

Sacrifice of Rejection in Amos and Relevance with Fifth Principle of Pancasila

Timothy Uriel Pelmar
Jakarta Theological Seminary
Jakarta, Indonesia

Josua Martua Frandiko Aritonang
Jakarta Theological Seminary
Jakarta, Indonesia

Abstract:- This Amos shows the Israelite sacrifice being rejected by God, even though the sacrifice fulfilled the ritual requirements. The people of Israel in the time of Amos were required by God to do justice and righteousness, but they did not do so and the Lord sentenced them. Some scholars also argue about this rejection and they fall into two groups.

The first group concludes that God rejected the sacrifice because He did not need it. The second group believes that the sacrifice was needed but must be followed by people living based on justice and righteousness. The Israelite people during Amos's time ignored justice; corruption, economic inequality, and poverty were rampant.

Indonesia, even though its people are religious, also has serious problems of social injustice. Poverty rate is high; economic inequality is wide; corruption is easy to find. The interpretation of Amos about justice is relevant to Pancasila, especially the fifth principle *Keadilan Sosial Bagi Seluruh Rakyat Indonesia*.

Keywords:- *Sacrifice, Sacrifice Rejection, Justice, Righteousness, and Pancasila.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The sacrifice rejection by God on the book/text of Amos purposes on this study. Because, it was found the sacrifice that offered to God had been rejected (Amos 5:21-27). On the text, the best quality of sacrifice that offered to God has rejected by "...fattened calves (Am.5:22)." If the quality was not the reason of God's rejection the Israel sacrifices, then there was another factors behind. It can be studied from the context of Amos' time. The sacrifice rejection was probably related with sins of Israelites. Because, reasonable for God to reject it. According to the book/text of Amos, case of God's rejection were; (1) a few people who pursue wealthy, but disregard for the poor (Amos 8:4); (2) traders sell flour by using rigged scales (Amos 8:5); (3) The Israelites ignored to be rebuked, even trampled to innocent (Am. 5.10); (4) the richer man oppressed the peasants by paying higher taxes (Amos 5:11); and elite group in Israel did corruption by taking advantage of 'loopholes' as entrance of trade and judicial system.

The effect of sins did by the people of Israelite include; (1) The people of Israel have range of poverty differently which make economic inequality widely; (2) Israel's morality were degenerated due to corruption; (3) The judicial system were not upheld equity or lack of awareness about value of justice; (4) Partiality to oppressors toward people of Israelite became injustice prevail in Israel commonly; (5) The judicial system that corrupted was contributing to deterioration of Israel's social life. From the text/book of Amos, the effects of injustice who did by its people of Israel created social injustice. Injustice not only influenced the morality of Israel but also their sacrifices. The text/book of Amos criticized about meaning of sacrifice rituals as like, Giving advice to people did to do right but practices were not carried out properly. Therefore, the meaning of the ritual sacrifice did not reflected on people of Israel living. While they performed ritual sacrifice regularly, they were continuing to make sins. As a result, the sacrifices was rejected by the God because of the injustice did by the Israelites.

The case of sacrifice rejection was revealed on the bible. This rejection not only wrote on the text/book of Amos, but also both of Old Testament and New Testament. Each text/book that criticized about sacrifice rejection in different context, but the reasons of the rejection same as on the text/book of Amos. This text as first of the nation's sacrifice rejection, which represent some cases of sacrifice rejection on the bible. As a result, the interpretation of Amos's text about sacrifice rejection became important to find meaning definitely. The sacrifice rejection was a contentious issue by many theologians, especially some Old Testament scholars. Some scholar arguments about sacrifice rejection can be divided into two groups. The first group believes the sacrifice rejection according to the Amos' text/book that God did not need sacrifice because He hate Israel's sin. However, the second group believes God needs sacrifice but rejection was probably about injustice. The sacrifice rejection was influenced social injustice.

The problem of social injustice in the context of Amos also occurred in Indonesia. The Israelites offered their rituals but they did not living based on justice and righteousness. Indonesia has a religious population, but social injustice still occurs and becomes a serious problem, as like; poverty rates is high, economic inequality is wide, corruption is easy to find.

Religious of people could be reduce social injustice through 'offering'. The offering not just only means of gratitude to God who gave salvation but also it could be more interpreted did by people of Indonesia, especially Christians. It can be related with the meaning of sacrifice based on justice of Amos' text/book. Unfortunately, social injustice in Indonesia is not parallel with Indonesia principles that was born when Bung Karno gave a speech at meeting to prepare for Indonesian Independence. The ideals of Bung Karno as Principle of Indonesia is Pancasila. The fifth principle is "social justice for Indonesian people". The existence of social injustice in Indonesia was indicated lack of awareness of the value of justice. As part of the Indonesian people, injustice harms life of Christians in Indonesia.

The sacrifice rejection related with injustice, so Amos emphasized that the Israelites ideally living on the value of justice in their daily. Likewise, Indonesia people are religious but still has problem social injustice. Based on the explanation, the problems was concluded as follows : " The reason behind the sacrifice rejection by God in Amos 5:21-27, sacrifice was relevant in the offerings of Indonesians, especially Christian. Furthermore, Amos' Justice can be compared with the fifth principle of Pancasila". The discussion of this scientific study limited to: (1) A review about the correlation between justice and sacrifice rejection (2) A review about Amos' sacrifice was relevant with the offering of Indonesia Christians' people. (3) A review about the comparison between Amos' justice and the fifth principle of Pancasila.

II. RESEARCH AND METHOD

The method is used a qualitative method based on grammatical (study of words and grammar) on Amos 5: 21-27. This study is also supported by literature of source text, literature of Pancasila who Bung Karno's speech at the trial of BPUPKI and also literature of fifth principle of Pancasila about justice. Moreover, another literature about sacrifice rejection in the time of Amos which is relevant with value of justice from fifth principle of Pancasila.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Context of the Book of Amos

Amos was a forest fig gatherer, sheep breeder from Tekoa on the outskirts of the desert of Judah (1:1), and a prophet during the time of Jeroboam II, son of Joash in the Northern Kingdom of Israel circa 793-753 BC.¹ Amos criticized the prosperity that followed Israel's moral degradation. According to Mawene, the reign of Jeroboam II was a "Golden Age" because Israel took advantage of the political situation of the great kingdoms which were weak due to war and Israel also built economic life to achieve prosperity, but this prosperity was accompanied by moral-ethical degradation in Israel's social life². Moral degradation

is evidenced in three aspects, namely the economy, justice, and worship.

Moral degradation from an economic perspective, according to Michael Shepherd, the social system that developed in Israel makes people eager to commit fraud in trade and neglect the poor³. For example, the ruler deliberately ignores his obligation to distribute the results of development equitably and fairly (Amos 5:12). Merchants "offered flour by reducing the ephah, raising the shekel, cheating with a false balance" (Amos 8:5).

According to Mawene, the moral degradation of the judiciary is that corruption is rife in the Israeli kingdom. As a result, injustice also spreads in the midst of Israeli society⁴. For example, the ruler collects taxes from the poor (Amos 5:11) and the testimony of the righteous is not heard in court, so that the wise keep silent (Am. 5:12-13).

Moral degradation in terms of worship according to Wahono, Israeli worship refuses to improve daily life in Israel, on the contrary worship supports and approves of the situation⁵. For example, the Israelites pretended to hold worship, even though they ate and drank to their heart's content and what they consumed was part of the proceeds from the fines obtained from trials that had been rigged and even contained corruption (Amos 2:8). Furthermore, father and son raped the maidservant who because of poverty in the house of the LORD (Amos 2:7-8).

The Debate About Sacrifice in Amos 5:21-27

Amos 5:21-27, especially verse 22 shows the Lord's rejection of the Israelite sacrifices. There is a debate among experts about the reasons for the refusal of the sacrifice. The first group perspective assesses rejection because God does not need sacrifice and only needs morality. The second group shows that the sacrifices are rejected only because of moral issues, but the sacrifices themselves are accepted by God on the condition that Israel must live in justice and righteousness.

Rejection of Sacrifice

According to James R. Linville in a book entitled *Amos and the Cosmic Imagination*, the rejection of sacrifice begins with a discussion of the context of the Day of the LORD (the day of judgment). The book correlates with Amos' question, "...What good will the Day of the LORD be for you?" (Amos 5:18). This question is a reflection for Israel who felt sacrifice was important and felt God was judging their enemy. However, Israel ignored the demands to live in justice, ignored the goodness that had given them prophets and nazirs (Amos 2:11), ignored the advice not to rely on sacrifices. As a result, the Lord rejected the sacrifice (Am. 5:22), takes Israel into exile (Am. 5:27), emphasizes

¹ W.S. LaSor, D.A. Hubbard, and F.W. Bush, *Pengantar Perjanjian Lama 2: Sastra Dan Nubuat* (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2007), 195.

² Marthinus Theodorus Mawene, *Perjanjian Lama Dan Teologi Kontekstual* (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2017), 100.

³ Michael B. Sepherd, *A Commentary on the Book of Twelve: The Minor Prophets* (Grand Rapids, Mich: Kregel Publication, 2018), 194.

⁴ Mawene, *Perjanjian Lama Dan Teologi Kontekstual*, 101.

⁵ Wismoady S. Wahono, *Di Sini Kutemukan: Petunjuk Mempelajari Dan Mengajarkan Alkitab* (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2015), 159.

He doesn't need a sacrifice (Jer. 7:22), and emphasizes that He puts morality first.⁶

Linville's ideas have similarities to John Barton's, but there is a difference in the way he views cases of refusal to sacrifice. According to Barton, Amos was an anticult (rejecting sacrifice) in the days of Jeroboam II (Amos 1:1). Based on Barton's analysis of Mary Douglas, concluded Amos was an anti-cult prophet because of the pressure from the policies of the rulers at that time and a high sense of social justice.⁷

Just as Barton saw Amos as an anti-cult and Gary V. Smith saw it so, but he focused on Amos's dedication to the God. He started in a way that pleased the God by living in obedience to holiness to avoid unclean things (Lev. 11:44) and not to repentance (Ps. 51:16-17)⁸, so that Israel's sacrifices were given a place to please the God. However, Israel was mistaken in thinking that only sacrifices were pleasing the God. Smith's comments will lead all the readers to see Amos as an anti-cult. Garrett as an expert also affirmed the thoughts of Smith who declared Amos as an anticult.⁹

The opinion of Linville, Barton, and Smith who is a biblical theologian is very different from René Girard who is not a theologian, but focuses on the relationship between sacrifice and violence. Violence causes members of the community to retaliate and hold grudges. They tried to vent their revenge by means of sacrifice which was felt as a solution, but some members still felt that it was not enough just to sacrifice. Victims feel that violence should be directed at the perpetrator as a solution to vent their emotions. As a result, violence will continue to spread among members of the community and make prophets, including Amos, feel that the sacrifice is meaningless.¹⁰

Acceptance of Sacrifices

Jonathan Klawans focuses on the rejection of Israelite sacrifices (Amos 5:22) because Israel's rich people offered sacrifices from stealing the rights of the poor (Amos 2:6,8). The sacrifice that comes from stealing is contradicted with the concept of holiness which is rooted in the concept of *imitation Dei* (imitating God), because God demands His people "...you must be holy, for I am holy" (Leviticus 11:44). Holiness is understood through unholiness (impurity) which is divided into ritual and moral uncleanness, but to fulfill the conditions of sacrifice required ritual and moral holiness. If the people are in ritual or moral uncleanness, then they are contaminated the Holy Temple. Based on the concept of holiness, Israel violated moral holiness and defiled the Holy Temple because the sacrifices came from stealing. However, the Lord did not reject the

sacrificial ritual absolutely and if the sacrifice was obtained properly and correctly, then the sacrifices will be accepted by the LORD and will not contaminate the Holy Temple. Based on the study of the Klawans, the prophet Malachi helped to strengthen the reason behind the rejection of the Israelite sacrifices in the time of Amos with the concept of ownership. The conditions that must not be done in the sacrifice are (1) insulting the name of the LORD (Mal. 1:6), (2) offering sacrifices that are sick, disabled, and blind (Mal. 1:8), (3) and handing over stolen sacrifices (Mal. 1:13).¹¹

In contrast to the Klawans, B. J. Boland argues that the refusal of sacrifice was because Israel prioritized expensive worship, so they replaced the obedience to the God through efforts to uphold justice and righteousness. According to Amos 5:21, Israel's worship was too dependent on Israel's rich people, so that the poor were looked down upon in worship. According to Amos, that worship is irrelevant because Israel ignores the value of justice and imagines the God serving only the rich. Boland argued, a just and holy God could not be persuaded by various sacrifices and expensive ceremonies to serve Israel. God demands obedience, love, and sympathy. He also interprets Amos 5:24 as a criticism against the people of Israel who only focus on worship, but ignore justice and truth in the practice of daily life¹². Worship is pleasing, when people glorify, be grateful, and seek only His will.

Boland and Carroll differed in their response to the rejection of sacrifice in Amos' time. Carroll saw Amos 5:22 mentioning "*the peace offerings of your fattened animals*.", these sacrifices were cattle and deliberately fattened and of high quality, but were rejected by the God not because of quality or price issues as Boland thought. The rejection was because Israel ignored God's demands to do justice and righteousness, as a result Israel imposed injustice¹³. Amos 5:15 also emphasizes the Lord's claim that "*hate evil and love good*" will save Israel¹⁴. The claim of some scholars who dichotomize between ritual and moral is refuted by Carroll through the interpretation of Amos 5:22-25. This text does not contradict ritual and morals because there is no mention of a sin offering, so Amos does not reject sacrifice absolutely. This refusal is a sarcasm towards the sacrificial ritual which is used for profit making.

Trent C. Butler as an interpreter has a different and unique conclusion because he seems to see Amos as an anticult, but not so. Sacrifice is rejected indeed because of moral issues, but morals take precedence over sacrifice. Good morality must be based on justice and truth comes first, so sacrifices can be accepted if Israel's morality is

⁶ James R. Linville, *Amos and the Cosmic Imagination* (Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2008), 117.

⁷ John Barton, *The Theology of the Book of Amos* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press., 2012), 90.

⁸ Linville, *Amos and the Cosmic Imagination*, 501.

⁹ Duane A. Garrett, *Amos: A Handbook on the Hebrew Text* (Texas: Baylor University Press, 2008), 174.

¹⁰ René Girard, *Violence and The Sacred*, trans. Patrick Gregory (London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1977), 43.

¹¹ Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2006), 85.

¹² B. J. Boland, *Amos: Seri Tafsir Alkitab Kontekstual-Oikumenis* (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2017), 68.

¹³ Mark Daniel Carroll, *Contexts of Amos: Prophetical Poetics in Latin America Perspective* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 247.

¹⁴ Carroll, 248

right. Morality is a prerequisite for sacrificing so that God is pleased.¹⁵

Interpretation of Amos 5:21-27

שְׂנֵאתִי מֵאֲסִי חֲגֵקֶם וְלֹא אֲרִיחַ בְּעֲצֵרֹתֵיכֶם:
sānētī mā'astī hagēkem wālō 'ārīah bə'ašərōtēkem
 (Amos 5:21).

The word *sānētī* (I hate), *mā'astī* (I humiliate) is a perfect *qal* verb which is classified as a *near-synonymous verb eloquently* (a verb that is synonymous with the aim of expressing someone's assertive expression)¹⁶. The occurrence of these two words expresses the disgust of the LORD, who is tired of Israel's boring and irritating celebrations. This is supported by the word *hagēkem* (your celebration) and if the word that appears is "our celebration", then at least God is still participating in the worship or celebration. God's hatred and annoyance is the result of worship that is not intended for Him, but is intended to please themselves.

The word *'ārīah* "I kiss",¹⁷ but the Bible translates "happy" for linguistic and not theological purposes. The use of this verb relates to the gathering of the Israelites, especially worship including ritual sacrifices in order to celebrate the Day of The Lord (The Judgment Day). Therefore, the use of the word *'ārīah* to describe something fragrant was burned in Israel's worship so that the LORD was attracted by the smell, so that the LORD was pleased to judge Israel's enemies and be pleased with their worship. However, the appearance of the word *'ariakh* with the word *lō'* (no) explains that the worship of Israel was rejected by God, even though the worship was aimed at attracting His attention.

כִּי אִם-תַּעֲלוּ-לִי עֹלוֹת וּמִנְחֹתֵיכֶם לֹא אֲרִיחַ וְשִׁקְלֵם מִרִּיאֵיכֶם לֹא אֶבִּיט:
Kī 'im-ta 'ālū-lī 'ōlōt ūminhōtēkem lō'erseh wāšelem mā-rī-
'ēkem lō' 'abīt (Amos 5:22).

The day of the LORD was celebrated by the Israelites by offering sacrifices to the LORD, namely burnt (*'ōlōt*), dish (*minḥa*), and salvation (*šelem*). *'ōlōt* is a burnt offering, usually accompanied by a food offering, and not for public consumption. This sacrifice aims to attract attention and show respect for Him. *Minḥa* is "...the best flour...pours oil and puts frankincense on it (Lev. 2:1)" which aims to show the commitment and seriousness of the people to the God. *Šelem* is a sacrifice that is consumed by the people and offered to Him, so the sacrifice of salvation is also known as the sacrifice of communion. These three sacrifices are referred to describe the general Israelite ritual of sacrifice. Israel's refusal to sacrifice was due to several possibilities, (1) the emergence of the word *'abīt* (fattened animals) as a key word because the refusal of sacrifice was because the sacrifice was always expensive, so that poor

people could not participate in the sacrificial ritual as Boland thought. However, if the reason is the price, then it can be disputed on the grounds that an expensive sacrifice, such as an ox, can be replaced with a cheap one, such as a turtledove (Lev. 1:14). (2) The appearance of the word *'erseh* (to accept) illustrates the possibility that the sacrifice can be accepted,¹⁸ but the word *'erseh* is accompanied by the word *lō'* (no). As a result, sacrifices were generally not accepted because the God was fed up with these rituals.¹⁹ Through these two possibilities there is an offer to see the reason for the refusal of the sacrifice because the purpose of the sacrificial ritual was not conveyed properly to the God. The purpose of the sacrificial ritual was not conveyed properly, namely that the actions of the Israelites were actually the opposite of the purpose of the ritual being carried out. For example, the Israelites performed ritual sacrifices intended for fellowship, while they were still oppressing each other.

הִסֵּר מֵעֲלֵי הַמִּזְבֵּחַ שְׂרִיד וְזִמְרַת נְבִלִיד לֹא אֶשְׁמָע:
Hāsēr mē'ālay hāmōn širekā; wəzimrat nəbālekā lō' 'ešmā'
 (Amos 5:23).

In this verse there are key words, namely *hāsēr* (keep away) and *lō' 'ešmā'* (I don't want to hear). These words are proof again that all parts of Israel's worship were rejected by the LORD. The excitement of worship is very clear in this verse because the celebration is accompanied by sounds to praise the LORD, but He actually rejects the celebration even though it is filled with festivities followed by music and the splendor of the offerings given by the Israelites. LORD rejected Israel's singing and music not because of discordant music, but because of moral and spiritual life.²⁰

וַיִּגַּל כַּמַּיִם מִשְׁפָּט וַיִּזְדַּקֶּה כְּנַחַל אֵיתָן:
wəyigal kamayim mišpāt; ūšəḏāqāh kənaḥal 'ētān
 (Amos 5:24).

The word *weyigal* (roll up) means waves that move quickly and abundantly, so this word suggests that justice should be pursued by all Israel. Justice is metaphorized as *mayim* (water) which in the OT context has several meanings, God's blessing, spiritual refreshment/washing, and danger/death (Today's Bible Encyclopedia, s.v. "Water"). Therefore, first *mayim* can mean "cleansing and refreshing", so justice and truth become an alternative to please the God other than through worship, sacrifice, and song.²¹ The two *mayim* can perhaps be understood as threats that announce impending disaster due to the lack of justice in society.²² The three *mayim* are a disaster, so the justice that comes from the God aims to punish Israel.²³ The meaning of *mayim* is influenced by the word *mišpāt* (justice) which is generally translated as justice, but *mišpāt* in the OT context has several specific meanings such as

¹⁸ Göran Eidevall, *The Anchor Bible: Amos* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017), 168.

¹⁹ Garrett, *Amos: A Handbook on the Hebrew Text*, 170.

²⁰ Garrett, 172.

²¹ Garrett, 172

²² Eidevall, *The Anchor Bible: Amos*, 169.

²³ W. Edward Glenny, *Amos: A Commentary Based on Amos in Codex Vaticanus* (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2013), 106.

¹⁵ Trent C. Butler, *Old Testament Commentary: Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah.*, ed. Max Anders (Fennessee: Holman Reference, 2005), 388.

¹⁶ Garrett, *Amos: A Handbook on the Hebrew Text*, 168.

¹⁷ Holladay Dictionary, s.v. "רוח"

decision/judgment (decision/punishment), *dispute/case* (dispute), *legal claim/claim* (legal rights or claims), *measure* (measurement), and *law* (law). *Mišpāt* is a gift from God as an essentially true object. When this word is metaphorized, *mišpāt* will be understood as a verb suggesting an action. *Mišpāt* which is parallel to *ṣadāqāh* (truth) can also be translated as true justice. This is also confirmed by the word *weygal*. Therefore, *mišpāt* is defined as an object of God's gift that is sought by His people, so that *mayim* as a *mipāt* metaphor is understood as a threat in the context of God's anger over injustice in Israel.

Justice that raised by Amos includes two forms, namely individual justice and social justice. Individual justice relates to problems that only befall individuals. Individual justice usually does not deal with complex and multi-person issues such as fraud in the judiciary. At the time of Amos, the terms individual and social justice had not yet emerged, but because *mišpat* had a broad meaning, so that it overshadowed the two forms of justice.

Social justice relates to Amos's critique of problems that involve many people, such as the case of poverty caused by rulers who overtax the poor. Social justice is contrary to social injustice, social injustice is generally a systematic crime, so that social justice can generally only be realized by people in power. Amos's Justice in the social field according to Kristina Ade Maria Panggabean is following God's goodness, God's love, and God's law which is realized and practiced in all aspects of people's lives (Panggabean 2019, 177). Efforts to realize justice, namely through the poor and weak, must be supported by a government system that protects and favors the people, not the rulers and the rich. Therefore, the definition of social justice according to Amos is a gift from the LORD that His people must strive for as the basis of social and religious life.

Justice appears as an object and is followed by various actions, here are some actions that can be used as principles of justice: (1) GOD "loves" justice (Isa. 61:8) which means justice is loved, so that humans who love justice will be loved by GOD. (2) Justice is "choosable" (Job 34:4) which means that justice is carried out or not, depending on the decision of humans. (3) Justice is "sought for" (Isa. 1:17) which means justice does not appear out of nowhere, thus seeking justice, for example, by reprimanding people who are cruel and defending the rights of orphans and widows. (4) Knowing justice (Mic. 3:1), if without knowing justice, it is impossible to understand what is right and wrong, so knowing justice is important. (5) Studying justice (Prov. 1:3), justice is not understood or known for granted, so studying justice is useful for knowing what is right. (6) Above all, justice is principally the object of *do* which means (*to do and to act*) (Gen. 18:19).

הַזְבָּחִים וּמִנְחָה הַגִּשְׁתֶּם-לִי בַמִּדְבָּר אַרְבָּעִים שָׁנָה בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל:
hazəbāhīm ūminhā higaštem-lī ḥamidbār 'arbā'im šānāh
bēt yiśrā'el (Amos 5:25).

"Did you offer me sacrifices and grain offerings during those forty years in the wilderness, O House of Israel?" this question is often understood as a rhetorical question expecting a "no" answer because the NT quotes again, gives a "no" answer, and Israel worshiped other gods (cf. Acts 7:42-43). However, if this text is reviewed through Hebrew grammar, it will be translated differently because verse 25 has an *exclamatory sense* nuance (a statement in the form of an exclamation to convey emotion). This verse may also be more accurately translated "O Israel, have you brought me sacrifices and food for forty years in the wilderness?!".

...As with other questions, polar questions with הָ can have an exclamatory sense...

"O Israel, you brought me sacrifices and offerings for forty years in the wilderness?!" Amos 5:25.²⁴

Therefore, this text is not a rhetorical question that aims to find yes and no answers as most interpreters do, but aims to describe the feelings of God. Israel in the desert offered sacrifices to the LORD in earnest, while Israel in the time of Amos gave sacrifices that made the LORD angry and disappointed.

וַיִּשְׂאוּהֶם אֵת סִקוֹת מַלְכָּם וְאֵת כִּיּוֹן צִלְמֵיכֶם כּוֹכַב אֱלֹהֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר עֲשִׂיתֶם לָכֶם:
ūnašātem 'ēt sikūt malkəkem wa'ēt kiyūn šalmēkem; kōkab
'ēlohēkem, 'āšer 'āsītem lakem (Amos 5:26).

Sikūt (Sakut) and *Kiyūn* (Kewan) were foreign gods worshiped by Israel in the time of Amos. Kewan was a star god who came from Assyria and was associated with the planet Saturn, then the idols of Sakut and the emperor used to be transported in processions of syncretic worship condemned by the prophet. The word *malkəkem* (your king) describes a foreign god who ruled Israel, but this belief is problematic because it conflicts with monotheism.²⁵ The word *kōkab* (star) also describes the belief affirmed by Amos 5:8 because Israel worshiped God's creation,²⁶ so Israel's non-monotheistic belief was a mistake. Amos saw polytheism as apostasy, but Israel seemed to understand that other gods had power. This polytheism was able to grow among the Israelites because of the expansion of the kingdom. They understood that the LORD of Israel only ruled in a particular way, so they thought that by increasing the number of gods they would also get wider protection. Amos saw differently, the LORD is the Creator who rules this world, the LORD not only has power over Israel, but also other nations, the Ethiopians, Philistines, and Aram (Amos 9:7).

Based on the search so far, verse 26 seems to be added later because this text is not very related to the previous texts which discuss the issue of injustice and unrighteousness. However, the text emphasizes that the post-Amos Israel understood the worship of other gods as

²⁴ Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 685.

²⁵ TDOT, s.v. "מַלְכָּ".

²⁶ Eidevall, *The Anchor Bible: Amos*, 172.

one of the problems that led to their exile. Amos himself did not significantly emphasize monotheism, but he taught Israel to depend on God alone, so that Israel later realized that polytheism resulted in God's anger.

וְהִגְלִיתִי אֶתְכֶם מִהָאֵרֶץ לְדַמְּסֵק׃ אָמַר יְהוָה
 wəhiḡlētī 'etkēm mēhālā'āh ləḏammāseq; 'āmar YHWH
 'ēlōhē-šəbā'ōtī šəmō (Amos 5:27).

In this verse, Israel will be exiled to Damascus, but Acts 7:43 describes Israel being exiled to Babylon. This difference is due to the fact that in the time of Amos the exile had not yet occurred. The difference in the purpose of exile in these texts is due to historical developments.²⁷ This exile signifies Israel's judgment and implies the theology of the Book of Amos on judgment prophecy, as in the context of celebrating the Lord's Day. The punishment in the form of exile is a consequence of injustice, while this text implies that Israel can no longer relate to God through religious means because God's temple is not outside Israel's territory 581 SCHMID. Based on the interpretation of Amos 5:21-27, the form of rejection of the sacrifice is through the expression of God that is firm against Israel. The expression is anger and disappointment. The reason behind the refusal was not because of the quality of the sacrifices and the need for sacrifices by God, but because of the corrupt moral and spiritual life, namely the injustice in Israel (cf. Isa. 1:11-14). This refusal was also due to the fact that Israel worshiped other gods (cf. Acts 7:43). They also received the consequences from the LORD, namely exile to Damascus.

The Relevance of Amos 5:21-27 and the Fifth Precepts of Pancasila

Israel's refusal to sacrifice in the days of Amos was caused because Israel did not do justice and righteousness, namely the problem of poverty and economic inequality because the poor pawned their wealth to maintain their lives, while the rich were able to build houses of chiseled stone. The problem of corruption is also a serious problem that occurs because the justice system has become dilapidated, so that many of the Israelites are victims of injustice. The injustices of the time of Amos also undermined the worship of the Israelites because the lives of the Israelites were filled with injustice and did not reflect the sincerity of worshiping the LORD. It's the same with Indonesia. Indonesians live a religious life, but injustice is getting worse as poverty rates increase, economic inequality widens, and corruption continues. Therefore, efforts to relevance Amos social justice and the fifth precept of Pancasila are to respond to and anticipate social injustice in Indonesia.

Pancasila is the ideology of the Indonesian state which was born from the term *panca dharma* which means five obligations, but Pancasila is not an obligation but the basis of the Indonesian state. Of the five basics, there are values that still cannot be interpreted properly because social injustice is still a serious problem. Therefore, the practice of the fifth principle of Pancasila "Social Justice for All

Indonesian People" is formulated in the MPR decree in order to realize the National goals and ideals of the Nation. The values of practicing the fifth precept are regulated in the Decree of the MPR RI Number II/MPR/1978 of 1978: (1) To develop a fair attitude towards others. (2) Maintaining a balance between rights and obligations. (3) Respect the rights of others.

According to BPS research, Indonesia's population was 270.20 million people in September 2020 (BPS website 2021). The problems of injustice in Indonesia include widening economic disparities, increasing poverty rates, and high cases of corruption. The economic gap between the poor and the rich is widening. The number of poor people in September 2020 was 27.55 million people (10.19 percent) poor, an increase of 0.97 percent compared to September 2019 (BPS website 2021). Poverty is also caused by widening economic inequality. Increased poverty and widening economic inequality are exacerbated by widespread corruption. From 2006-2015, 46 regents/mayors and 10 governors were entangled in corruption, mostly in the budget management sector with the bribery mode, followed by the procurement of goods/services and licensing sectors (BPS website 2021).

This indicates that corruption is still a serious problem among leaders in Indonesia. Corruption is a problem that has been rooted in Indonesia, it is even difficult to judge whether corruption in Indonesia is high or not. This is because corruption is basically hidden and sometimes carried out systematically, so that it is quite difficult to assess the standard of corruption. Corruption is still happening in Indonesia massively because when we are dealing with state administration matters such as paying taxes, extending residence cards, and driving licenses, sometimes bribes can still be used to shorten the administrative process. For those who do not have money, it will be difficult for him to complete his administrative affairs. This fact does seem without evidence, but we certainly realize that the use of "facilitating money" is a common thing, isn't this term a form of corruption or can also be said to be an act of fraud.

The problem of injustice in Indonesia occurs because a group of people take advantage of power to reap profits, then because the policies and economic systems that are formed do not prosper the poor, so that the poor are trapped in structural poverty. Although, Indonesians are known as religious people, their lives are not fair and do not reflect religious life. Problems of poverty, economic inequality, and corruption are not in line with the first principle, Pancasila "Belief in One God". This indicates that injustice has undermined the religious life of Indonesians. Evil may have entered deep within the institutions of worship. This happens because the lack of appreciation of the value of justice and religion does not remind Indonesians to live a just life, especially the rich and the rulers against injustice.

Bung Karno aspired to realize social justice including social welfare within the scope of economic and political equality, so that the rulers did not oppress the small people

²⁷ Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress press, 1987), 55.

and narrow the economic gap. Based on legal experts in Indonesia, Bahder Johan Nasution stated that social justice is justice that demands that everyone gets what is their right (Nasution 2014, 120). Social justice is concerned with the determination of rights and the fair distribution of rights in the relationship between society and the state. The rights that can be obtained are in the form of something for mutual benefit, such as protection and public facilities. Based on Nasution's thought, social justice has the value of justice for everyone, then social justice is based on the value of social welfare. Therefore, social justice in the fifth principle of Pancasila can be formulated as justice for everyone to obtain the right to prosper, including the fulfillment of basic needs, a sense of security, comfort, and political and economic equality.

The fifth precept of Pancasila is the basis of the state, but the religious people do not live up to social justice. Lack of appreciation is evidenced by the existence of injustice and untruth in the form of poverty, economic inequality, and corruption. Similar to the context of Amos, people are religious, but injustice is rife in Israel. According to Max Boli Sabon, who is a legal expert in Indonesia, he is of the opinion that the fifth precept means that justice is evenly and continuously every Indonesian person experiences true spiritual-physical harmony.²⁸ The word spiritual describes a good religious and social life, then physical describes the basic needs, namely clothing, food, and shelter. Sabon's thoughts on the dichotomy of spiritual-physical harmony do not clearly show justice in religion, so that the spiritual connotation of being religious actually has a social meaning. Finally, the idea of synergizing justice is actually difficult to understand. Therefore, justice may be divided into two parts, first spiritual justice and social justice. Spiritual justice is related to the basis of justice from a religion or someone's reflection on the teachings of God that synergizes with social justice, while social justice is a value of justice that grows in Indonesia and outside of religious values, for example the meaning of justice in culture, history, and justice that is understood generally. Justice contained in Pancasila overshadows religious and social justice. Spiritual harmony and society illustrates not prioritizing one of them, but both must be prioritized. Social justice from a spiritual perspective is formulated through Amos' social critique. Four principles contained in Amos' critique that can be relevant in Indonesia: (1) achieve economic equality. (2) good morality so that there is no cheating in trade. (3) a fair justice system. (4) the worship system becomes a means to speak out for justice, against bribery, the absence of slavery that pollutes the Temple, and the absence of extortion through taxes.

The worship system as a means to voice justice through rituals based on the fifth precept. The ritual that Amos criticizes is the ritual of sacrifice because it is not based on justice and truth. Thus, the ideal religious ritual in Indonesia is also based on justice as Amos demands, but the Indonesian context has the fifth precept as the basis for a

²⁸ Boli Sabon Max, *Mengenal Indonesia: Aku Cinta Indonesia, Tak Kenal Maka Tak Sayang*, ed. Sonta Frisca Manalu (Jakarta: Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya, 2019), 97.

religion with social justice. As a result, Indonesians, especially Christians, can reconstruct religious rituals, so that the rituals are based on social justice. However, the Amos sacrificial ritual is different from the religious rituals that have grown among Christians in Indonesia, so that the sacrifice spiritualization offered by Gerritt Singgih is a way out to contextualize the sacrificial ritual in the Christian world in Indonesia.

He explores the meaning contained in OT sacrifices to maintain the validity of the sacrifice not only from a ritual perspective, but also from a motivational point of view to initiate contextualization or what can be called the spiritualization of the sacrifice.

The Psalmist paved the way for maintaining the validity of the ritual sacrifice not only from a ritual point of view, but also from a motivational point of view. By emphasizing motivation, which is something internal, we can say that here a process of spiritualization or the spiritualization of sacrifices has begun.²⁹

The review of the spiritualization of the sacrifice is not about an attempt to technically bring the sacrificial ritual into the lives of Christians today. However, the spiritualization of the sacrifice is seen from the motivation of the sacrifice given to the God. Singgih in his book *Sacrifice and Atonement* sees Psalm 51 as an alternative to maintaining the value of sacrifice, not only from a ritual point of view, but also from a motivational point of view because when the Temple was not there, sacrifices could not be offered. It is precisely the sacrifice in the form of a "*broken soul; a broken and contrite heart (Ps. 51:17)*" which is accepted by the LORD.

Through Singgih's presentation, the rejection of Israeli sacrifices related to the values of justice and truth can be relevant in the religious life of Christians in Indonesia, which is followed by various purposes, but still must be followed by evidence that people must live in justice and truth. As Singgih argues, "*even if the ritual is carried out correctly, if there is no motivation, God is not pleased*"³⁰. Therefore, living with justice and righteousness is one of the non-negotiable conditions so that the worship of the people can be accepted by God.

The ritual of sacrifice has various meanings that can be relevant in the religious rituals of Christians in Indonesia, namely offerings. However, offerings are generally understood as thanksgiving to Jesus Christ because He died for mankind. This idea was affirmed by many theologians such as Noordegraaf A, George Eldon Ladd, and Evalina Simamora.

Noordegraaf argues that the great sacrifice that Jesus has made to atone for our sins, so God wants us to give the

Emanuel Gerrit Singgih, *Korban Dan Pendamaian: Studi Lintas Ilmu, Lintas Budaya, Dan Lintas Agama Mengenai Upaya Manusia Menghadapi Tantangan Terhadap Kehidupan Di Luar Kendalinya* (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2017), 149.

³⁰ Singgih, 149.

sacrifice of thanksgiving. Based on Noordegraaf's formula, the sacrifice of thanksgiving is in the form of an offering to the God because Jesus has sacrificed for the sake of mankind. This thought will limit the people who offer sacrifices with various motives such as the sacrifices in the time of Amos. According to Ladd, the offering is a thanksgiving to God because He has given the harvest. Ladd's comments color the meaning of the offerings given because God first gave them to us, but this comment is in the context of discussing the salvation that Jesus gave through His death. The context of the offering given to God has been locked in the understanding of salvation as a gift that Jesus gave. This is even emphasized by Simamora as the basis for giving offerings that are developing in Indonesia. According to him, the salvation that Jesus gave was responded to by the people through offering thanksgiving to God.

The basis of Indonesian religious life can develop and be colored with the meaning contained in Amos's theology of sacrifice. There are four principles contained in Amos's theology of sacrifice that can be relevant in Indonesia as offerings: (1) people prostrate themselves to God and attract God's attention; (2) the people offer something as a form of fellowship between themselves and the LORD; (3) the people surrender something related to the intention that is proven through the life of the devotee, namely based on the social justice of Amos and the fifth precept; and (4) people give something only to God with the idea of monotheism.

IV. CONCLUSION

Amos describes the issue of sacrifice rejection related to social justice in Israel during the time of Jerobeam II. The problem of justice did oligarch and wealthy man who seek profit through oppression and corruption so it was created social inequality and poverty. The several problems also occurs in Indonesia lately, it is indicating lack of awareness of the value of fifth principle of Pancasila. If Christians in Indonesia has understanding value of social justice, it will make social prosperity to people of Indonesia.

Understanding social justice through the interpretation of Amos 5: 25 "Did you offer me sacrifices and grain offerings, during the forty years you spent in the wilderness, family of Israel?" becomes "O, Israel you have brought to me the sacrifice and offerings for forty years in the wilderness?!!". This verse becomes statement to convey the emotions of God towards Israel because they sacrificed sincerely in the past. On the contrary, they gave sacrifice without followed by living on justice and righteousness.

Justice according to Amos includes social justice with six principles like: (1) sense of justice (2) choosing of justice (3) seeking for justice (4) knowing of justice (5) understanding of justice (6) action of justice. These six principles complemented of the fifth principle of Pancasila which was not understood by religious of Indonesians properly. Social justice from the fifth principle Pancasila means justice for everyone having rights to get prosperity. Its includes fulfillment of primary needs, safety, peace, political and economic equality. The fifth principle of

Pancasila maintains the value of social justice even spirituality and sociality. In spirituality, social justice can be interpreted on sacrifice ritual of offering that do by people of Christian in Indonesian. The meaning of offerings is arranged on four principles: (1) worshipping God and seeking Him (2) fellowship between man and God (3) following God by living on His way based on text/book of Amos about justice and also fifth principle of Pancasila (4) Giving only to God or monotheism. Thus, the correlation between the time of Amos with situation of Indonesia recently can be reflected as awareness of value of justice.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Barton, John. *The Theology of the Book of Amos*. New York, Ny.: Cambridge University Press., 2012.
- [2]. Boland, B. J. *Amos: Seri Tafsir Alkitab Kontekstual-Oikumenis*. Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2017.
- [3]. Butler, Trent C. *Old Testament Commentary: Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah*. Edited by Max Anders. Fennessee: Holman Reference, 2005.
- [4]. Botterweck, G. Johannes. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1999.
- [5]. Carroll, Mark Daniel. *Contexts of Amos: Prophetic Poetics in Latin America Perspective*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- [6]. Conzelmann, Hans. *Acts of the Apostels*. Philadelphia: Fortress press, 1987.
- [7]. Eidevall, Göran. *The Anchor Bible: Amos*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017.
- [8]. Garrett, Duane A. *Amos: A Handbook on the Hebrew Text*. Texas: Baylor University Press, 2008.
- [9]. Girard, René. *Violence and The Scared*. Translated by Patrick Gregory. London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1977.
- [10]. Glenny, W. Edward. *Amos: A Commentary Based on Amos in Codex Vaticanus*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2013.
- [11]. Holladay, William L. (ed.). *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.
- [12]. Klawans, Jonathan. *Purity, Sacrifice and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- [13]. LaSor, W.S., D.A. Hubbard, and F.W. Bush. *Pengantar Perjanjian Lama 2: Sastra Dan Nubuat*. Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2007.
- [14]. Linville, James R. *Amos and the Cosmic Imagination*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2008.
- [15]. Mawene, Marthinus Theodorus. *Perjanjian Lama Dan Teologi Kontekstual*. Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2017.
- [16]. Max, Boli Sabon. *Mengenal Indonesia: Aku Cinta Indonesia, Tak Kenal Maka Tak Sayang*. Edited by Sonta Frisca Manalu. Jakarta: Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya, 2019.
- [17]. Sopherd, Michael B. *A Commentary on the Book of Twelve: The Minor Prophets*. Grand Rapids, Mich: Kregel Publication, 2018.

- [18]. Singgih, Emanuel Gerrit. *Korban Dan Pendamaian: Studi Lintas Ilmu, Lintas Budaya, Dan Lintas Agama Mengenai Upaya Manusia Menghadapi Tantangan Terhadap Kehidupan Di Luar Kendalinya*. Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2017.
- [19]. Wahono, Wismoody S. *Di Sini Kutemukan: Petunjuk Mempelajari Dan Mengajarkan Alkitab*. Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2015.
- [20]. Waltke, Bruce K., and M. O'Connor. *An Intrduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns,