

YALE ALUMN WEEKLY

VOL. VIII. No. 7.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1898.

PRICE TEN CENTS.

PROFESSOR BUDDE'S LECTURES.

Review of the Course by Professor F. K. Sanders.

A notable series of six lectures has just been completed at Yale. The lecturer, Professor Karl Budde, D.D., of the University of Strassburg, is in this country under the auspices of the American Committee for Lectures on the History of Religions, composed of representatives from our leading universities.

Professor Budde has for years been an eminent representative of the best Biblical scholarship of Germany. He is not only a diligent student, but a keen and clever investigator, and a broad-minded and positive thinker. Perhaps no one to-day would be regarded as better fitted to discuss to the profit of a University audience the theme presented by him.

His purpose was to trace the origin and historical development of the religious ideas of the people of Israel, from the earliest times to the age of the exile (586-538 B. C.).

His standpoint was that of a student of comparative religion, hence he used the Old Testament simply as a source of reliable information. He regarded the religious data contained in the Hexateuch and the historical books as frequently obscured by the particular use made of them by the authors of those books, and consequently based his use of these data on an exact and thorough criticism, which discriminated between statements found in their original form in the Old Testament, interpretations made early and those made very long after the actual occurrences and sometimes under a misapprehension of them. However any auditor might differ from Professor Budde in regard to these matters, none could fail to be impressed by his candid, earnest and instructive presentation. The last three lectures, being based upon the prophetic books,—first-hand sources—did not call for such preparatory criticism of the material used.

The opening lecture discussed the "Origin of the Religion of Yahweh." The speaker emphasized the broad gulf between the Jehovah of whom a Christian of to-day thinks and the deity whom an early Israelite worshipped, a difference easily kept in mind by the use of the really more accurate name, Yahweh, for the latter. Archaeological discoveries and the many-sided testimony of the Israelites themselves prove that this people were set free from Egyptian bondage in approximately the fourteenth century B. C. Their relations with Egypt left them free to adopt a national God. Exodus 6:3 places their recognition of Yahweh in the time of Moses, while Exodus 3 asserts that he revealed himself to Moses when that leader was living among the Kenites of Midian. Following these and other clues the inference is natural that Yahweh was originally the name of the warrior or storm god of the Kenites, through whose power Moses felt himself enabled to deliver Israel from bondage. The deliverance took place and Israel readily covenanted to adopt Yahweh as their god. At this time they were at best monolatrous, freely recognizing the existence and the power of other gods (Judges 11:23, 24). How they came to take the far-advanced step of attributing to Yahweh an absolute world sovereignty which recognized no other gods and purely ethical attributes can only be made clear by a

study of their historical development. The theme of the second lecture was "Yahweh and his Rivals." When the Israelites conquered a foothold in Canaan they found a land of small communities, each with its Baal or "Master" deity, who was supposed to control the soil. It was natural and inevitable that the Israelites should for a time worship these local deities, alongside of their



PROFESSOR KARL BUDDE.

covenant god, Yahweh, since we find good evidence in the Old Testament that they recognized also household gods, tribal gods, etc. The one fruitful result of this acquaintance of the Israelites with the sensuous and happy Canaanitish cults was that they caught the idea of the possibility of familiar association with their Yahweh, a real step in advance of the austerity and awe heretofore associated with him.

The third lecture traced the agency of three national factors in making Yahweh the only recognized god of Israel, that of priests from the tribe of Levi, of the newly organized order of prophets and of the kings, Saul, David and Solomon. Through them Israel gradually acquired a political supremacy in Palestine. As the nation unified and became strong, the worship of Yahweh acquired preëminence. To a certain extent, however, it retained and included as recognized features of its own cult elements borrowed from the older Canaanitish religion. It particularly took over the ancient sacred places of the Canaanites.

The fourth lecture on "Foreign Powers and the Written Prophecy of the Northern Kingdom" discussed the struggle of Yahwism against Phoenician Baalism introduced and supported by Jezebel and against the crushing power of Assyria. A new type of prophecy appears with Amos and Hosea, for whom it is not enough that Yahweh alone should be worshipped by all Israel. The failure of the expected deliverance to appear after the dynasty of Jehu had extirpated Baal-worship proved to these deeper-seeing prophets that a moral reformation as well was required before Yahweh's favor could be expected. Assyria appears to Amos as a power directed by Yahweh to the punishment of sinful peoples—not Israel alone, but the neighboring nations as well. Hosea goes further and develops the idea that Yahweh punishes Israel with a purpose of loving restoration.

The fifth lecture traced the growth of religious thought in the Southern Kingdom during the 130 years between the fall of Samaria and its own destruction. The first third of this period is covered by the career of Isaiah, whose preaching was based on the principles of Amos. Internal reform, not diplomacy and foreign alliances, was the divinely indicated policy. Isaiah was rebuffed by Ahaz and for years with-

drew from public life. Nevertheless his failure led to the adoption of a real inculcation of prophetic principles among a school of highly influential followers. His subsequent triumph, when Hezekiah, accepting his advice, defied Sennacherib and witnessed at the supreme crisis the overthrow of the mighty foe, was in at least one respect—the development of the conviction of the inviolability of Zion—an injury to religious progress. Under Manasseh a second period of 50 years of strong Assyrian influence set in, vainly opposed by the prophetic party, until with the reform of Josiah they succeeded in bringing forward and securing the adoption of their conception of the Mosaic ideal as set forth in Deuteronomy. This reform abolished the old-time local sanctuaries and concentrated all worship under official surveillance at Jerusalem.

THE FINAL LECTURE.

The sixth and final lecture described conditions during the generation which witnessed the fall of Jerusalem, the tragic career of Jeremiah and the beginnings of legalism fostered by Ezekiel. To the pessimism of Jeremiah the later Judaism owed the independence of its religious life from the accident of national prosperity or adversity. Jeremiah found a faith in God superior to these and foreshadowing the personal religion of later times. Ezekiel, himself a priest, consoled Israel in exile by his picture of a new Jerusalem, whose ideal was isolation of the holy people. From his outlines grew up the priestly legislation which kept the Jews a peculiar people through centuries of dispersion. Ezekiel's visions of an ideal future became at the same time the foundation of later apocalyptic hopes. The third and greatest of the figures of this period is the nameless prophet of the exile known as Deutero-Isaiah, whose writings, beginning with the message of comfort Isa. xl., set forth the lofty ideal of Israel as Yahweh's servant, who suffers that he may fulfil his mission of preaching Yahweh to the nations. On these three pillars grew up after the exile the structure of Judaism, which contained in itself the germs of Christianity, the world-religion.

This survery of the steps by which Israel attained its unique consciousness of God, far from being an attack on the integrity or sacredness of the Scriptures, leads us to co-ordinate the methods of God in revealing himself to mankind from the dawn of human history to the present day, and enables us to solve the majority of the puzzling problems of the Old Testament. Professor Budde's solutions may not be final, but they are at least exceedingly helpful to every student of religion.

FRANK K. SANDERS.

Brief Sketch of Prof. Budde.

Professor Karl Budde was born in the Rhine Provinces in 1850. At an early age he entered the University of Bonn and studied under Kamphausen. His studies were interrupted by the Franco-German War, and after serving in the army he returned to the University of Bonn and became an Instructor in Literature and History. Professor Budde's Biblical History of Primeval Times is of great importance, and it was owing to this work that he was called to take the professorship of Hebrew at the University of Strassburg. His principal writings are Commentaries on Job, Lamentations and Judges, and A Critical Analysis of Judges and Song of Solomon. He was the translator and editor of the Hebrew text of the Books of Samuel in Paul Haupt's series entitled "Sacred Books of the Old Testament."

IS IT TOO LATE?

Mr. Camp on the Chances of Making a Team Now.

Now that coaches are here and more expected it is only fair to the team to let the graduates know how handicapped Mr. Chamberlin and the faithful men who have worked under him have been through the month of October. This is not to depress the spirits of the many good Yale men who hope to be on hand to see the matches of the 12th and 19th, but to state facts as frankly as they should be stated and understood by Yale men. No Yale team has ever before been so neglected by the coaches as that of 1898, and no Yale captain before has ever plead to so many deaf ears. Up to the first of November and especially during the last two weeks of October, the vital weeks in a football team's development, no amount of telegrams, letters and personal entreaty could secure anything more than a desultory day now and then for some single coach.

With players in plenty but without a staff of coaches, Captain Chamberlin has staggered along the best he could. The team have struggled nobly to keep up to the work they know must be done in order to reach a proper point of development before Nov. 12th. It is safe to say that it is not the desire of any captain or any eleven to rely upon a whirlwind finish for final victory. Such things are too risky, and when any organization begins to depend upon such miracles the miracles cease to come. A beneficent Providence that rewards endeavor is the Providence to which justice must point. And when a team has done all in its power, when the coaches, as last year, have watched and prayed with it day after day, knowing its insufficiencies, but doing their best to make them less, then there is reason for trusting in Providence for the rest. But when Providence has helped out and every body says, "If as a green team the Eleven won, there need be no coaching to make certain of victory as veterans," then Providence turns away.

A COMPARISON WITH OTHER COLLEGES.

Princeton has a triumvirate of three men at the head of her coaching this year: Mr. Lea, that wonderful tackle; Mr. Moffat, a thorough student of back field work and kicking, and Mr. Brown, a remarkably clever end. Harvard has at the call of Mr. Forbes a dozen coaches, eleven of whom have been on the field at one time. Cornell has Mr. Warner and Mr. Fennell in daily charge, and Pennsylvania has in Mr. Woodruff a man whose knowledge is complete and who is regularly engaged by the management to instil that knowledge into the teams of the University of Pennsylvania. At New Haven Mr. Butterworth has come up the most frequently of any of the coaches, but his visits have hardly averaged twice a week. Mr. Sanford has given several days to the rush line, and Mr. Bull gave part of his Summer to the kickers. Mr. Rodgers and Mr. Murphy have spared a few days. Mr. Stillman and Mr. Corbin have been present each a single day, and one or two others have taken a very short turn at it. But there have been days when no one was present, and no time when for the continued period of a single week systematic handling by one or