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THE ATTITUDE OF THE HEBREWS TOWARD FOREIGNERS

ANALYSIS

The aim of this thesis is to examine the relation of the Hebrews of biblical times to foreigners, and their attitude toward them; particularly to determine whether the distinctive religion of the Hebrews influenced them to take responsibility for the propagation of their faith and culture among those with whom they had contact.

I. Introduction: "Salvation is from the Jews", that is, the sources from which the Christian religion has evolved are primarily Hebrew.
A. The Hebrews possessed a unique genius for religion which not only characterized their own immediate history; but lent its stamp to the greater religion which grew out of it.
B. The religion of the Hebrews of the Old Testament was the preparation for, and the background of the Christian religion.
C. The missionary motive is an essential and (in quality) distinctive fact of Christianity.
D. The beginnings of the missionary motive are discoverable in the development of the religion of the Hebrews as revealed in their
attitude toward foreigners.

E. There are bearings of the attitude of the Hebrews toward foreigners which are of present-day international significance.

1. Their attitude toward the individual foreigner reveals the idea of the value of human personality.

2. Their attitude toward foreign nations bears lessons which should apply in the solution of modern international problems.

II. The historic background against which is seen the developing attitude toward foreigners reveals that they were included, accepted, granted a large measure of liberty and privilege, but yet generally treated with discrimination.

A. The existence of foreigners in ancient Israel made necessary the early definition of the attitude of the Hebrews toward them.

1. The distinctions made between classes of foreigners is revealed in the study of the various words used to designate them; i.e., 'stranger', 'sojourner', 'ger', 'foreigner', 'heathen', 'gentiles', etc.

B. The common attitude of hostility toward foreigners on the part of the Hebrews was a natural and necessary condition of their primitive civilization, social organization and geographical distribution.
1. Constant warfare was waged against enemy tribes and nations, and fear and hatred prevailed.

C. The social and economic conditions of foreigners in ancient Israel varied according to their status, and to the developing organization of Hebrew society.

1. Sojourners were admitted and protected.

2. The condition of settled aliens or *gerim* in Israel depended upon the kind of relation sustained by them to the Hebrew people.

   a. There were *gerim* in subjection to individual tribes.

   b. There were *gerim* in subjection to the king,-- in the town.

   c. There were *gerim* in larger bands.

   d. Foreigners were held as slaves.

      i. The development of the Hebrew attitude toward slaves is indicated in the three great legal codes, i.e., the Code of the Covenant, the Deuteronomistic Code, and the Priestly Code.

   e. Hebrew intermarriage with aliens added greatly to the complexity of the problem as to their attitude toward them.
D. The religious condition of settled aliens in Israel was determined largely by the general attitude that they participated in the patronage of the god or gods of whatever locality they occupied.

III. The universality of the prophets made for a broader attitude toward foreigners.

A. The moral conceptions of the prophets resolved into the idea that all nations were included in Jahweh's judgment, favor and reign.

1. The 'nations' were considered wicked, unclean, worshippers of idols; objects of pity as well as of hatred.

2. The mixture of Hebrews with foreigners was disapproved.

3. The idea persisted that the Hebrews were Jahweh's chosen people, and that foreigners were incapable and ineligible to participate in their religion.

4. But there was also the conception that the 'nations' were used of Jahweh to chastise the miscreant Hebrews.

5. The idealistic motive of the prophets tended toward universality, and in a remarkable degree attained to it in their writings.
B. There were modifications of the attitude toward foreigners.

1. The attitude toward foreigners was conditioned by the following considerations:
   a. The laws of hospitality.
   b. Political alliances.
   c. The needs of commerce.
   d. Religion.

2. The Hebrews were greatly influenced by foreign religions and customs.
   a. They imitated and adopted from the religions of other nations.

3. In the Deuteronomic regulations many provisions were made with regard to foreigners.

4. Proselytes were made.

IV. Subsequent reactions. (But the die is cast, and the influence of Hebrew religion and culture has been given to the world.)

A. The break-down of the nation of Israel, and the Babylonian Captivity.

B. The development of the idea of universality of Jahweh's reign is found in Deutero-Isaiah.

1. This is a most remarkable acclamation of world-religion given at the time of the national decline of the Hebrews.
C. The return from captivity.

1. The attitude of the returning exiles toward those who remained in the land was that of intolerance, especially with regard to their intermixture with other nations.
   a. The reforms under Ezra and Nehemiah won out for exclusiveness and separatism.
   b. Yet there remained proselytes and the system of proselytism.
   c. And certain Israelitish thinkers protested against the attitude of exclusiveness and separatism.
      i. The protest on behalf of the Moabites involved in the book of Ruth.
      ii. The missionary polemic of Jonah.

D. The Maccabean uprising in the 2nd Century B.C., with its anti-foreign spirit, made for still greater exclusiveness.

E. The eventual attitude toward foreigners was that of extreme intolerance and exclusiveness.

1. The culminating note of the Canonical books is sounded by the author of Esther.
2. But the exclusiveness of the Hebrews was a definite factor making toward the early wide-spread Christian activity among the gentiles.
V. Conclusion: The missionary attitude toward foreigners, which is manifest in Christianity, has its rise in the attitude of the Hebrews toward foreigners; not that the nation as a whole had a missionary attitude toward other nations, but that the development of their superior religion and culture produced, through their relation and attitude toward other nations, the abiding and fruitful conception of the prophets concerning the universality of the kingdom of Jahweh.
THE ATTITUDE OF THE HEBREWS TOWARD FOREIGNERS

An investigation for the purpose of determining whether the distinctive religion of the Hebrews influenced them to take the attitude of responsibility for the propagation of their faith and culture among foreigners; Based upon the history and literature, both biblical and extra-biblical, of the Hebrew people, and upon recognized authorities of modern times.

I. INTRODUCTION

Jesus, in telling the Samaritan woman about the worship of God as a spirit, said to her: "We worship that which we know; for salvation is from the Jews"*. Thus he set forth an interesting and significant Jewish dogma as to the originality and superiority of the religion of his nation. In the light of his whole teaching it is obvious that he did not believe that this religion was the exclusive property of the Jews, nor that it was transmitted by them in its absolute or final form. But he did hold that they were indeed the chosen people, and that through them as such God purposed to reveal himself to all mankind. This might reasonably be interpreted as the consummation of particularism as applied to missionary

*John 4:32
motives, and, if so, no man before or since the time of Christ has ever stated the case more simply or clearly. The Samaritan woman and her people, and as for that matter, all non-Jewish people were worshipers of that which they knew not, whereas the Jews knew. In a peculiar way it was committed to the Jews to know the way of worship in spirit and in truth. Jesus, realizing this in sublime consciousness of his leadership, took upon himself the responsibility of revealing this way, and himself became the consummation of this revelation to all mankind.

But is salvation from the Jews, and if so, in what particulars have they been its exponents? From the earliest gleams of their history down through the rise and fall of their national life they have manifested a special genius for religion. Their leaders and heroes have been people possessed of religious conceptions and motives. Their individual and corporate activities have been fraught with religious significance and consequence. Their religious experiences went through a marvelous course of development, and while there were always elements of crudity and weakness, there was on the whole such progress as to place them well at the head of all ancient peoples in matters of religion. They worshiped and served one God, who was the only God, the creator of all things, the father of the sons of men, and who desired the holiness and welfare of all his children. They produced a literature having to do
with their religious and civic life which has endured with ever-increasing significance as a religious monument and source of wisdom and inspiration.

What is of still greater significance is that their long generations of religious activity and growth prepared the foundations for the rise of the Christian religion, in which the world has had such enrichment and increase as to make the influence of this faith the outstanding incident of all history.

It took long centuries of time and a vast amount of experience to produce the religious knowledge and character of the Hebrew people. It took punishment, bitterness and exile, as well as the triumphs and prosperity with which was associated the favor of Jahweh, to bring forth those qualities of steadfast hope and devotion to sustain the remnant of the chosen ones of Israel. It took the greatest geniuses of many generations to fill out the ranks of that incomparable procession of prophets, law-makers, poets, rulers, heroes, and godly men who raised the level of religious belief to such heights that Christianity was enabled to proceed therefrom.

The missionary motive is an essential aspect of the Christian religion, and, in its quality, distinguishes Christianity from the other great religions. To be sure the missionary motive seems in some degree to be inherent in other religions, especially in those which have been
headed by personal founders. King Asoka has the credit for starting the foreign missionary effort of Buddhism in China, whence it eventually spread to Korea and Japan. The impulse originates in the teachings of Buddha who is reported to have sent missionaries, directing them to "wander everywhere, preaching the doctrine (Dharma) and teaching men to order their lives with self-restraint and chastity". The vast extent of Buddhism indicates the power it has had to propagate itself through the activities of its believers. Mohammedanism has never had a priesthood nor any organized missionary enterprise, but from the Koran we learn that the missionary obligation is held to be a universal one imposed upon every follower. The method of its propaganda has been in the main the "proselyting zeal of the individual believer who is prompted by his personal devotion to his faith to win the allegiance to it of others". Zoroastrianism has been considered a missionary religion in that its founder desired to "convert all men living". With the discovery of any great truth or principle there tends to arise in the discoverer a passion to convey his possession to others. It must have been some such spirit that caused the Athenians to spend their time "in nothing else, but either to tell or hear some new thing", or impelled Ikhnaton, the ancient Egyptian monarch to have the name of his new-discovered national deity chiseled

upon many of the monuments in the places of the names of the old deities.

In connection with the rise of the Christian religion there is evinced a remarkable tendency to extend its teachings and communion beyond the realm of its origins, and we call this the missionary impulse. It has characterized Christianity in greater degree and intensity, and with vastly more profound significance in the histories of religion and civilization than it has any other religion. It is commonly thought that the missionary impulse of Christianity had its inception with the teachings of Christ and the beginnings of the Apostolic Church. While it is true that Christian missions could not exist prior to Christianity itself, it is nevertheless equally true that the missionary impulse has its roots extending back into the history of the Hebrew people; and as surely as Judaism was a preparation for the coming of Jesus and Christianity, the attitude of the Hebrews toward foreigners in the light of their distinctive religion of ethical monotheism was a preparation for those missionary teachings summed up in the words of the Great Commission: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you."

That these beginnings of the missionary motive can be discovered in the development of the religion of the Hebrews

*Mat. 28:19-20a.*
as revealed in their attitude toward foreigners is the conclusion of this investigation, and the aim is to proceed to this conclusion, in so far as may be, by way of a historical and interpretative study of the Hebrew people of biblical times in their relations to the non-Hebrew peoples with whom they came in contact.

Such a conclusion serves, not only to reinforce the bonds which tie the new back to the old in appreciation of the value of our present-day Christianity, but opens up the whole problem as to what bearings, if any, it may have upon the understanding and correcting of international attitudes of today. While Israel was indeed a comparatively small nation, her history is long and complex, and falls over periods of high social, governmental and diplomatic development, as well as over periods of great strife, oppression and disaster. The knowledge and experience remaining from these past ages have stood the tests of time and of the most searching criticism. Many of the difficulties and evils due to racial and national differences would never need to recur if they were but adequately understood from the point of view of the Hebrew experiences of long ago. Pretty much the whole gamut of international relationships was run by this little nation. From being a homeless host of people wandering among unfriendly tribes in mountain and desert they grew to be a proud and well-to-do nation, numbering their vassals from many surrounding countries.
Then they underwent the national decay and disruption which left them a band of broken-hearted, exiled captives. Comparative release from the actual state of captivity allowed them to become sternly self-conscious, legalistic and exclusive, and possessed of that hope of national re-establishment which kept them ever 'a peculiar people'. Out of all this tribal and national history, as we shall see, there come at least two conceptions which are of importance for our present age. The one is found in the attitude of the Hebrews toward the sojourners within their gates. It is that in the individual person, regardless of whether he is native or foreign, bond or free, there is a God-given sense of freedom and self determination which seals him with the value of his own personality, both to himself and to society. The other is found in the relation of the nation of Israel to other nations, and the attitude of the Hebrew people toward them. It is that any religious, social or governmental enterprise which is conceived of and undertaken for the exclusive purpose of its own existence and prosperity is futile; and that the idea which holds the nation to be an organization justified solely for self defence and for the preservation of national institutions and traditions, without regard to responsibility for the welfare or misfortune of other nations, is false.
II. THE HISTORIC BACKGROUND

The historic background against which is seen the developing attitude of the Hebrews toward foreigners begins with the earliest records and extends through the time of the crystallization of their racial consciousness and the closing of their national circle in the second century B.C. The tendencies of outstanding significance in this history may be excellently summarized in the words of Professor Peritz: "... during the first period the material development was uppermost; and ... the Hebrews emerged from it with a well-organized government. ... the second period brought Israel with the dissolution of its state the consciousness of its national mission to be missionaries of the noblest moral and spiritual ideas to the world. ... during the third period the tendencies to formalism and particularism nearly undid the mighty work of Israel's prophets." Beyond this time it will not be necessary to go because the whole story leading up to the conclusion of this thesis is told within these bounds. Herein it is revealed that there were always many foreigners in Israel for whom the Hebrews had to have some kind of consideration, and that this consideration grew to be something of international and religious significance for all time.

The geographical situation of Palestine was such as
to involve its inhabitants in continuous relationships with other peoples. This little country was the crossroads for important trade routes of antiquity, was the battle-grounds of many international conflicts, and its boundaries were frequently changed under the pressure of tribal migrations, military aggression and national expansion. Thus it necessarily transpired that throughout the whole history of the Hebrews, they were thrown into contact with foreigners from many different tribes and nations. With Palestine as the center, the known world of the Hebrew people extended eastward into Iran (Persia), westward to Crete and Macedonia, northward into Asia Minor and southward into Arabia. Of the people who inhabited these regions, some were Semitic, some Indo-European and some Undetermined as to racial stock*. It is notable that the names of nearly all of these peoples appear in the Old Testament, and that the names of the regions of the country inhabited by them were also more or less well known. Among the peoples named who might have been considered foreigners by the Hebrews, the most important ones are these:

(1) The Mittites, who were pre-Israelitish occupants of Palestine.

(2) The Canaanites, whom the Israelites found in possession of Palestine at the time of their occupation, and among whom were included the Amorites, Beeroshites.

*Bedale, Peake's Commentary, p 50.
Gibeonites, Jebusites, Perezzites, and probably numerous other small tribes. The Phoenicians, and the Zidonians who were a branch of them, may also be included among the Canaanites.

(3) The tribes akin to Israel, among whom may be numbered the Ammonites, Edomites, Ishmaelites, Midianites, and Moabites. It should be noted, however, that kinship was not always counted as overbalancing foreignness and enmity. The Hebrews frequently warred against these peoples.

(4) The Amalekites, and related to them, the Kenites.

(5) The Assyrians and Babylonians, sometimes designated by the name 'Ashur'.

(6) The Philistines, and related to them, the Gittites, and possibly the Carites and Cherethites (mercenaries from Caria and Crete, respectively).

(7) Miscellaneous tribes, such as the Jerahmeelites, Kadmonites, and many others too indefinitely known to classify or allocate.*

Among the countries more or less familiar to the Old Testament writers may be included the territories of all these people listed above. In Genesis, chapters 10 and 11 there is given a series of genealogical data which purports to account for the origins of all the inhabitants of the world from after the flood down to the time of Abraham. The basis of this account is the descendants

*H. B. D. ad.loc.
Noah's three sons, Shem, Ham and Japheth. While it is complicated by contradictory elements in the parallel accounts of other documents, and cannot be taken as strictly historical material, it nevertheless reveals the conceptions held with regard to the distribution of peoples in the early times.

The descendants of Shem, according to this passage, formed the eastern group. They were called Shemites, or Semites. Thus from the name of Shem comes the racial name of all that great group from which come the Hebrews. The descendents of Ham, or the Hamites, formed the southern group, and the Japhites were the peoples of the north and west.

The following diagram will serve to indicate, insofar as may be done with assurance, just how this table of the nations covered the known world as the time of Ancient Israel:

THE SONS OF SHEM, HAM AND JAPHETH

Genesis 10-11.

I. Japheth and his sons (P document). These are the northern peoples of Asia Minor, Armenia, the shores of the Caspian and Atlantic; representing the Indo-European group:

A. Gomer and his sons Ashkenaz, Riphath and Togarmah, are supposedly the peoples called the Cimmerians by the Greeks, or Gimirra by the Assyrians.
B. Mizraim, which is Egypt, is associated also with a number of descendants concerning whose identification with tribes there is no certainty.

C. Canaan (E) has even more recorded descendants, and naturally enough, for because of the proximity of this region, it falls out that the names of these are largely those of smaller divisions of the Canaanitish people. Among them are the Jebusite, Amorite, Girgashite, Hivite, Arkite, etc. The following statement is made concerning the boundaries of Canaan: "and the border of the Canaanite was from Sidon as thou goest toward Gerar, unto Gaza; as thou goest toward Sodom and Gomorrah and Adinah and Zeboiim, unto Lasha".* This would indicate that the E writer had something of a geographical understanding and interest.

III. Shem (father of the Children of Eber) and his sons. (E and P). These were the group located at the east of Palestine, including Assyria, Babylonia and Mesopotamia. Here again the question as to what definite groups of people are signified by the various names of the descendants must be left an open one, for while the names are numerous and it is sometimes possible to associate them with specific tribes, the difficulties are too great for any consistent results to be derived.

*Gen. 10:19, E.
It merely remains to be stated that from the great abundance of references in the literature of Ancient Israel to peoples of the surrounding countries, of which the foregoing is but a sample, it is seen that the foreigners played considerable part in the affairs of the Hebrews. In this connection Professor Bedale says: "... it has gradually become apparent that Israel was greatly affected, sometimes directly, sometimes indirectly, by the peoples in the midst of whom she lived. It is no longer possible to think of Israel as an isolated nation"*.

In times prior to the conquest of Canaan Israel was not in any sense of the word a nation which could be distinguished from the related clans surrounding it. Nor was Israel conscious of any difference in kind between its own religious and social life and that of other peoples surrounding. But there was at this early age a spiritual relation of Israel and its kindred tribes to Jahweh, and each tribe or group of tribes had its own sacra or sanctuaries where were observed the rites of their early religious beliefs. In the E account of the migration of Abraham to Canaan** mention is made of his building of altars unto Jahweh at Shechem and Bethel and Hebron, and in the Code of the Covenant the command is given: "An altar of earth thou shalt make unto me ... in every place where I record my name I will come unto thee and I will bless thee***.

Even in the earlier periods of the settlement of Canaan, there seemed to be no marked contrast, either religious or otherwise between Israel and the Canaanites. Little of what may be called religious particularism became manifest prior to the time of Elijah and his work.*

For an example of this, the tendency to consider that an exile from the land of Jahweh was subject to the gods of the land in which he sojourned seems to apply. David, when he had been pursued by Saul, said to him: "they have driven me out this day that I should not cleave unto the inheritance of Jehovah, saying, Go, serve other gods"**

Yet it was not long before the foreign lands began to be considered 'unclean'***, although it is not likely that there was thought to be any relation between the uncleanness and the local authority of their respective gods.

We read in Judges, which comes from relatively late in the period of the prophets, that Jephthah in his message to the king of Ammon expressed his confidence that Chemosh, the god of the Ammonites, would bestow upon them their inheritance****.

During and after the conquest of Canaan, while Israel was becoming more settled in agricultural and town life, it became a united body of people separated from the nomadic tribes on its borders by its more advanced interests. Under the Judges, and especially in the early founding of the

kingdom under Saul and David, Israel became well defined and fixed in its national scope, constitution, life and the idea of its relation to Jahweh.

The relation to Jahweh, however, was far from what it came to be under the later prophetic influence. The religion of the Israelites was profoundly influenced by that of the Canaanites. They had ordinarily adopted the sanctuaries and high places with ancient religious associations, and taken over with them many of the religious customs and practices. It had not happened at once, but had been a long and gradual process, and the idea that evil was involved therein did not begin to come to the front noticeably until the advent of Elijah and Elisha. There probably was always the conflict between superior and inferior ideals, and this would not have been a one-sided conflict, because of the fact of the superior development of agricultural life among the Canaanites as opposed to the finer religious and moral conceptions held by the Hebrews. But it does not seem that the conflict between ideals was at all prominent, for it was rather a period of tendencies toward assimilation and syncretism. This was no small matter, for, as Bennett says, "the interaction of religious influences between the latter (Canaanites) and Israel is a most important feature in the development of the Hebrew attitude toward non-Israelites and their religion".*

---

A. THE EXISTENCE OF FOREIGNERS IN ANCIENT ISRAEL

The existence of foreigners in and about Israel made necessary the early definition as to what attitude should be taken toward them. From the first there was a tendency to include them, accept them and grant them a large measure of liberty and privilege, insofar as this was compatible with safety, social solidarity and current religious sanctions. Yet there was also the attitude of hostility, discrimination and distrust. The Hebrews must have had foreigners among them from the times of their sojournings in Egypt and prior to their settlement in Canaan, as indicated in the reference to the 'mixed multitude' of Exodus 12:38 and Numbers 11:4, and they afterwards had the surviving Canaanites to deal with, not to mention the surrounding foreign peoples. Foreigners were unavoidable, and also indispensable, and their status with relation to Israel had to be settled upon. At once we meet with distinctions between the several classes of foreigners as indicated by the various words used to designate them. Those of significance for the present study, as found in the American Standard Version of the Holy Bible are as follows:

1. "Foreigners". These were the foreigners proper, who were represented originally by the Hebrew word, 'nakheri'. They were those peoples from other lands who had not had sufficient dealings or relations with the Hebrews to be considered as entitled to any rights or home with them. The enemy peoples were included in this
classification, and those who were unknown through utter lack of contact with them.

2. "Strangers". The Hebrew word used to designate this class of foreigners is 'zar' (ץ). These were the foreign people who came among the Hebrew people frequently enough to make themselves somewhat known to them, but who still did not participate in any of the privileges of the tribe or nation, except by the courtesy and hospitality ordinarily accorded to them incidentally with their passing through the country. Merchants and traders usually came within this classification, and also people traveling through the country enroute to some other region.

3. "Sojourners". The most important group of foreigners perhaps, was that of the sojourners, the Hebrew word for whom is 'ger' (ג). These were the foreign peoples who lived within the borders of the Hebrew nation, and who participated in varying degrees in the affairs thereof. There were sojourners among the Israelites even during the Exodus*. They seemed never to forget that they themselves had been sojourners, as shown by the frequency of such sayings as: "for ye were sojourners in the land of Egypt"**.

There are some other words which connote these various groups of foreigners. Among these are 'nations', 'aliens', 'peoples', and 'proselytes'. Variations in the use of these words persist in considerable degree, but the fundamental distinction is that between the foreigner proper

and the *ger*. In the present study it will generally be possible to distinguish between foreigners upon this simple basis. Under foreigners proper may be listed those called strangers, nations, aliens, peoples, etc., whereas under 'gerim' or sojourners may be listed only that particular class of foreign people who dwelt in some kind of constant relation with the Hebrew people within their boundaries and under their control and protection.

Berthelet points out this distinction at the very beginning of his monograph*, and insists that it is one which may be established for the whole history of the attitude of the Hebrews toward foreigners. His illustration is that of the contrast between the status of Ittai, the Gittite, who is a stranger, and that of the son of an Amalekite sojourner**. David commanded Ittai, the Gittite to return to Saul the King, instead of following the army into battle, because he was not one of them, but only a stranger who had but come, and who would directly be gone; he was a foreigner to use the specific term. On the other hand, David had liberty over the person of the son of the Amalekite sojourner and held him responsible with his life for the slaughter of Saul, because he was a sojourner, i. e., because of his fixed relation of dependence in the land, though he was of foreign descent.

Berthelet's statement of this is as follows:

"Ithai, der "Nokhri" ist "gestern" gekommen und soll heute oder morgen wieder zurückziehen. Der Bote, der vor David steht, würde sich nicht gerade für den Sohn eines "Ger" nicht irgendwie dauernd zukame und seine ganze (für eine Zeit wenigstens gültige) Stellung bezeichnete."

The distinction between the foreigner and the sojourner is a fixed and persistent one. The sojourner partakes of the benefits afforded by the relationship he sustains to the tribe or nation in which he is located, and he is also expected to share in the responsibility for the common welfare, whereas the foreigner or stranger does not.

In connection with the study of words having to do with people and things which are non-Israelitish, the use of the word 'foreign' is found to occur frequently in the formula 'foreign god' or 'foreign gods'. This is significant as revealing the eventual prophetic and priestly attitude toward foreigners, inasmuch as it follows reasonably enough that if foreign gods are evil, the foreigners who follow after them would be considered corrupt and abhorrent. At any rate this is the attitude with respect to the religious affairs of foreigners, especially in the later days of Israel's growing consciousness of the superiority and originality of its own faith in, and worship of Jahweh.

As already stated, foreigners played an important part in the affairs of the Hebrew people throughout all

*Bertholet, pp1–2.
their history. While those foreigners constituting the enemies, the strangers, and the various other external groups had much to do with shaping this history, the sojourners, the gerim, had even greater effect as regards the formation and development of the attitude of the Hebrews toward their problems of the foreign peoples. For these sojourners abode in considerable numbers in the lands and homes of Israel. In the Chronicles it is recorded that Solomon took a census of the sojourners, determining that there were one-hundred-fifty-three thousand, six-hundred of them, of whom he set one-hundred-fifty thousand to task work*. In view of the late date of this text, which comes from about 250 B.C.,** and its manifest tendency to give unreasonably large numbers in describing measurements, both of objects and bodies of people, it seems that this census must be discredited to some extent. But these enumerations appear to be adaptations from I Kings 5:13ff, which gives as the number of the workers in connection with the building of the temple practically the same total. As Curtis suggests***, it is not improbable that the late Chronicler, in an effort to make it appear that the people of Israel did not have to serve in such strenuous labors, interpreted the earlier source as referring only to foreign task workers. Why else he should have overlooked the levy of thirty-thousand laborers from all Israel is not apparent. If it may be assumed that all besides this levy

*II Chr. 2:17ff. **Smith, O.T.Hist., p500. ***I.C.C., "Chronicles", p 322.
of thirty-thousand from all Israel were foreigners, and that there were no foreigners left outside the levy for task work, it would be an easy matter to determine the number of foreigners sojourning in Israel as approximately one-hundred-twenty-three thousand. But clearly such calculations avail but little, and we shall have to remain content with the assurance that there were sojourners in considerable numbers in Israel at the time of Solomon's building enterprises.

In defining the status of the ger, the following statement is made in the Bible Dictionary*: "The 'ger' in the oldest time is a stranger who dwells under the protection of a family or tribe to which he does not belong. He is not necessarily a non-Israelite." In the 'oldest time' social and tribal bonds had not yet been firmly and definitely fixed, so it may be presumed that there was considerable variation in the conceptions held as to the proper status of the 'ger'. For the greater part it appears that he lived in the midst of the community in comparative personal freedom, although he usually had no political rights or privileges. He had to render services and do common labor, but not as a slave, for he was usually given wages of a sort. Jacob worked on shares with Laban**. The matter of justice in paying wages to hired sojourners is enforced in the Deuteronomistic regulations ***. Thus the tendency was toward the adoption and assimilation of the

'ger'. But the attitude toward all other foreigners stood in marked contrast.

B. The General Attitude of Hostility.

Centrally located as it was in relation to the many adjacent nations and tribes, the land of the Hebrews was constantly buffeted by them. Sometimes the conflicts assumed considerable proportions, as in the case of those long drawn out with the Philistines, or of the later Syro-Ephramitic war and the Persian Invasion, and sometimes they were mere border skirmishes. But on the whole there was a very great deal of warfare throughout the history of the Hebrew people. The natural result was that intense rivalry prevailed almost constantly, and victory for the Hebrews was followed by violence occasionally leading to the wholesale extermination of enemies. Defeat was accompanied by groveling fear, desperate compromise and not infrequent humiliation. In addition to this fact that the attitude of the Israelites toward foreign peoples was conditioned by that chronic hostility which is characteristic of the half-civilized nations of primitive times, it was also believed that war was sacred, and that the destruction of foreigners was righteous, holy and well pleasing to Jahweh. This latter idea is amply illustrated in the imprecatory psalms, and has frequent place in the accounts of the wars.

Such relations could lead only to hatred, distrust and exclusiveness. On the other hand it must be remembered
that Palestine is such a small region that it was never possible for the inhabitants to escape the influence of peaceable contacts. This was the more especially so because of the trade routes which penetrated from north to south and from the east to the sea. Numerous caravans constantly traversed these highways, bringing merchandise desired by the people, and it was a strenuous time indeed when a truce could not be had for the sake of commerce. There grew up from this the tendency to extend hospitality to the traveling merchants, and these dauntless trafficers found it not so perilous to ply their business but that it prospered them to do so. More will be said of this below.

Withal, the family, the town and the tribe furnished the social units of organization, and in the early period of the Hebrew occupation of Canaan, and the change from nomadic to settled, agricultural life, it was only natural that ignorance with regard to the peoples beyond the immediate neighborhoods should prevail. It was only natural that distrust, superstition and suspicion should so abound as to make possible many such revolting occurrences as those freely recorded by the Old Testament writers, of which the outrage of the Levite's concubine by the base fellows of Gibeah* is a typical example. The general attitude of hostility on the part of the Hebrews in their relations with foreigners was a natural and inevitable condition of

*Judges 19.
their primitive civilization, social organization and geographic situation.

Such an unfavorable attitude toward foreigners outside of her realm is nothing unique or peculiar to Israel, nor have modern times greatly improved matters with regard to such international relations, except as the principles of Christianity may have been actually applied. How is it then, that such a situation can give us anything in the direction of, or approaching towards the Christian ideal? The answer to this question will be found, in part at least, through a more detailed study of the life of the 'ger',--the sojourner in Israel.

C. The Social and Economic Condition of Foreigners in Ancient Israel (see following page).
C. The Social and Economic Condition of Foreigners in Ancient Israel.

As has been suggested, the 'ger' in Ancient Israel was not subjected to uniform and consistent treatment from the first, but rather, the Hebrews, finding him in their midst increasing in importance and value, gradually built up those regulations which governed their dealings with him, and which reveal to us their attitude toward him. This attitude varied according to the status of each different class of 'gerim', and also according to the developing organization of Hebrew society. In all events they were admitted and protected in considerable numbers, but with such distinctions as that one observed by Bertholet, as cited above. In this regard Kent says, "True to their early nomadic instincts, the Israelites were generous in their treatment of aliens who came to seek their protection and hospitality. They distinguished sharply, however, between a foreigner (ben nekhar), one who retained his allegiance to his own tribe or nation, the protection of which he therefore continued to enjoy, and the resident alien (ger) who had taken up his permanent abode in and placed himself under the protection of an Israelitish tribe. Their attitude toward aliens also underwent great transformations in succeeding ages under the influence of the stirring political experiences through which they passed."*

*Israel's Laws and Legal Precedents, p 66.
There were still other distinctions as to the relations of foreign people to the Israelites which effected their social and economic condition as such. These distinctions pertained to the sojourners or 'gerim' rather than to the foreigner proper, who sustained no political allegiance to the tribe or nation wherein he was temporarily located. It was among those who served in one capacity or another that the distinctions arose.

Generally, the 'gerim' were required to render service in return for the protection and opportunity afforded them, but rarely as slaves. They usually had wages for their work, as in the case of the Levite whom Micah hired for his private priest*, Jacob, whom Laban told to name his own recompense**, and the Deuteronomic regulation whereby the Israelites were commanded to leave the forgotten sheaves for the "sojourner, for the fatherless, and for the widow"***. To be sure, in most cases these wages could hardly be counted as legitimate returns for the services rendered, but it appears that the attitude expressed in providing for them served to distinguish the servitude from actual slavery, in which no such matter as pay would be considered. That the lot of the sojourners was not always just and easy is well illustrated by the story of Laban referred to above, and that their position

elicited the frequent exhortations to act justly by them*,
to show them kindness**, to refrain from oppressing
them***, and to allow them certain benefits of religious
observance****. The fact that some of these exhortations
come down from the earliest documents (J and E) indicate
that such matters had consideration from the beginnings
in the history of Israel.

The different classes of 'gerim' in Israel may be
treated under the following headings: the 'gerim' who
were in subjection to individual tribes, those who were
in subjection to the king (in the town), 'gerim' in
larger bands, slaves and foreign wives. Of course
slaves and foreign wives cannot be considered as mere
sojourners having the larger liberty to come and go and
make their own way, but in certain cases they were taken
from among the sojourners, the spirit of the Hebrews in
their dealings with them was much the same, and for
present purposes they may be included here.

The 'gerim' of the earlier period were usually those
who had been attracted by some such consideration as
intermarriage or trade to take up their abode among some
tribe away from their original homes. Or to escape debt
or the consequences of crime may have sometimes been the
motive with which the sojourner set forth to find new
opportunity and better his condition. Such were the

*Dt 1:16, 24:17, 27:19. **Dt.10:19, 26:12. ***Ex 22:21,
23:9 (both J and E)Lv 19:33, Dt 24:14, Jer 7:6,
Zec 7:10. ****Ex 20:10-33:12 (both J and E), Dt 5:14.
sojourners who came under subjection of tribes. Probably they came without wealth or family support, wherefore they were treated as wards of the community, and each succeeding code granted them greater rights and privileges. Under these conditions, they were undoubtedly welcomed because of their adding to the military strength of the tribe, but this had little relation to matters of their religious life. These remained to be adjusted and expanded as time went by, and the relationships became more involved and complex. It was not until the tribal life had been well merged into national existence with its more general religious consciousness that the great codes became effective in their provisions for the religious welfare of the sojourners. The fact remains, however, that the problem of the foreigner living within the tribe, protected by it and sharing its benefits throughout the time prior to this more advanced development made for a thorough-going understanding of him as such, and led to the establishment of those measures to insure him not only justice, but kindness, love and practical charity. If these provisions as we find them in the Holiness and Priestly Codes may be considered as having their rise in the experience of the Hebrews in their dealings with sojourners, it seems not unlikely that the attitude producing them must have existed in developing form from the earliest times of tribal life. If so, the social and economic condition of the sojourners must have been relatively favorable when they were under
subjection to the individual tribes.

On the other hand it may be inferred that the later legislation on behalf of the 'gerim' would indicate that there had been a general state of abuse and evil practice, and that the condition of these foreign people had been only wretched and pitiable because of the exploitation and injustice of the Israelites. This would be but to add to the difficulties which stand in the way of a thorough understanding of these obscure times. Certainly we may take it for granted that there was wrong-doing on the part of the Israelites toward their foreign wards, even as there was wrong-doing among themselves. It seems preferable to consider the laws which they developed for the safe-guarding of the sojourners' rights as reflecting the better tendencies, rather than the worse. The fact of the presence of sojourners in Israel in large numbers, witnessed by the frequent reference to them, and by the large measure of adjustment made in their behalf, serves to indicate that the Hebrews, in their tribal days even, must have held a receptive and favorable attitude toward them.

It was probably not uncommon for 'gerim' to have the relation of subjection to the king, or to the chieftain of a clan. There was a time when David, before he became king of Israel, was a follower of the Philistine, Achish of Gath*, and was supposed to be estranged from his own people. In this relationship he was expected to make the

*I Sam. 27:12, 28:1ff, 29:3.
interests of Achish his own, and to fight, if need be, against his own tribe. This would indicate that such customs were not unheard of, and also that the natural aversion between tribes was not always such as to shut out the sojourners who might be found to be of use in military or other service. The Israelitish kings actually encouraged the presence of foreigners in their courts, and depended upon their fidelity, even more, sometimes, than they did upon their own subjects. Saul had as his chief herdsman Doeg, the Edomite*; David retained as servants and warriors Cherethites, Pelethites and Gittites, who fought for him against his own mutinous and perfidious sons Absalom** and Sheba***; Solomon was supported by Cherethites and Pelethites when he assumed the kingship#; Ittai the Gittite, whose case has already been observed, was a foreigner who followed David's army##; and we read of Carites, who, as soldiery, participated in the conspiracy for the establishment of the boy king, Joash###. Such instances could be multiplied, and in general it would be found that the attitude of the kings toward their foreign servants was that of practical, democratic employment, which was not greatly different from that toward their native subjects. Those sojourners who had this relation of direct subjection to the king, whether as soldiers or in some form of task work, generally lived in

#I K. 1:38,44. ##II Sam. 15:19. ###II K. 11:4ff.
the capital—or some other large town, and therefore did not have the same opportunity for settled life. They were kept together in companies, and mobilized from place to place as the exigencies of the king’s enterprises might demand. Such a situation would tend to keep them stratified, and to prevent the free intermingling which prevailed with regard to the sojourning foreigners in subjection to tribes. But they helped to constitute the problem of the foreigner, and numbers of them undoubtedly drifted out of the condition of subjection to the organized government and found places in the village and country life of Israel, becoming thereby the objects of direct consideration on the part of the Hebrews as to how they should be received.

Then there were 'gerim' in larger bands, such as whole clans or tribes. Israel was such in its sojourn into Egypt, and the memory of this status abode until it found a place in the religious experience and literature of the race*. Upon their conquest of Canaan, according to JE, they were led into a covenant with the tribe of the Gibeonites who thereby became 'hewers of wood and drawers of water for the house of my God'**. At one time 'the Beerothites fled to Gittaim, and have been sojourners there until this day'***. These two tribes or clans were related in that they were traced back to Benjamin, but they cannot be counted among the Israelites because they considered them as being 'the remnant of the Amorites'#, who were Canaanites.

*Gen. 15:13, Ex. 22:21, 23:9 (all JE); Lv.19:34 (H); Dt.10:19, 23:8. ***II Sam.4:3. **Jos. 9. #II Sam. 21:2.
They figure in an interesting episode which reveals that David considered them to be under the protection and providence of Jahweh. This condition was the result of the covenant made long before, but Saul "in his zeal for the children of Israel and Judah"*, had violated the covenant by seeking to slay them. To this act David attributed the three years of famine as a punishment of Jahweh upon Israel because of Saul’s sin against a band of sojourning foreigners. This is significant as revealing the tendency to consider that foreigners were entitled to, and received the jealous, vengeful protection of Jahweh, even as the Hebrews.

Those foreigners who were held as slaves by the Israelites form a class of some importance in connection with this study. The institution of slavery was universal in those days, as indeed it has been throughout all history until in relatively very recent times. As soon as any clan or tribe attained to sufficient strength to enforce its control over individuals or groups, and as soon as organized warfare became known, slavery must have been practiced. The fact that in both biblical and extrabiblical literature remaining from the times of the Hebrew national existence there is no indication that slavery as an institution was ever considered illegitimate or unrighteous makes it possible to consider here the attitude of the Hebrews toward their slaves from the practical standpoint of showing how it contributed to their

*II Sam. 21:2c.
ultimate universal conceptions.

The development of the Hebrew attitude toward slaves, and toward other classes of foreigners as well, is revealed through a comparison of the regulations provided on their behalf in the three great codes of Israel, i.e., the Code of the Covenant*, the Deuteronomic Code**, and the Priestly Code***. These represent the development of religious and social legislation over the periods of Hebrew history from the earliest traditions down to about the fifth century B.C.

In the earliest extant source of biblical law, the J Decalogue#, there appears no reference to foreigners except as they are considered among the enemies to be driven out of the land. The law is very rigorous in its attitude that the Hebrews are to avoid contacts with them except through aggression, breaking up their altars and the vigorous exercise of their consciousness that they are a chosen people. The only intimation that there may have been tendencies toward intimacy with these people of the land is the prohibition of intermarriage (Ex. 34:16).

But in the Code of the Covenant we find the beginnings of comprehensive consideration for the slaves. It is thought that, while the roots of these laws go back into earlier tradition, their written formulation comes from about the first century of the founding of the Kingdom.

---

*Ex.20:22-23; 34:19, E, but dated 900 B.C. by Smith. **Dt.12-28, 650-321 B.C. ***Lv.17-26, Exilic, 550 or later. #J, Ex.34, from ancient lore, written c. 850 B.C.
and by this time there would have been a well settled social order, and probably there were numerous slaves as a result of successful warfare with surrounding enemies. The only direct reference to the treatment of slaves has do do with Hebrew slaves, however*, though there does appear what may be considered the beginnings of consideration for the foreigners, for it is commanded, "a sojourner shalt thou not wrong, neither shalt thou oppress him"**, and the commandment is repeated the second time***. On the other hand, it has been questioned as to whether such elements in this code may not be the fruit of the Deuteronomic redaction, but Driver thinks that these clauses are in their original place in Exodus#. A further objection to the generous spirit of such provisions is found in the strenuous assertion of the idea that the Israelites will expel the Canaanitish inhabitants of the land through the in leadership of the angel of Jahweh, and the prohibition of the worship of their gods###. But the reiteration of the commandment not to wrong or oppress the sojourner is too significant as a step in social morality to pass over lightly. It is a foregleam of the later standards in which the Israelites to a remarkable measure attained their position as a distinctive people of the righteous and holy Jahweh.

In the E Decalogue#### there is found the provision

for extending the privilege of sabbath rest to "thy stranger that is within thy gates", and it is interesting to observe that the possessive pronoun, 'thy' is used in a sense to indicate a spirit of hospitality and responsibility for the visitor. Beyond this there is no reference in this ancient passage which might be construed as having any special bearing upon the condition of sojourners, and there is no mention whatever made of slaves. It would appear, therefore, that at the time of the writing of these earliest sources there was no special problem of the slave, although the Hebrews were sufficiently advanced in their social standards to have regard for the sojourner.

The Deuteronomic Code comes from a time considerably later in the history of Israel. It is characterized by a religious emphasis which could have resulted only from such a series of advances and reactions in religious life as had befallen Israel up to the time of the exile. Driver describes this work as the "prophetic re-formation and adaptation to newer needs of older legislation".

He also points out that, while it represents the later point of view, it certainly has a retroactive application in setting forth standards which had been developing throughout the whole period from Mosaic times. It is largely based upon the older codes, and draws from them some conceptions with which its own spirit is not always in harmony. This is true in the matter of exclusiveness, or the attitude that Israel should be segregated from

*Driver, p91, 93.*
from heathen influences, for it is very clear that this attitude is more strongly emphasized than before, while there is also an increasing tendency to provide the humanitarian and religious regulations applying to the sojourners. The distinctions in favor of sojourners and strangers are as yet not highly refined. For example, meat which 'dieth of itself' may not be used by the Israelites, but may be sold to the sojourner or foreigner*, loans shall be released when owed by brethren whereas they may be exacted when owed by foreigners**; interest may be required in the case of loans to foreigners, but it is considered unjust to do so in case of loans to brethren***, etc.

But on the other hand we find over and over again the combination or formula, 'the sojourner, fatherless and widow', and sometimes it includes the Levite, in the commandments providing for mercy, equal justice, religious privilege and economic opportunity to be given them. Only once in the earliest documents does this combination appear, and this is in Exodus 22:21-22. If it may be considered as original here, it is significant to note how, not only the Deuteronomist, but also Jeremiah#, Ezekiel##, Zechariah###, Malachi### and even the Psalms### have taken up the refrain and echoed it down the ages, thus indicating that in the better natures of these people there was the element of compassion, democracy and justice.

The exclusive elements are manifest in such expressions as those demanding the segregation of Israel as a people, the destruction of the peoples as the work of Israel, the forbidding of entrance to the assembly of Jehovah to the Ammonites and Moabites, the injunction to hold the old grudge against the Amalekites, etc. As to the attitude toward slaves, we find that there is still little sentiment upon the matter. What in those times was considered entirely righteous and humane treatment for female captives of war is prescribed in Deuteronomy 21:10-14. Perhaps some generalization may be made on behalf of the slaves from the general attitude toward foreigners, for there must necessarily be some transfer of ideas in the consideration of the various classes of foreign peoples. But about all that may be said is that the Israelites were now vividly conscious of the problem of their foreign population, and out of their experience of relationships with them the prophets had established standards of attitude and conduct which found their way into the Deuteronomistic legislation, and to some extent into the life of the nation. The fact that they are in the laws may be taken to indicate that they were already incorporated in the opinion and practice of the nation. The more significant aspects of this advance will be taken up in the following section.

It remained for the third great code of our consideration to set forth the most advanced religious and humanitarian attitude of the Hebrew people toward foreigners. In the Holiness Code, which comes from the time of the Exile, and probably from the pen of Ezekiel, we have a sweeping review and expansion of the religious law of Israel with a more ethical motive and conception than has hitherto been found. Israel is to be holy because Jehovah is holy; thus the spirit of the work might be summarized. Herein we have a catalogue of many regulations and provisions with constant reference to the status of the sojourner in relation to them, and the attitude is, with practically no exception, that the same law shall avail for the house of Israel and the stranger that is within their gates. As an example of the frequency of this expression, it is found repeated four times in the single passage devoted to the matter of sacrifices: Another characteristic expression is, 'whether born at home or born abroad', and the usage uniformly implies equal standards. The matter of particular significance in this code is that the sojourner now comes under the provisions of the law so as to be responsible for keeping them the same as does the home-born Israelite. This advances his status greatly, and makes for the ultimate provision for his being admitted to the religious

*Lv.17:8-15.*
household of Israel as a 'proselyte'**: Then in far greater measure than in previous writings are found the exhortations and commands for the extending of tolerance and mercy to the sojourner. "Do the sojourner no wrong; love him as thyself"** is the climax of this advanced attitude. Yet the fact that such commands were incorporated must indicate that there was still discrimination, severe injustice and cruel oppression on the part of the Hebrews, and that the prophetic ideals had to be supported by the emphasis of legal enactment. And, further to compromise the improved situation, the Code itself contains such discriminations against the foreigners as make it impossible to arrive at any positive conclusion concerning the idealism of the times. For while sojourners have equal rights and responsibilities in the offering of sacrifices, observance of sabbaths and loyalty to Jahweh; there is nevertheless the persistent discrimination against the peoples inhabiting the land with the Hebrews***, the prohibition is made: "There shall no stranger eat of the holy thing"#, and the strangers are committed to bondage forever##. Another vivid contrast showing the extent of the problem, was that if a sojourner became rich he might hold slaves or bond servants of his own, whether they be of the Hebrews or of other peoples, and the standards applying were the same as in the case of the Hebrews.*# But that the strangers and sojourners were generally very poor is indicated by the frequent recurrence of the infer-

ence that they are subject to special consideration in such matters as gleaning the fields after the harvest*.

In chapter 26 of the Holiness Code, still further to confound the situation as to the ideal religious and moral conditions affecting the Israelites and the foreigners round about them, we find echoes of rank syncretism and idolatry, especially in verses 27–33, and we know from the records of the activities in the kingdom of Israel at this time that all of this is fully justified. The significant thing, however, is that the ideals did emerge and find their way, not only into the writings of the prophets and law-makers, but to an important extent into the consciousness of the Hebrew people. So, taking account of the problem of evil as it is found in great prevalence, we are still able to marvel at the breadth and depth of humane and spiritual insight attained by the Hebrews in their dealings with those foreigners who sojourned with them in bondage and slavery. The preeminently distinguishing fact of this attainment is that they conceived of it as inherent in their relation to the righteous and holy God, Jahweh, who was indeed the creator, father and lover of all mankind.

Interrmarriage with aliens added greatly to the complexity of the problem as to the attitude of the Hebrews toward them. We have already seen how provision was made for the marriage of a Hebrew with a captive maiden, and it is reasonable to suppose that in the times prior to monogamy

*Lv. 23:22.
as a marriage standard it was very common for Hebrews to take wives and concubines from among sojourning families and tribes, and to capture the women of their enemies in war and bring them into their own households. Indeed, this condition is commonly acknowledged and taken for granted throughout the earlier biblical records, and as Kent points out, laws against intermarriage with foreigners cannot be traced back beyond the late prophetic codes.* He attributes such references to the prohibition of foreign marriages as occur in Exodus 34:15-16 and Deuteronomy 7:1-4 to supplemental editorial addition at times little, if at all, earlier than the Babylonian Exile. He further suggests, plausibly enough, that the silence of the primitive codes on this subject may be explained by the references in the earlier historic narratives where the marriages of kings like David, Solomon and Ahab, and of private citizens like Samson and the mother-in-law of Ruth with foreigners, is a common practice uncondemned by their contemporaries and successors in prophetic and historic writing. It is not improbable that prior to the vigorous annunciation of his principle of non-alliance of the Hebrews with foreigners on the part of Elijah, the question of intermarriage was not much thought of, either by prophet or people. Even then it did not become effective until the exigencies of the Exile, which made it a necessity on the part of those Hebrews who were taken into Babylonia in order to preserve

*Kent, Israel's Laws and Legal Precedents, p 54.
their national identity. The peculiar problem in connection with the Exile will be taken up later. The fact that needs to be recognized at this point is that, regardless of later attitudes or precedents, the Hebrews intermarried widely enough with foreign peoples to extend their allegiance and relationships greatly. Their peculiar civilization and their worship of Jahweh were thereby communicated to many foreigners who were thus brought among them. Undoubtedly the fact of family ties to foreign peoples had much to do with the gradual extension of protection, privilege and fellowship to them, as indeed, it brought outside influences to bear upon Israelitish religious tendencies.

It has been suggested that foreign marriages were employed by kings to strengthen their alliances and international positions. Examples of this are David's marriage to Abigail a Kalebite and Maacah a Geshurite*, his sister's marriage to Ithra, and Ishmaelite**, Solomons harem with Pharaoh's daughter, Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians, and Hittites***, Ahab and Jezebel#, and numerous other cases. While intermarriage with the Canaanites was forbidden, and mixed marriages generally met with disfavor in prophetic circles, it is nevertheless quite within the range of possibility that such amalgamations had as much to do as war with the subduing and absorbing of the people of the land, and that the foreign wives became the first connecting links in joining Hebrew interests to those of foreigners.

#I K. 16:31.
D. The Religious Condition of Settled Aliens in Israel.

The religious condition of settled aliens in Israel was determined largely by the general attitude of the Israelites that they participated in the patronage of the god or gods of whatever locality they occupied. Especially in the earlier times, and up to the time of the prophets, the liberty to worship national, tribal and purely local deities prevailed. Local sanctuaries for this worship were very numerous, and for the thinking of the time there was no conflict between this situation and the worship of Jahweh by the Hebrews. In this respect it would appear that there was little concern for the exclusive worship of Jahweh. But the common idea of the patronage of local gods, known to us as 'tutelary deities', emphasized the worship of Jahweh on the part of the 'gerim' who were in the territory of the Hebrews. For an example of this II Kings 17:24-26 may be taken, where the foreigners who were brought into the cities of Samaria to displace the Israelites, upon proceeding to establish their foreign worship, found themselves in ill fortune which was attributed to their not giving allegiance to Jahweh, the 'god of the land'. Of course, such an account seems very primitive as compared to the loftier expressions of the supremacy of Jahweh in the prophetic writings, but it has significance, nevertheless, in showing this one thing;-- that the tendency
was developing among the Hebrews to regard the foreigners as under necessity to worship and serve Jahweh.

Even in the time of the ascendancy of the united kingdom under Solomon there was the great example of tolerance and patronage of foreign gods and foreign worship, expressed in his building sanctuaries at Jerusalem for the foreign deities of his wives and court visitors: "Then did Solomon build a high place for Chemosh the abomination of Moab, in the mount that is before Jerusalem, and for Molech, the abomination of the children of Ammon". It will be noticed that the record here makes it very clear that this act on the part of Solomon "was evil in the sight of Jahweh". While this reflects the religious attitude from the later date of this writing, there is no justification for thinking that the act of Solomon was generally offensive in his own day. There is no record of any objection being raised against Solomon's act in his own day. Not only Solomon, but Jeroboam I, Ahab and other kings besides manifested this tendency toward syncretism; but as the traffic in cosmopolitan religion increased the prophetic voices of protest began to arise. Jeroboam I had to face the brave protest of Ahijah who, while the report comes to us with later Deuteronomic color and sentiment, revealed that the prophetic attitude of the period was against syncretism. The fact of his interest in the possible disruption of the monarchy indicates that he was able to

recognize the religious peril in the king's loose policy. Then, the experience of Ahab with the fiery prophet Elijah is an even more emphatic repudiation of the suggestion that no one cared much what gods were worshiped in Israel. The prophetic protest against heathen gods goes back to Moses. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." This is the command of Jahweh. It would seem that the consciousness of the election of Israel was the cradle in which was nurtured the principle of ethical monism, and that syncretism has ever had conscientious objecters in Israel.

But it took ages for these ideas to come into wide enough circulation to be very effective, and in all probability, it was generally considered righteous for Solomon, and also expedient and democratic, to provide for the elaborate religious program that had sway in his kingdom.

In the Deuteronomistic writings, as has been noted above, there is a great advance in the attitude toward the religious condition of 'gerim', and the Priestly Code is even more distinctly committed to giving them religious opportunity practically upon a par with that of the Hebrews. In that the Deuteronomistic regulations tended to check the syncretism, which would have been the natural growth out of the earlier situation with its many local deities, they had to make adjustments for the 'gerim' whereby they could have the opportunity to worship Jahweh. This they did with remark-
able completeness. 'Gerim' were given equality with the Israelites in numerous important ceremonial observances. They were allowed to participate in the feast of weeks*, the feast of tabernacles**, the offering of the first fruits***, the sabbath rest#, the tithes##, the gleanings of the field### and were given equal justice in humane consideration of their lowly social and civic status. "Thou shalt not oppress a hired servant that is poor and needy, whether he be of thy brethren or of thy sojourners that are in thy land within thy gates*#.

This marked a very great step forward in the matter of the religious situation of the sojourners in Israel, and made possible an experience of religious kinship which led both to the later universal ideals of the prophets and the proselyting movement.

The Deuteronomic regulations were the most liberal and equal provisions ever made by the Hebrews for their sojourners. More advanced ground was taken by the Priestly Code, but in a way to be more restricting and formalistic. The example previously cited of the regulation with regard to the use of meat "that dieth of itself", and that therefore was considered to be ceremonially unclean for use by the Israelites is again in point. Deuteronomy forbids its use by the Israelites, but specifies that they may dispose of it by selling to their sojourners, who do not as yet make the distinction in ceremonial terms (much less in hygienic!);

whereas the Priestly Code makes the same requirement of ceremonial purging for both Israelite and sojourner in the case of defilement through the use of such meat. It is to be noted that the Priestly Code sets the higher standard of religious equality for the sojourners, and in this indicates that there actually was at that time the tendency to accept them into the religious life of the Israelites.

The rite of circumcision was considered to be of primary religious importance among the Hebrews, and, in fact, it was observed among other peoples of the east to some extent. Even during the early periods of the development of the religion of Israel, emphasis began to be laid upon it as to be enforced among the sojourners. In the account of the institution of the rite, in the covenant of God with Abraham as set forth by the Priestly Narrative*, the matter is made very inclusive: "... Every male among you shall be circumcised. ... and it shall be a token of a covenant betwixt me and you. ... every male throughout your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any foreigner, that is not of thy seed. ... And the uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant."** In extending the privilege of celebrating the feast of the passover to the sojourners, the Priestly Code makes circumcision the essential preparation: "And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee,

* Gen. 17:10ff.
and will keep the passover to Jehovah; let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as one born in the land; but no uncircumcised shall eat thereof. One law shall be to him that is home born, and unto the stranger that sojourneth among you". When in the later times of the more exclusive attitude on the part of the Hebrews, we find that the priests still held to the policy of circumcising foreigners. The prophet Ezekiel considered it obligatory, and in his later religious refinement refers to it as applying to spiritual as well as physical perfecting. He was concerned with the fact that the Israelites had become remiss in enforcing the regulation among foreigners, and in keeping with such formalistic delinquency, had also become indifferent to the matter of keeping their worship free from the evil influence of foreigners. The text in question reads as follows: "O ye house of Israel, let it suffice you of all your abominations, in that ye have brought in foreigners, uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh, to be in my sanctuary, to profane it, even my house. . ."* For Ezekiel the terms 'heart' and 'flesh' here seem to be parallel ones. While the statement is negative in its attitude toward foreigners, it would nevertheless appear that the prophet would concede that, were foreigners circumcised in heart and flesh, they might not be unacceptable in the sanctuary of Israel. The subsequent statement, "and they

*Eze. 44:8ff.
have broken my covenant", (according to the marginal reference in the American Standard Version of the Bible), probably refers to the covenant with Abraham, cited above.

The settled aliens in Israel had a large measure of practical religious privilege affording them the benefits of the religious life of the nation, and establishing their religious kinship with the Hebrews. In view of all the oppression, discrimination and exclusiveness which was manifest toward them prior to the extremes of the post-exilic period, it may still be said with confidence that the Children of Israel, the Eleot of Jahweh, had a real missionary experience in admitting the sojourner into their religious life. Out of this experience came the noble conceptions of the prophets which take their place of insight and authority above all the confusion and strife of persecution, hatred and aloofness.
III. THE UNIVERSALITY OF THE PROPHETS.

The great prophets of Israel, motivated by their religious zeal and moral ideals, attained to conceptions far in advance of the thought and feelings which were prevalent in their times. In fact, many of these conceptions still await general acceptance, and are considered visionary and impractical. But while a prophet may be ahead of his times, it is obvious enough that he has to take his start from contemporary situations, and that what progress he makes can be only upon such a foundation. It is true that there are genius and inspiration, but they have to play upon men and affairs as they are, and not as they ought to be. The great religious, ethical and social visions of the Hebrew prophets reveal something more than just what has been seen by them to be true, good and essential to the welfare of the people and nation. They reveal in vivid, flaming expression that of which there is already some gleam in the life and affairs of their day, and their genius and inspiration consist in their power to discern for their people that which, at heart, they already partially know. In our study of the attitude of the prophets toward foreigners we shall discover that it reflects what were the better ideals (and the worse as well) with regard to the religious responsibility of Israel toward them.
A. The Moral Conceptions of the Prophets.

Professor Knudson points out that prophecy was a recognized institution in Israel, and that it was the mission of the prophets to communicate to the people of Israel the word of Jahweh. They were the creative thinkers of the nation, and it was upon the nation that they fixed their attention principally, preaching for a redeemed and transformed society,—the kingdom of God.* In this function they constantly gave attention to the relation of the Israelites to foreign peoples, for they were alert to the influences which would tend to corrupt and dissipate the true worship of Jahweh. This led, naturally enough, to the attitude of exclusiveness, and we find it set forth in most vigorous fashion again and again. On the other hand, the prophets were deeply concerned with the moral issues of Jahweh's justice, mercy and love, and this devotion outweighed the former interest. Thus it was that the moral conceptions of the prophets ultimately resolved into the idea that all nations were included in Jahweh's judgment, favor and reign. We have seen how the earlier codes of the law revealed the practical situation of foreigners dwelling in Israel in an unideal situation, where they were tolerated and accorded an increasing measure of religious and social privilege, but under conditions of discrimination and prejudice. This was the result of

*Prophetic Movement in Israel, Ch. I.
current social forces, custom, and the general state of civilization. Now, over and against this practical situation, in which the prophets had their full share of participation, we find the unescapeable prophetic attitude developing with its ideal conception of universality.

The earliest conspicuous prophetic attitude toward foreign peoples is that of Elijah in his campaign against Assyrian Baalism during the reign of Ahab and his foreign wife, Jezebel. But here the cause was not made so much against any class or group of foreigners as such as it was against the organized foreign worship which was gaining a footing in the land. It was yet too early for any advanced attitude of exclusiveness. It must be recognized, however, that it was characteristic of the times to consider the 'nations' as embodying a wide range of undesirable and evil qualities. The prophets, especially Ezekiel, Nehemiah and Ezra, frequently made use of such words and phrases as 'wicked', 'unclean', 'worshipers of idols', etc., in their contempt and hatred for foreign people. Even the words 'peoples', 'nations' and 'heathen' became synonymous with all that was considered objectionable in foreigners. This attitude became practically habitual insofar as the literary expression of the Old Testament writers is concerned, and it recurs with increasing prevalence throughout the course of the prophetic writings. But withal there is also the development of the idea that these non-Israelitish people
are objects of pity and mercy, as well as of aversion and scorn. With the increasing complexity of Hebrew society, there became manifest these indications of a better understanding and appreciation of the foreigners.

Amos, the first of the literary prophets, in one sense of the word sets forth an intense doctrine of exclusiveness. His concern is for Israel, the chosen people of Jahweh. It is on account of their religious and moral delinquencies that he is moved to pronounce his terrible message of doom upon them. But his fundamental moral insight gives universal scope to his message. He realized that the Israelites were complacent in their assurance of being the elect of Jahweh, and that they were depending upon external, formal religious observance which had been corrupted and debased, rather than maintaining the godly ideals which were their national heritage from the covenant of Sinai. So his vision of doom takes the remarkable position that Jahweh will not discriminate in their favor just because he chose them once. Because of their sins they will be punished in unremitting justice. Through their sins they violate the trust which Jahweh placed in them when he chose them. He created the other peoples of the world as well as the Israelites, and, to him, there can be no distinction except upon the basis of morality and obedience. "Are ye not as the children of the Ethiopians unto me, 0 children of Israel? saith Jehovah. Have not I brought up Israel out of
the land of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir?" (9:7). In commenting upon this marvellous utterance, Professor Knudson says: "Jehovah's protecting care was not confined to Israel. It was universal. It had brought the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir; nothing, then, in Israel's outward history afforded her any ground for presuming upon the divine clemency. Whatever preeminence she possessed was to be found in the special revelation which Jehovah had made to her of his character and will. This revelation she had spurned. She, therefore, had no advantage over other nations. She meant no more to Jehovah than the distant and despised Ethiopians". Thus the inevitable logic of the moral law is in the direction of universality.

The Prophet Hosea follows hard upon the teachings of Amos with respect to the relation of iniquity to doom. For him, Israel has incurred the wrath of Jahweh through wickedness and infidelity, and the election of the nation will not be sufficient cause for his sparing the punishment thereof. This, as we have seen is an important element in clearing the grounds for universalism, for it eliminates Israel's unique security in her confidence of election. He is exceedingly severe in his condemnation of social injustice and mal-practice, and while the general inference must be that he refers to such conditions as prevailing between the various strata of Hebrew life, it is not an
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impossible presumption that he would include those of the sojourners who were subjected to abuse as objects of his compassion, and also those who may have come into wealth and corruption like that of the Israelites as objects of his ire.

But Hosea denounces foreign alliances* and applies his prophesying to Israel alone. The doom pronounced by him upon Israel is equivalent to a recognition of her loss of the unique position of election, and in this respect compares with that of Amos, although he does not set forth that any other people will receive Israel's birthright in her stead. His great emphasis upon the wickedness of idolatry, and upon all kinds of prevailing social crime and immorality would seem to apply to the non-Israelites as well as to the Israelites, but there is no basis for any conclusion that he was interested in foreigners as participants in divine favor and the religious privileges of Israel. His evident attitude toward the syncretism under the reign of Jeroboam I was that of supreme disapproval. It would seem that his part in the development of the attitude of universalism as applied to the welfare of foreigners was negative and inferential only. There is, however, the moral and spiritual insight which justifies our feeling that the religion of Hosea was universally applicable. He sees that the real values in life are spiritual, and that redemption is to be through divine love. There is a faith

*7:11, 10:8, 12:1, 5:13, 8:13, 9:13, 11:5.
that cannot be held exclusively for any one nation. Thus the conception of Jahweh's love which we find in Hosea's writings forms a part of the enrichment of the faith, making way for loftier human ideals.

The prophet Isaiah (that is, the first Isaiah, Chapters 1-39) makes his outstanding contribution to Israel in teaching faith as the condition of salvation. As in the case of the former prophets, his interest is centered upon Israel. He sustains their prophetic attitude of disfavor toward foreign alliances, as in his denunciation of that with Egypt*, but on the other hand he seems to believe that they are binding when once entered upon. At least, it is not well to violate one alliance to take up a worse one. It is with him that there appear the first great utterances upon the matter of universality. While he has the strict point of view of Israel's salvation and spiritual leadership, he nevertheless takes high ground in his conceptions that other nations are to share in the judgment of Jehovah. He is liberal in his dispensation of doom, but through it all he sees a ray of hope, which he gives expression in such passages as these: "And it shall come to pass in the latter days, that the mountain of Jehovah's house shall be established on top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow to it. And many peoples shall go and say, Come ye and let us go up to the mountain of Jehovah, to the house of the God of Jacob; *30:1-7; 31:1-3."
and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of Jehovah from Jerusalem. And he will judge between the nations, and will decide concerning many peoples; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more!**  "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the root of Jesse, that standeth for an ensign of the peoples, unto him shall the nations seek; . . . .  And he will set up an ensign for the nations, and will assemble the outcasts of Israel. . "**  ** " . . and the sojourner shall join himself with them, and they shall cleave to the house of Jacob"***. While some critics would wish to have these passages otherwise assigned than to this Isaiah, it must be admitted that here they stand mighty testimonies of the faith and vision of some great spirit who was able to see foreign peoples in the light of their universal relationship to the kingdom of Jahweh. Whether it be Isaiah, as it seems reasonable to believe, or some other voice out of the unknown, we find in him those elemental characteristics of high moral and spiritual discernment which give to religious faith its eternal scope, and in his revelation of the character of Jahweh is found also the fundamental principle leading outward and upward into universalistic application.

Micah made his contribution to the growth of the spirit

of universalism in his proclamation of the rights of the poor. While he also was undoubtedly confined in his interests to his own people, in him we find another idea of real significance in the rise of the greater religious and social idealism. Justice, kindness and humility are the desire of Jahweh. This idea is given its most powerful utterance in that famous passage containing the words: "... what doth Jehovah require of thee, but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God?"*

The essential message of this passage is directed against just such things as made for the exclusiveness in the religion of the Hebrews. They had gone to seed in a formalistic, ceremonial type of religion, the very nature of which set them off from the other peoples. We have seen how the provisions for sojourners in Deuteronomy and Leviticus required elaborate ceremonial observances upon their part before they could be admitted to the privileges of the worship of Jahweh. Furthermore, while the glamor of their ceremonialism may have appealed to outsiders to some extent, its objectionable features only served to make the Hebrews the more disagreeable to them. Micah is setting forth a religious teaching which is universally applicable. Certainly this cannot be limited merely to Judah. The tolerance revealed in any such spirit must make for an

---
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attitude of benevolence and sympathy for the peoples of all races.

Following these prophets there came the period of the Babylonian Exile, which will be considered in its own place. But by the way of keeping continuous the treatment of Hebrew prophecy, we shall proceed now to the analysis of the attitude of the prophets of this period, i.e., Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Zephaniah, Nahum and Habakkuk. The prophets coming still later than these will be taken up in the next section.

Zephaniah is interesting for his foretaste of apocalyptic utterance. His idea of universal doom, while gloomy enough, partakes of sufficient breadth of view to seem to include all the world as under Jahweh's wrath and dominion. Nahum's doom is upon Nineveh, and as Professor Knudson points out, this is "the first prophetic book directed wholly against a foreign city or people"*. He interprets foreign peoples and influences, to quote further, as "the chief obstacle to the divine rule in the world." This idea, as we shall see, had predominance among the Jews of later times, and became the position in which they attained to great exclusiveness. Habakkuk fixes upon a unique speculative problem, inquiring why it is that Jahweh permits the wicked to go unpunished. This he answers by attributing the mission of divine justice to the Chaldeans and Babylonians. The anomaly of this unprecedented atti-
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tude toward foreign people is reconciled by the bringing on of still another new, universal religious ideal: "The righteous shall live by his faithfulness"**. Thus the application of this principle must lead to granting the righteous man of whatever people the certainty of salvation through faith.

Jeremiah revealed the great principle of the inwardness of religion, and demonstrated it in his personal life. While, coming as he does from exilic times, he is naturally of externally exclusive tendencies, he is nevertheless, by virtue of his high spiritual conceptions, a marker of a new level in the religious conceptions of the age, and the fact that inner principles and criterions of religious life are so mightily set forth and applied by him has much to reveal as to the development of more idealistic religious thought and practice. No man could cherish Jeremiah's personal piety and his sympathy and compassion for his own people without a tendency also to have regard for others.

Professor Knudson points out the significant fact that Jeremiah, in connection with his prophetic call, was commissioned to be a missionary to the nations*;—not that he was to leave his home to sojourn abroad with his message but that the fate of Israel was involved with that of other nations, and that they were all comprehended in Jahweh's reign; therefore, his prophetic utterances had their bearing upon the affairs of the other nations.

**Hab.2:4, Professor Kundson's translation.
Ezekiel's emphasis upon the ideal of the individual has a direct transfer to our concern for universality, for in his assertion that Jahweh has no pleasure in the death of the wicked*, there is the implication of his love for all peoples. Ezekiel, however, seems to have meant this in the sense of applying particularly to Israel, for it would be out of harmony with his general attitude of exclusiveness (which will be examined in the following section) to allow for the entrance of foreign peoples into the precincts of Judaism.

Before the consideration of the post-exilic prophets it will be desirable to proceed with the situation with regard to the attitude of the Hebrews toward foreigners as it actually existed during this period of the great moral conceptions. For the actual situation throughout stands in an unfavorable contrast with the idealism which we have discovered.

To summarize this situation briefly, we may point out that all foreign peoples were considered wicked and ceremonially unclean, and that this attitude increased rather than diminished. While national affairs were steeped in rottenness and intrigue, and the kings plunged their nations into one compromise after another, both religious and political, there nevertheless was the increasing opposition to mixture through intermarriage. The idea persisted that the Hebrews were Jahweh's chosen people, and that foreigners were
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incapable and ineligible to participate in their religion.

It is notable, on the other hand, that there was an idea which developed out of Israel's military calamities, that Jahweh was employing the nations to punish the Israelites for their sins. This was a prophetic and priestly idea, but it could well find lodgment in the minds of the afflicted people. Of course, such an idea would not tend to make the Israelites have a more kindly attitude toward the foreigners, and it had the defect that often the nations went too far with their punishment, and the worm had to turn. It was impossible for the Hebrews to interpret their tragic defeats in this light for very long at any one time.

Thus, while the people floundered in the confusion of their national and social decay, the great prophets got a grip upon the fundamental truths of religion, and so wrote them into the records and lives of their people as to make irrevocable the principle of the universality of the dominion and love of Jahweh, and the all-inclusiveness of his kingdom. Where the earlier codes of law, and the histories as found in the chronicles of the nation indicate the practical situations as they were, now we have in the prophets the revelation of things as they ought to be. In the records we find the modifications of the Hebrew attitude toward foreigners as they were affected by several factors. In the first place there was the almost universal fact of hospitality which had its laws in the customs of the peo-
ple, and wherever the traveler gained entrance to household, tribe or clan, there he was protected with a faithfulness that went far toward breaking down the intertribal and international misunderstandings. Then the political alliances to which most of the prophets objected so strenuously, and which brought so many serious complications into Israelitish national affairs, did much to bind them in interdependence with other peoples. The needs of commerce were intermingled with the practice of hospitality and the making of alliances, and, as has been pointed out, there was the profound effect of foreign religion and customs in broadening the Hebrew attitude toward the peoples among whom they lived.

Attention has already been devoted to the consideration of the Deuteronomic regulations with regard to foreigners. It has been shown that there was a significant, increasing tendency to provide for their welfare, both socially and religiously, as sojourners in Israel. The normal outcome of this led to a very important development in the relation of the sojourner to the Hebrew, i.e., in that the practice of making proselytes grew up. This practice made foreigners into members of the community as virtual converts to Judaism who had the privileges of the religious life of the Hebrews, and conformed to all the rites and standards. These later came to have a significant place in the religious life of Israel. The liberality which made this extension of religious privilege possible was a distinct development and achievement,
and is a significant approach to what might be considered an assumption of missionary responsibility on the part of the Hebrews for the sojourners within their gates. The significance of this movement will be reviewed in the following section.
IV. THE SUBSEQUENT REACTIONS.

It has already been intimated that the achievements of the prophets through their gleams of universal conception did not pervade the whole of Israel. But no people or series of events can ever utterly obliterate progress which has once been truly made. The die had been cast, and the influence of Hebrew religion and culture had been so largely given to the world as to affect profoundly the course of civilization and religion, and direct it along lines of righteousness, faith and human brotherhood. The subsequent reactions in which occurred the utter breakdown of the nation of Israel, the resulting Babylonian captivity and eventual release, and the final great rally of Hebrew national effort under the Maccabees, in spite of their bitterness and disillusionment, were not sufficient to overcome this marvelous influence which had gone before. Furthermore, it was out of these times of darkness that there came the sublime voice of the second Isaiah, who gave climactic utterance to the idea of universality, and proclaimed for all mankind the message of a world-wide religion.

A. The break-down of the nation of Israel, and the Babylonian Captivity. (586-538 B.C.)

After about four hundred years of national life, in which took place the religious and social development we have been examining with regard to the situation of foreigners,
Jerusalem was overcome by the Chaldeans in the year 586 B.C. They made a thorough business of destroying the city, and they led into bondage the most representative people. This most important group were carried into Babylon, while another group were transported to Egypt. A third and more numerous, though less important group were allowed to remain in their home-land, Palestine, as peasantry. It is in connection with those who were led into Babylonia that the great religious development of this period took place. There, the only means of preserving their identity as a people and as a religious body was for them to adhere to a strict policy of exclusiveness. Their own religious beliefs and practices, in contrast with those they found in Babylonia, seemed very precious to them. As they were away from the land and the city of their religious associations, they had only those means of religious observance which they had been able to bring with them or improvise in the foreign land. Thus they were limited to the more spiritual and subjective forms of religious expression. This fact, taken together with the great emotional complex arising out of their condition of bondage, became the impetus to great religious activity, and in the period of the exile much of the richest of Israel's literature was produced. The exile, for the Hebrews who were carried into Babylonia, may be considered as a time of refinement and chastening, but this process brought with it certain austere
effects which contributed to the feeling of bitterness toward all other peoples. They became more keenly sensitive of the spiritual superiority of their religious conceptions, and the gross beliefs and practices of the other religions were offensive to them. Their rigorous adherence to the policy of keeping their national identity unmixed with that of the foreign country gave them a hard sense of exclusiveness. The unaccustomed hardships and deprivations tried them severely, and caused them to feel that they belonged peculiarly apart from other people. On the other hand, their experience of individual opportunity in the foreign land, taken with the necessity of adapting themselves to their changed environment broke the spell of their former provincialism, and they became people, not of a mere country, but of the whole world.

It was from the exile that Deutero Isaiah acclaimed his ideal of world religion, and his preaching standing alone against all that went before or came after is enough to justify a conclusion that the worship of Jahweh could, and would be the faith of all peoples. He cries out:

"Assemble yourselves and come; draw near together, ye that are escaped of the nations: they have no knowledge that carry the wood of their graven image, and pray unto a god that cannot save. Declare ye, and bring it forth; yea, let them take counsel together: who hath showed this from ancient time? who hath
declared it of old? have not I, Jehovah? and there is no God else besides me, a just God and a Saviour; there is none besides me. Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else. By myself have I sworn, the word is gone forth from my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear."

This process of universal conversion will take place by way of individual persons, and will be a sort of proselyting process on a great scale:

"... they shall spring up among the grass, as willows by the watercourses. One shall say, I am Jehovah's; and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob; and another shall subscribe with his hand unto Jehovah, and surname himself by the name of Israel"**.

The new universal kingdom will include the high and mighty, and their subjects as well:

"Kings shall see and arise; princes, and they shall worship; because of Jehovah that is faithful"***.

"I will establish my justice for a light of the peoples. My righteousness is near, my salvation is gone forth, and mine arms shall judge the peoples; the isles shall wait for me, and on mine arm shall they trust"#.

---

In achieving this wonderful result, Israel, the broken and scattered people, the nation which is no more, is to become a missionary power, and is to have a missionary obligation:

"I Jehovah have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thy hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the dungeon . . ."*

He recognizes that Israel is not awake to her responsibility:

"Hear, ye deaf; and look, ye blind, that ye may see. Who is blind, but my servant? or deaf as my messenger that I send? who is blind as he that is at peace with me, and blind as Jehovah's servant?"**

Deutero Isaiah conceives of Israel's missionary responsibility as being accomplished through vicarious suffering, that is, he is to be the suffering servant:

"He was despised, and rejected of men; a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief: and as one from whom men hide their face he was despised; and we have esteemed him not.

"Surely he hath born our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with

his stripes we are healed"*

In this conception of Israel as the suffering servant, it would appear that the mission is both an actual and an ideal one,—that the two are blended in this view. The service is to be actually rendered in suffering and sacrifice, and this experience on the part of the servant is to be the distinctive characteristic of his divine calling. Herein is to be Israel's missionary contribution to the whole world, and for all time, and an equally justifiable conclusion would be that this quality of servitude is to be the heritage of all who come under subjection to this divine mission.

But this last deduction is ahead of Isaiah's time. As Wellhausen has interpreted him, his creed is, "there is no God but Jehovah, and Israel is His prophet"**: 

"... yea, he saith, it is too light a thing that thou shouldst be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth.***

With this transcending climax we must rest our case as to the missionary vision of this great prophet. Needless to say, he was not understood nor believed in his own day, nor have mankind yet come fully into the breadth of vision manifested by him so long ago. But his flaming spirit shines out down the centuries, at once marking a great

advance in the thinking of the ages, and a lofty spiritual standard for the guiding of all people.

C. The Return from Captivity.

When, after fifty years in Babylonia, the exiles were given permission by Cyrus to return and rebuild their city and temple, a new leadership sprang up under which developed the attitude and actual practices of intolerance, exclusiveness and persecution in which we have to view the closing period of Hebrew history. Under Joshua a priest and Zerubbabel a prince royal, a selected group of Hebrews made the long journey back to Jerusalem. They made such restorations of altars and began such ceremonies and feasts as they were able, and had a revival of religious fervor which led them onward in their attempt to restore the former conditions. The matter for our particular interest was that they immediately took the position that the people of the land, who were largely of Jewish blood, but had depreciated through intermarriage during the time of the exile, were not worthy of admission to their new circle of religious reorganization. This discrimination made the so-called people of the land enemies, and started a factionalism which caused great harm.* The completion of the temple and the termination of the exile allowed for the free development of the new organization along priestly lines, with elaborate ritualization, admixture of Babylonian and Persian thought, elevation of

of the Priesthood to supreme authority, and gradual abandonment of the prophetic viewpoint. This made for the firm establishment of an almost entirely new religion, if we may so discriminate with regard to the transition from the exile to the building of the temple and its subsequent worship and government, and this new achievement is known as Judaism.

In this period there developed two great personalities whose influence counts for much in our study of the relation of Hebrews toward foreigners. They were Ezra and Nehemiah. The reforms which they established won out for exclusiveness and separatism to the extent of breaking down the tendency of intermarriage between the exiles and the people of the land. They involved matters of ceremonial observance as well, but the prohibition of mixed marriages and the actual situation in which many marriages of long standing were broken up under priestly constraint and popular concession are of outstanding significance. This was a decided break with the ideals which had developed with the prophets from the exile and before, and it appears that the eventual decay of this new Judaism must have had its roots in the immorality of this policy of exclusiveness and separatism. It is but a corollary of a modern contention that a Church which does not have a missionary spirit cannot long exist.

An important survival from the exile, and even the times

prior, was the custom of making proselytes, to which reference has already been made. The proselyte was the stranger who had been made a member of the Jewish Church. According to Berthelet, this had become a common thing by the fourth century B.C. "Der Ger ist Proselyt geworden", is his terse putting of it*. The proselyting activity of the Hebrews was not developed greatly until during the time of the exile, when they were no longer confined to their narrow national environs, and when they had begun to lose their hold upon the idea of a national existence as such. Then it was that they were thrown into intimate contact and relationships with people who were much below them in the religious scale. The Hebrews may have felt that their strength consisted not so much in a community of mere nationals as in a community of faithful believers, and while they may have entertained aversion and disgust for the religious observances of these people, they must have also been moved to sympathy, as well. At least this does not seem to be a hard presumption in the light of the moral and spiritual achievements of the prophets of these times. Furthermore, the non-Israelites who came into contact with these superior exiles must have been impressed favorably by their character and faith, and drawn to seek the religious character which they manifested. That the Hebrews themselves were moved to respond to their opportunity to make proselytes is confidently asserted.

*Berthelet, p 178.
by Gilroy in his article on Proselyte in the Dictionary of the Bible: "The Hebrews themselves seem to have responded to their opportunity with a quickened enthusiasm for humanity and a higher ideal of their national existence, in the providence of God, among the nations of the earth. . . . They were convinced of the claim of God to the homage of men everywhere, the universalism of their revelation of truth and duty, and their own fitness to bring the world to God."* So along with the movement of the exile and the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the temple afterward, even in the times of severe discrimination against the people of the land, there were proselytes among the Hebrews, and the system was fostered until it became a characteristic element in Judaism. There was something of a double standard, whereby it seemed possible to admit the sojourner to the proselyte's status if he was willing to submit to circumcision, cleansing or baptism, and to make the sacrifice, but which kept the barriers of exclusiveness up as concerned all other foreigners. This system stands in marked contrast to the general situation of exclusiveness which developed following the exile, and indicates that there was truly a survival of the spirit of universalism, warped, to be sure, but allowing for the continuation of religious influence among non-Israelitish peoples.

Then, there were certain Israelitish thinkers who

protested in one way or another against the attitude of exclusiveness and separatism, as for example, Jonathan the son of Asahel and Jahzeiah the son of Tikvah who are reported in Ezra 10:15 to have "stood up against this matter (of the putting away of foreign wives)", or, to take a much more suggestive case, the authors of the books of Ruth and of Jonah.

The book of Ruth is significant as standing in marked contrast to all other canonical books with the one exception of Jonah, on the matter of exclusiveness toward foreigners. Through the telling of a charming story of the loyalty and devotion of Ruth, a Moabitess, and the liberality and kindness of Boaz an Israelite, the author leads up to the matter of the ancestry of David, showing him to be a direct descendant of Ruth. This story is told with such effectiveness as to disarm any objection or aversion to foreigners, and therefore is thought to involve a protest against the current bitter discrimination. Significant as this point is, it has to be qualified by the acknowledgement that we cannot know certainly whether this effect was intended, or that there was anything more in the author's purpose than the relating of a beautiful tale. But the fact that such a story could hardly have been related by one in sympathy with the contemporary attitude toward foreigners remains to strengthen the contention that this little book contains an important minority point of view, and therefore it seems
plausible to postulate this vital, human sentiment as having a real place after all in the thought and feeling of the time.

The book of Jonah is considered the most distinctly missionary polemic of all the Old Testament literature. Herein the prophet Jonah is represented as the narrow, exclusive, nationalistic man, a good type of what the whole Israelitish people must have been. He heard the call to preach to Nineveh, which may be interpreted as a type of all the Gentile world, but evaded it by taking flight. Jonah's predicament with the whale may also be taken as representing the punishment which came upon the nation when it was swallowed up by Babylon. Also the effect of the punishment was not satisfactory, for it did not remedy the attitude toward the foreign world, but merely elicited the message of doom. The rebellious attitude of Jonah upon the repentance and salvation of Nineveh is entirely characteristic of the later Hebrew attitude toward those Hebrews of the land, who would have come into the privileges of the restored Jerusalem. Also, the detail of the gourd for Jonah's shelter brings out the prophet's selfish regard for his own well-being, and sets in vivid contrast Jehovah's greater regard for his people, and this again is not unlike the concern of the Israelites for their own comfort. The account of the humanity and democracy of
the sailors shows them up in a favorable light as foreign men. It would seem that no detail had been missed in the revelation of Israel's un-missionary attitude, and in the expression of one writer's conviction that the missionary obligation was appointed by Jehovah. The fact that such a marvelous point of view could be held at all in this period of rife anti-foreign spirit again reveals to us that the moral teachings and universal conceptions of the prophets were not in vain.

The anti-foreign attitude was not without its exponents among the prophets, as is illustrated by the brief contribution of Obadiah, with its doom on Edom and its doom on all peoples. It stands about as directly in contrast with Jonah as could possibly be.

D. The Maccabean Uprising in the 2nd Century B.C.

By 330 B.C., when the Greek period began, Judaism had come well into its own and done its greater work. Under the Greek rule abuses prevailed against which the Hebrews seemed unable protect themselves, but which brought them such hardship, both economically and religiously, as to incite within them very great antagonism and resentment. After the historic "Abomination of Desolation" and the extreme measures of Antiochus Epiphanes to 'hellenize' Palestine, there came forward the stalwart family of Mattathias, and the Jewish general Judas Maccabeus, who
succeeded in winning Jewish independence. This was a very strenuous time throughout for the Jews, and out of its trying experiences they gained a new sense of national unity, which was racial and religious, rather than political. Their various dispersions had made them a people of cosmopolitan outlook. They had come sufficiently under the influence of Greek culture so as to have their scriptures translated into the Greek language. Whether this was a product of proselytism or a means to it, or both, is not certainly known, but there was certainly a definite connection. While proselytism did not continue throughout this period as it had following the exile, there were still numerous adherents to the faith of Judaism who were not of Israelitish descent. But it was a time of the formation of parties and sects, with extremes in practically all directions, and especially, antagonisms between the Sadducees and Pharisees. It might be characterized as a time of ingrowing Judaism, illustrative again of the principle that a religious movement, in order to survive and flourish, must reach out and hold fast at the same time; that is, expand through missionary effort and conserve through inward purity.

The extreme intolerance and exclusiveness of this last period of Israelitish history has its characteristic illustration in what was, perhaps, the latest book to be included in the canonical writings,—the book of Esther.
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Herein is sounded a harsh note indeed for the closing passage of so majestic and profound a score. In the first place, its purpose is directly opposed to what ought to be the culmination of all religious idealism, and what we might hope to expect of Judaism on the basis of her greater prophets and statesmen. It is dedicated to the exaltation of the Jews, and sets them at the head of all things, even including the purposes and glory of Jahweh. This story is a case of history working for the welfare of Israel, and history which employs the most revolting and bloody savagery. Legalized slaughter of enemies for sake of vengeance and security, and carried out with a frenzy and wildness hard to imagine, is made the climax of this work. Triumphant Judaism is glorified in the extermination of foreigners. Thus we read: "And the Jews smote all their enemies with the stroke of the sword, and with slaughter and destruction, and did what they would unto them that hated them... This was done on the thirteenth day of the month of Adar, and on the fourteenth day of the same they rested, and made it a day of feasting and gladness."

The only religious result is the establishment of the feast of the days of Purim, and this was at the command of the vengeful queen, not their God.

But the exclusiveness of the Hebrews seems to have been turned to some final account on behalf of a better state of affairs, for, in a way, it had something to do with the early

*Esther 9:5,17.*
wide-spread Christian activity among the Gentiles... As we have seen, there was inseparably mixed with their most extreme intolerance the practice of proselyting, and the proselytes continued among them throughout. These always formed a means of connection with non-Israelites without the circle of Judaism, and upon whom the better aspects of Judaism must have made a strong impression. With the Jews and their proselytes scattered as they were at the beginning of the Christian era, it is quite certain that great numbers of Gentiles had come under Jewish influence, whether the Jews would have it so or not. These, unwilling to accept the requirements of proselytism, or directly excluded by the Jews, nevertheless made ready candidates for the early Christian Church. Gilroy states, "It is easy to understand how quickly the gospel would be adopted by these adherents of Judaism. Every synagogue would become the seed-plot of a Christian Church"*.

Thus, while it may be argued that the preparation for Christianity would have been more effective had the attitude of later Judaism been openly missionary toward foreigners, the fact remains that there was something inherent in the abiding religion of the Hebrews which laid hold upon other people and prepared them to receive and learn of the better way. Thus the final attitude, while openly hostile and exclusive, may be said to have been unable to overcome

*Hastings One Volume Dictionary, p 767.
the inner power and influence of this great religious movement. This influence was inherent therein, and, great as were the obstacles imposed by the slow learning and perverseness of the Hebrew people, and the tribulations through which they emerged into this last unsatisfactory state, it ever prevailed and developed until it afforded the broad and deep foundations upon which Christianity was ultimately enabled to build its new kingdom.

And this was what the Hebrews themselves desired, if we may trust their recorded visions, aspirations and expectations, as found throughout their wonderful literature in ever increasing richness and beauty.
V. CONCLUSION.......

The missionary attitude toward foreigners, which is manifest in Christianity does have its rise in the attitude of the Hebrews of Old Testament times toward the foreigners among whom they lived. It cannot be contended that they at any time assumed a direct missionary attitude or responsibility for peoples outside their race or nation; in fact, they were generally limited in their conceptions to the idea that they were the elect of Jahweh, and that no other peoples could share with them. But this idea was incidental only, and did not affect the intrinsic nature of their developing religious life as a people. In the development of their superior religion and culture there was produced the abiding and fruitful conception that the kingdom of Jahweh was universal in its scope and application. This conception of the great prophets was reached through their having had contact with foreign peoples, as well as through their having had contact with Jahweh and their own Hebrew country-men. These relations, and the attitudes which grew out of them were indispensable to these great seers and statesmen in their task of revealing Jahweh and his will to mankind. The revelations which they made grew out of their human experiences illuminated and exalted by their ever-brightening knowledge of the ways of Jahweh. After all, these ways are manifest principally
through his children, the sons of men, when they are striving to find him and serve him. Therefore, it was in the attitude of the Hebrew people, who, believing themselves to be the very elect of Jahweh, were able to lead the world of their time in religious achievement and power, that we find the roots of the missionary motive. Out of this leadership it was made possible for Christ to come bringing his kingdom and saying, "Salvation is from the Jews". Then, in his spirit it was possible for Paul to write to other foreign people, "there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: But Christ is all, and in all".

*Colossians 3:11.*
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