom of human sacrifice far back in Semitic history. (Gen. 22). That movement which finally elevated the Hebrew religion far above the surrounding Semitic religions, doubtless began far back from the time of Moses. However late the tradition (Gen. 22) as it now appears, would seem to show that higher and lower ideas of religion had appeared in the past not unlike the differences between Yahwism and the worship of Molech in the time of the prophets.

Along with the higher elements that gathered themselves into the enlarging religious life of the Mosaic religion, there continued from a distant past those forms of nature religion, which in complex conditions and by later developments could produce even the Molech worship or an occasional practice like that of Jepthah or of Mesha. Human sacrifice lay in the background of the whole Semitic nature
worship. It was resisted by a higher spiritual conception of deity. It lived in Canaanitish tribes with which Israel was surrounded and on occasions it was practiced. But there seems no sane reason for claiming that it was ever a part of that religion which through Moses came from the past and was carried forward by the prophets till it conquered all forms of nature worship and established itself as an ethical religion under a world-ruling, ethical God.
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