Boston University

OpenBU **http://open.bu.edu**

Boston University Theses & Dissertations Dissertations and Theses (pre-1964)

1939

Election in the old testament

https://hdl.handle.net/2144/4503

"Downloaded from OpenBU. Boston University's institutional repository."

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Dissertation

ELECTION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

by

Russell Chase Tuck

(A.B., Bates College, 1926; B.D., Newton Theological Institution, 1929; S.T.M., ibid., 1930; A.M., Harvard University, 1932.)

submitted in partial fulfilment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

1939

PhD
1939
t
copy 2

Approved

by

First Reader Elmer A. Leslie
Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Literature

Second Reader Robert H. Pfeiffer
Professor of Old Testament

TOPICAL OUTLINE

Outline

ELECTION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Introduction

I. The "choice pattern" among Israel's neighbors

A. In Assyria and Babylonia ..... p. 1

B. In Egypt ..... p. 2

C. In Moab ..... p. 3

II. The "choice pattern" in Israel - which history validates, while rejecting the belief as held by others..... p. 4

III. Scope of dissertation: analysis of two problems ... p. 5

A. What factors in the history of Israel gave rise to the belief that they were the chosen people?

B. How did the belief in their election affect their thinking and behavior?

Review of Work of Other Investigators

I. Kurt Galling ..... pp. 6 ff.

II. W. J. Phythian-Adams ..... pp. 10f.

III. J. M. P. Smith ..... pp. 11f.

IV. Jewish Theologians ..... p. 12

Part I. Historical Background

The Development of the Concept: Yahweh, God of Israel

I. The Revelation of Yahweh to Moses

A. The J and E accounts, Exodus 3, examined ..... pp. 14f.

B. The call of Moses ..... pp. 14f.

1. By a new God ..... p. 16

a. Moses came to know him through Jethro in Midian, - the Kenite hypothesis .... pp. 17ff.

b. Answers to arguments that Yahweh was known to Israel before Moses ..... pp. 19ff.

II. The Exodus

A. Moses' problem to persuade people to follow him simplified:

1. By his personality ..... pp. 22f.

2. By small number of Israelites in Egypt .... p. 23

3. By lot of affliction ..... p. 23f.

B. Moses' problem to persuade Pharaoh ..... p. 24

C. The crossing

1. Where and how of lesser importance ..... pp. 24f.

2. Of prime importance - the historic event .. pp. 26ff.

a. In literature

Ex. 15:21. Dt. 11:2ff. Is. 43:17f;51:9f. Ps. 66:6; 106:9ff. Etc.

III. The Wilderness

A. Evidence for the importance of Kadesh over Sinai pp. 30ff.

B. Welding process in operation ..... p. 33

1. Furthering of dependence on Kenites, Ex.18 . pp. 34ff.

2. A germinal covenant ..... p. 36

a. Its essence expressed in Jer. 7:22f.

IV. The Settlement in Canaan

A. Evidences of Yahweh's favor as revealed in literature

1. Judges 5 ..... pp. 39ff.

2. Gen. 9:25-27 ..... pp. 41f.

3. Gen. 49 ..... p. 42

B. Patriotism stimulated by threats of enemies ..... pp. 42f.

V. The Monarchy: Its establishment deepened the sense of Yahweh's favor

A. Glories of the monarchy ..... p. 44
and significance of Yahweh's favor ..... pp. 44f.

B. Evidences from literature ..... pp. 46ff.

1. Nu. 23f.

2. Dt. 33

3. J and E

a. J's national spirit

b. E's impression of national prosperity

VI. Conclusion ..... p. 50

Yahweh has shown his continuous protection and favoritism to Israel from the time when he first revealed himself to Moses. Through several centuries the belief in his guidance has been sustained by concrete evidences, and it finds its culmination in a sense of national well-being. It remains now for a religious genius to penetrade, to interpret, the deeper implications of Yahweh's relationship to Israel.

Part II

The Effect of the Idea of Election in Thinking and Behavior

I. The Eighth Century Prophets

Introduction: Historical background ..... p. 51

A. Amos

1. Israel not exempt from Yahweh's judgment - 2:6 ..... p. 52

2. Patriotism of masses and of Amos ..... pp. 52ff.

a. Day of Yahweh no guarantee of protection.

b. Neither the cultus

c. Annihilation almost certain

3. Conclusion: Because chosen, responsibility all the greater ..... p. 57

B. Hosea

1. The unique relationship between Yahweh and Israel

a. Yahweh's love and care paralleled in Hosea and Gomer ..... p. 58

b. The evidences in prophecy ..... p. 58f.

2. Relationship broken by Israel's sins

a. Religious ..... p. 60

b. Moral ..... p. 60f.

c. Political ..... p. 62f.

3. Yahweh's due

a. Not magic ..... p. 63f.

b. Not images ..... p. 64

c. But 'hesed' ..... p. 64f.

4. Judgment and Salvation ..... p. 65

5. Conclusion: Love must triumph in reestablishing the relationship ..... p. 66

C. Isaiah

1. Connection with predecessors ..... p. 67

2. Positive quality of Religion - Faith ..... p. 68

Note 7:9 28:18 30:15

a. Impossible to kindle faith

3. The remnant

a. The idea with Elijah and in Amos ..... p. 69

b. With Isaiah an early development
Compare 'Shear-Yashub' ..... p. 69

c. Faced with failure to inspire faith in
king and people, turns to disciples ... p. 70

d. Remnant a radical idea in Old Testament
An Israel within Israel ..... p. 71

e. Teaching: 10:20-23 28:16 ..... p. 72

f. Inviolability of Jerusalem a consequence
p. 72f.

4. The Messianic passages, if genuine, have
bearing ..... pp. 73ff.

5. Conclusion: Remnant, his outstanding contribution.

II. The Covenant - Old and New

Introduction: Historical background ..... p. 76

A. Deuteronomy

1. Date and its significance ..... p. 76ff.

2. Influence of prophets on central ideas
of Deuteronomy

a. Unique claim of Yahweh ..... p. 78ff.

b. Prohibition of images ..... p. 80

c. Ethical qualities of Yahweh ..... p. 80f.

d. Necessity to love Yahweh and fellow-man..... pp. 81ff.

3. Idea of Covenant in light of Deuteronomy

a. "Chosen" in theological sense, first in Dt..... pp. 83f.

(1) Israel unique recipient of Yahweh's Grace ..... pp. 84f.

b. Contribution of J to Deuteronomy ..... pp. 85ff.

c. The Deuteronomic code compared with Covenant Code of Exodus ..... pp. 89ff.

d. Decalogue - necessary to study before conclusion regarding Covenant ..... pp. 91ff.

(1) "J Decalogue" related to Covenant Code ..... pp. 92ff.

(2) Relation of E Decalogue to D. Decalogue ..... pp. 96ff.

(a) No relation to Sinai Covenant ..... p. 98

e. Book of the Covenant

(1) Post-Mosaic ..... p. 99
Hence no bearing on any germinal covenant in wilderness

f. Idea of Covenant gets first great significance in Deuteronomy ..... p. 99f.

B. Jeremiah

1. His greatest contribution, himself ..... p. 101

2. Influence of Hosea .....p. 101f.

3. Failure of Deuteronomic reform ..... p. 102

4. Effect of prophet's personal experience ... p. 102f.

a. Led to concept of individualism ..... pp. 102f.

5. New Covenant

a. Closely related to individualism ..... p. 103

b. Relation to Deuteronomic reform; outgrowth of its failure ..... p. 104f.

c. Hope in it for readjustment of relationship between Yahweh and Israel ..... p. 105

6. Yahweh in fellowship with individual Israelite ..... p. 106.

III. The Seventh Century Religious Thinkers

A. Introduction .....pp. 107f.

1. Reason for considering Zephaniah, Nahum and Habakkuk as a group

2. Historical background

B. Zephaniah ..... pp. 108f.

1. Aroused by Scythian invasion

2. Day of Yahweh universal

3. Way of escape for Judah: repentance

C. Nahum ..... pp. 109ff.

1. One theme: Fall of Nineveh

a. Intense nationalism

(1) Result: low estimate of Nahum

b. Fall of Nineveh would vindicate prophet's faith in Yahweh

D. Habakkuk ..... pp. 111ff.

1. The prophet's concern

a. Seeming lack of control by Yahweh in the world

b. Chaldeans fail to answer him for they punished Judah

c. His answer

2. Significance of Habakkuk

a. Strengthened and vindicated faith in Yahweh

IV. The Exile

A. Ezekiel

1. The critical question

a. Recent studies and conclusions ..... pp. 114ff

2. Teaching regarding Election-chapter 20 ..... p. 116

a. A summary of history

b. Though "elected", always rebellious - chapters 16, 23 ..... pp116ff.

(1) Punishment the consequence

3. Restoration

a. Reason: Yahweh bound to Israel ..... pp 118 f.

b. Teaching as set forth in chapters 34-37 .. pp.119ff.

4. The Ideal for Israel: Chapters 40-48 ..... pp. 121f.

a. Not individualistic

(1) Distinguish from individualism

b. A particularistic society

5. Conclusion and relation to his day..... p. 122

B. Deutero-Isaiah

1. Introduction

a. Historical background ..... p. 123

(1) Especially Cyrus ..... pp. 123f.

b. Purpose of Deutero-Isaiah: creation of a mood of expectancy

2. Distinctive teachings

a. Monotheism ..... p. 124

(1) Because of monotheistic outlook, idolatry criticised .....pp. 124f.

(2) Universalism - a corollary of monotheism ..... p. 125

b. Yahweh's special relation to Israel ... p. 125ff.

(1) Illustrative passages ..... p. 126

(2) Redeemer ..... p. 126

(3) Reconciliation of special relationship of Israel to Yahweh and universalism ..... p. 127

c. The four Servant Songs

(1) Critical question - Who was the Servant? .....pp.128ff.

(a) Answer: Israel

(2) Teachings ..... pp. 132ff.

3. Conclusion: The significance of Deutero-Isaiah for this study lies in the election of Israel to service ..... pp. 137f.

V. Post-Exilic Period

Introduction

1. The relation of Particularism and Universalism to Election ..... pp. 139f.

2. Historical Background

a. The conditions of Judah during the Exile ..... pp. 140ff.

b. The first returns and their effects .. pp. 142ff.

c. The Ezra-Nehemiah period ..... p. 143f.

A. Particularism

1. Ezra and his work

a. Introduction of the Law ..... pp. 144ff.

(1) Extent of law uncertain ..... p. 145

(2) The reading of the Law and its effect ..... p. 145

(3) Characteristic of the law: exclusivism ..... pp. 145ff.

b. The Dissolution of Mixed Marriages .. pp. 148ff.

(1) Mixed marriages a result of the various strains in Palestine ... p. 148

(2) They were defiling in Ezra's opinion ..... p. 148

(3) Cases tried

(a) Priests promise to put away foreign wives ..... p. 149

(4) Intense hatred aroused ..... p. 149

(5) Motivation: self-preservation; and accomplished through preserving religion ..... p. 149f.

c. Estimate of Ezra ..... p. 150

2. Nehemiah

a. First visit to Jerusalem

(1) Backed by particularist party, he restored the walls ..... p. 150

b. Second visit to Jerusalem

(1) Corrected the sabbath abuse .....pp. 150f.

(2) Attacked intermarriage ..... p. 151

(3) Drove Eliashib's grandson from the city ..... p. 151

(4) Promises of the people ..... p. 151f.

c. Estimate of Nehemiah ..... p. 152
and of his and Ezra's work..... p. 152

3. Apocalyptic Prophets

a. Joel ..... pp. 152f.

(1) Yahweh's Spirit to be poured out on Jews

(2) The nations to be judged

(3) Characterized by Israel's "sacred egoism"

b. Deutero and Trito - Zechariah and Isaiah 24-27..... p. 153

(1) Punishment of the nations

(a) Revoltingly cruel

4. The Book of Daniel ..... pp. 153f.

a. The Messianic kingdom for Jew alone who stands out in the narrative as God's favorite

5. The Book of Esther .....pp. 154f.

a. Glorifies the Jewish people

b. Extreme nationalism

6. Higher form of exclusivism in devotion to the Law ..... p. 155

B. Universalism

1. Universalism represented by a minority . p. 156

2. Trito-Isaiah (56:1-8) ..... p. 156

a. Shows exclusivism in Jerusalem

b. Shows universalism of the author

3. Ruth: an answer to Ezra-Nehemiah ..... p. 156

4. Jonah ..... pp. 157f.

a. Resembles Deutero-Isaiah

b. "Jonah" serves as representative of narrow outlook, to set off universalism of author

c. A parable of the history of Judah

5. Catholic note in Isaiah 24-27; 19 Zephaniah pp.158f.

6. The Psalter ..... pp. 159f.

a. Speaks for the catholic faith of the people

b. Yahweh is gracious to all
(1) This message to be proclaimed to the world.

7. Universalism the creative element in Judaism p. 160

Conclusion ..... pp.161f.

Abstract ..... pp.163ff.

Bibliography ..... pp.169ff.

Autobiography ..... p. 176

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Election - the consciousness within a racial or national group that they are chosen to fulfil some special destiny - is a well nigh universal concept. It appears early in the written history of mankind and is still in evidence in our day.

Assyria-Babylonia

With the Assyro-Babylonian peoples belief in the "choice pattern" was widely prevalent as is shown in the materials which J. M. Powis Smith has gathered in an article entitled "The Chosen People."[1] Sargon I says, "Ishtar looked on me with love....four years I ruled the kingdom."[2] Hammurabi felt himself to be "the favourite of Shamash, the beloved of Marduk."[3] "Tiglath-pileser I addressed the gods as those 'who have enlarged the kingdom of Tiglath-pileser, the beloved prince, the desire of your hearts, the exalted shepherd, whom in your faithful hearts you have called, whom you have crowned with a lofty diadem, whom you did solemnly appoint to be king over the land of Enlil'".[4]

---

1 AJSL, Vol. 45 (1928), pp. 73 ff.

2 Ibid., p. 74, quoting R. F. Harper: Assyrian and Babylonian Literature (1901), p. 1.

3 Ibid., p. 2.

4. J.M.Powis Smith: "The Chosen People" in AJSL, Vol. 45 (1928), p. 74, quoting D.D.Luckenbill: Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia, Vol. I (1926), p. 75.

Nebuchadrezzar writes thus regarding himself: "Under his [i.e., Marduk's] mighty protection I marched through far-off lands and distant mountain-ranges from the northern sea to the southern sea along far-stretching roads and paths which were blocked, where my steps were hindered and I was unable to stand; a toilsome journey, a thirsty way. The rebellious I subjugated, enemies I took captive; the land I ruled justly; the people I cared for; the bad and the ill-disposed I kept away from the people. Silver, gold, and precious stones, copper, palm-wood and cedar-wood, everything that was costly, in magnificent abundance, the product of the mountains, the yield of the sea, did I bring as a weighty gift and a rich tribute into my city of Babylon to his [i.e., the god's] presence."[1]

Cyrus the Great believed that "...the great gods have delivered all the lands into my hand."[2]

It is, of course, the king and not the nation who was chosen, but, as Smith points out, the king represented the nation and regarded himself much as did Louis XIV - 'L' etat c'est moi.'

Egypt

The evidence from Egypt as to belief in the divine origin of the pharaoh and as to his position as 'the beloved' of this or that god, is abundant. One striking illustration appears in a poem which celebrates the victory of Ramesses II at Kadesh:

---

1 W. O. E. Oesterley: A History of Israel, Vol. II, p. 11 (quoting Winckler, and Langdon).

2 Ibid., p. 18 (quoting C. J. Gadd).

" 'I call to thee, my father Amūn. I am in the midst of foes whom I know not. All lands have joined themselves together against me, and I am all alone and none other is with me. My soldiers have forsaken me, and not one among my chariotry hath looked round for me. If I cry to them, not one of them hearkeneth. But I call, and I find that Amūn is worth more to me than millions of foot-soldiers, and hundreds of thousands of chariots, than ten thousand men in brethren and children, who with one mind hold together.'" " Amūn hearkeneth unto me and cometh, when I cry to him. He stretcheth out his hand to me, and I rejoice; he calleth out behind me: 'Forward, forward! I am with thee, I thy father. Mine hand is with thee, and I am of more avail than an hundred thousand men, I, the lord of victory, that loveth strength.' "[1]

Moab

From Moab we have just one fragment - the Moabite Stone. This is sufficient, however, to show how Kemosh was regarded. "'Omri[5], King of Israel, he afflicted Moab many days, because Kemosh was angry with his land[6]. And his son succeeded him; and he too said, I will afflict Moab.... And 'Omri took possession of the [lan]d[8] of Mehēdeba...but Kemosh restored[9] it in my days...and the king of Israel built 'Ataroth for himself. And I fought against the city and took it. And I slew all the people.[12] the

---

1 Adolf Erman: The Literature of the Ancient Egyptians, translated by Aylward M. Blackman, p. 264.

city, a gazingstock unto Kemosh and unto Moab...And Kemosh said to me, Go take Nebo against Israel. And[15] I went by night and fought against it from the break of dawn till the noontide, and I[16] took it and slew all.... And I took thence the..[19].of Yahweh, and I dragged them before Kemosh."[1]

Israel

Israel, too regarded itself as a "chosen people". In this attitude alone there is nothing unique. Yet, the idea of election as it applies to Israel is unique in the fact that it has an origin in history. From the early day commemorated in this expression of their confidence,

"Sing to Yahweh,
for highly exalted is He,
The horse and its rider
He has hurled into the sea",[2]

down through much of their history the belief in their election vitally affected the thinking and conduct of this little people in a way never seen elsewhere.

The reason for this difference is not far to seek. With all others who held to the divine election of the state, their choice was regarded as a choice made by the gods that the country might be supreme over all other nations. Power and self-glorification were ends in view. Itwas nationalism with no concern for other peoples. While Israel at times stood on this exclusive plane, it rose to heights of vision which discerned a mission to the world.

---

1 G. A. Cooke: North Semitic Inscriptions, pp. 2 ff.

2 Translation by Julius A. Bewer in The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 2.

Israel's belief that they had been chosen by Yahweh as his people stands at the very center of their religion. This belief was intensified for Israel in that their relation to Yahweh was grounded in history and was not, as in all other contemporary religions, a natural relationship between deity and people.

We have already noted that the "chosen" concept was always been present. The judgment of history has shown the validity of Israel's belief and has ruled out the belief held by other nations of their day that they were "chosen people".

Here is, then, a significant field of investigation: to examine the origin of Israel's election-faith; and to see how, under it, they developed in such a way as to demonstrate the genuineness of the choice.

In the study of the idea of election in the Old Testament we shall be concerned with these two problems:

(1) What factors in the history of Israel gave rise to the belief that they were the chosen people?

More important,

(2) How did the belief in their election affect their thinking and behavior?

REVIEW OF WORK OF OTHER INVESTIGATORS

Review of Work of Other Investigators

Galling, Kurt: Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels, Giessen, Töpelmann, 1928.

In the introduction to Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels, Galling states that though in almost all treatments of the religious history of Israel and Judah there is mention of the consciousness of national and religious election or choice, yet a monographic presentation has hitherto been lacking. Since he published his monograph, one book in English has appeared: The Call of Israel, an Introduction to The Study of Divine Election, by W. J. Phythian-Adams (reviewed below).

Galling's title is suggestive of that which he has undertaken, namely a study of the traditions of election in the Old Testament. His own words give his major purpose: "Die vorliegende Arbeit greift aus dem Gesamtproblem einen Teil heraus, der, aufs erste gesehen, nur formaler Art zu sein scheint, nämlich die Selbstaussagen über die Erwählung in Alten Testament. Die Gruppierung dieser führte zu der pluralischen Fassung des Themas und läßt nicht unwichtige Folgerungen traditionsgeschichtlicher Art zu. Die Doppelung der Erwählungstradition nachzuweisen, wird die Hauptaufgabe der Untersuchung sein." (p.1). The two traditions are: "Die Auszugstradition" and "Die Erzvä-

tertradition."

The first section of the study is devoted to the consciousness of election as it is grounded in the Exodus tradition (pp.5-37). Beginning with the Exodus hymn (Exodus 15:21), Calling traces the appearance of the tradition through the literature which he has arranged chronologically. From the passages quoted it becomes evident that the Exodus was far-reaching as a witness to Yahweh's special relation to Israel.

After this survey of the Exodus tradition, Calling considers the relation of the Sinai covenant to "Die Auszugstradition." Although he recognizes the importance of the covenant in Judaism as a validation of election, his thesis is that the covenant idea is of little importance to the idea of election. It is not an independent election-tradition but it belongs with the Exodus-tradition.

The second of the traditions of election-faith (and Calling's second main point) has to do with the patriarch-tradition. This is taken up under the headings: (1) Die Erzväter-verheissungen and (2) Die Verknüpfung der Traditionen. As a part of a literary and historical problem the relation of the two election traditions to one another is considered.

In the Genesis sagas it is clearly stated that God had chosen Israel in its patriarchs. Calling examines (following Nissfeldt for L) the four sources L, J, E, P for their contribution to the patriarch tradition. A development from L to P shows the increasing importance which was given to Abraham. The linking of the conscious-

ness of election with the patriarchs characterizes the narrative of the Pentateuch. Outside this source the patriarchs appear only in the later literature and there incidentally. Abraham appears in the Psalter but once (Psalm 105). The Exodus is mentioned many times. An explanation of this striking fact is required.

In Exodus 3 and in parallel traditions differences of opinion are detected as to the previous relation of Yahweh to Israel. E and P agree as over against L and J. These differences are older than the sources.

Again on the one hand the covenant with Abraham is regarded as the foundation of Judaism; on the other, the first full knowledge of God is attributed to Moses.

From the fact that the patriarch-tradition is lacking with the pre-exilic prophets, both with themselves and their hearers, the independence and age of the Exodus-tradition is established. Where did the patriarch-tradition originate? "Die Genealogie sub specie einer Stammes - und Stämmegeschichte, die religiöse Verknüpfung durch die Sagenreihe: diese entscheidende Formung, man kann auch sagen: Umformung, die ist gewollt, geschaffen. Sie ist darum auch ein erstmalig-einmalig vollzogener literarischer Akt, sie läszt sich nur in der Person eines Schöpfers, in der schöpferischen Persönlichkeit denken. Der Name dieses Ersten ist verschollen, mag man ihn nur den (ersten) Jahwisten oder (mit Kissfeldt) L nennen."

The prophets consciously refused the patriarch-traditions, for here was mention of the sacrifice and altars of the patriarchs which were

incompatible with their idealization of the Exodus time. This attitude of the prophets stopped the progress of these traditions and placed Moses at the center. Deuteronomy illustrates the importance attached to Moses (p. 67).

The Exile marks a turning point. Abraham is a prototype of Judaism. From P the way leads to Matthew 3:9: "We have Abraham to our father." The presence of Genesis in the canon proves the victory of the jahwistic tradition-idea. Yet from Psalms 135 and 136 it is evident that the Exodus tradition held its own. The ascription to Moses of authorship of the Pentateuch can be understood perhaps as the last expression of the Exodus tradition.

The final section of the monograph has to do with "Die grosz-israelitische Idee in der Geschichte des Volkes". The first division deals with the political attempt at the formation of a pan-Israel. The pan-Israel idea is traced in the period of the divided kingdoms, in Judah, in exile, and after.

Galling has studied the two traditions upon which the consciousness of election was based. He has therefore necessarily given a larger place to the Genesis material which deals with the patriarchs and the promises made to them than has been the case in this study. Galling has made a more extensive survey of the Exodus tradition as it appears in the literature than we have done.

Galling's concern is with tradition which he regards as possessing value even though not developing from an historical basis. This approach leaves the way open for our dissertation to examine the his-

torical data and to see how the election-consciousness was developed in the course of history.

Galling has not developed the effect of the election-idea on religious thought and behaviour.

Phythian-Adams, W. J.: The Call of Israel, An Introduction to the Study of Divine Election, London, Oxford University Press (Milford), 1934.

This book has its focus in the Call of Israel. The author is concerned in recovering and substantiating the reality of the events surrounding the deliverance from Egypt.

The first part is devoted to the consciousness of the Exodus in the Old Testament literature. The author begins with a survey of the Psalter and quotes passages which speak of the deliverance from Egypt. This section is followed by one on the faith of the Prophets in which passages are again presented. Working backward he comes to the Faith of the Fathers which for the writer forms a basis for the faith of the prophets.

In Part II a study of the tradition is made. The documents are regarded from the point of view of aetiology, 'the science of detecting underlying purposes or causes.' The writer illustrates his proposed approach by giving two examples: (1) The Episode of the Water-Miracle and (2) The Episode of Jethro's Visit (Exodus 18). In his approach he belittles what he terms the 'scissors and paste' method which seeks to reconstruct an historical picture from the documents without attention to their aetiological significance. The aetiologi-

cal method must ask and answer three questions: (1) Why was this written down? (2) When? (3) By whom? This study of the tradition constitutes the unique section of the book and is the least valuable.

Part III, The Miracle of the Call, concerns itself with the phenomena of the deliverance. In a sense these events are regarded as miracles only to the degree that they surpassed the normal experience of living men. They are a part "of what must have been one of this earth's mightiest upheavals." For the Chosen People "the conviction was driven home that they had been called and delivered by a Power which was unique and utterly incomparable."

The final chapter has to do with the Miracle of the Call - a philosophy of Miracle.

Mythian-Adams is at the other extreme from Calling. He is anxious to establish the reality of the Exodus events which went so far in determining the Election-tradition. His book is, however, as already noted limited in its scope.

Because of this limitation the effect of the Election-tradition is not studied in its relation to the development of thought.

Smith, J. M. P.: "The Chosen People", in AJSL, Vol. XLV (1929), pp. 73-82.

This article does two things, the first of which is the more important. First, it is concerned with the concept 'chosen' as it was found in Babylonia, Assyria, Egypt, Moab, and Israel. Here the chief value lies in the references to the literature of these peoples,

other than Israel, to illustrate their belief that they were chosen. The writer in such an article has naturally stated Israel's belief by merely mentioning a few passages from the Old Testament. Second, the author states briefly the reasons for the permanency and validation of Israel's concept over against the belief held by all the other nations which has been discounted and forgotten.

Kohler, K.: Jewish Theology, N. Y., Macmillan, 1918, pp. 323-330,

and

Shechter, S.: Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, N. Y., Macmillan, 1939, pp. 57-64.

These two chapters give a brief statement of the Jewish theological viewpoint regarding Election.

Our dissertation attempts to do two things which the other writers have left partially or wholly undone:

(1) To study those factors in the history of Israel which gave rise to the belief that they were the chosen people. This investigation follows a line midway between Galling and Phythian-Adams. On the one hand it is much more concerned with an historical basis for the election-idea than is Galling whose study of tradition includes both Exodus and the patriarchs. On the other hand our concern is not to account for the Exodus events by a scientific explanation of the data which Phythian-Adams attempts. Nor is it to limit the development of

the election-tradition to the beginnings of Israel's history.

(2) To see how the belief in their election affected the religious life and thought of the people of Israel. This problem constitutes the major part of this dissertation.

THE DISSERTATION

1.

The Revelation of Yahweh to Moses

What factors in the history of Israel gave rise to the belief that they were the chosen people?

It might be considered by some as sufficient to say that election is posited on the Mosaic traditions - in Midian, in Egypt, in the Exodus, in the covenant, and in the wilderness. But there is no uniformity of opinion about the traditions. While certain factors are relatively unimportant for consideration here - for example, the date of the exodus - it is essential to give the historical background which caused the idea of election to become firmly established.

The event which stands out in all the Old Testament literature as the supreme evidence of the election of Israel is the deliverance from Egypt. But before discussing this point it is necessary to go back in the narrative as found in Exodus to the revelation of Yahweh which came to Moses. The record of this experience, as found in Exodus 3, is based on J and E.

J tells us that at the burning bush Yahweh said to Moses: "I have surely seen the affliction of my people that are in Egypt... and I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians."

Moses is commissioned to go and to gather the elders of Israel and to say to them: "Yahweh, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, hath appeared unto me, saying, 'I have surely visited you, and seen that which is done to you in Egypt.'"[1] This gives all the J data necessary for our present consideration.

E gives us a geographical setting. Moses was guarding the flock of his father-in-law, Jethro, who was the priest of Midian. "...he led the flock to the back of the wilderness, and came to the mountain of God, unto Horeb."[2] Here it was that God called him and said: "I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." He went on to say that the cry of the children of Israel had come unto him and he had seen their oppression. Moses was then commissioned to go to Pharaoh to deliver them but he demurred. Yahweh promised to be with him and said that when they came out of Egypt they should serve him upon that very mountain.

Moses raised another objection: "Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, the God of your

---

1 In this thesis since the name Yahweh has been used, for the sake of uniformity the writer has taken the privilege of substituting Yahweh for Jehovah in all passages quoted from the American Standard Version.

2 The confusion regarding Horeb and Sinai is recognized. Horeb has been used in the passages quoted where it occurs and in references to these passages. Elsewhere Sinai has been used. While their identity has been questioned by eminent scholars, others of equal authority have believed them to be identical. Compare Lewis B. Paton: "The Origin of Yahweh-Worship in Israel", in BW, Vol. 42 (1906), p. 12.

fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, what is his name? what shall I say unto them?" God answers him: "I AM THAT I AM" [אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה] and he said, thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM [אֶהְיֶה] hath sent me unto you." Verse 15 is to be regarded as coming from the redactor's hand. Then following Holzinger ("das אֶהְיֶה ist auffallend; wenn v. 15[a] sekundärer Text ist, liegt es nahe, dass die Quelle יְהוָה geschrieben hatte, das um v. 15 nicht zu sehr als blosse Wiederholung erscheinen zu lassen nach 14[a] korrigiert wurde"[1]) and Budde,[2] 14[b] would be read, "Yahweh hath sent me unto you."

The question which arises from a study of this experience of Moses is: Was there here a revelation of a new God? J seems to say no. This is Yahweh, 'the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob.' In E we read, "I am the God [underlining mine] of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." When Moses asked the name of this God of the fathers of Israel, he received the answer, "I AM THAT I AM ..., Yahweh." In the fact that Moses did not know the name of the deity in E there is a decided implication that this is a new God. This position is further strengthened when it is noted that God is never referred to as Yahweh in E prior to this Horeb experience.[3] After Exodus 3, E uses both Elohim and Yahweh.

---

1 Exodus, p. 14.

2 Religion of Israel to the Exile, p. 14.

3 "Gn. 22:14 and 28:21, the only apparent exceptions, are almost universally regarded as due to the hand of Rje." E. S. Brightman: Sources of the Hexateuch, p. 113.

P. follows E in the use of the name Yahweh. "And God spoke unto Moses, and said unto him, I am Yahweh: and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as God Almighty [אֵל שַׁדָּי]; but by my name Yahweh I was not known to them" (Exodus 6:2-3). Exodus 3 is characteristic of J. He has used the name Yahweh almost wholly in his entire narrative.

Let us for the moment defer the attempt to decide as to whether J or E and P should be followed and take our lead from E. Here we have a revelation to Moses of a deity under a new name. There is general agreement that a new name means a new god. Morgenstern believes that the oldest document of the Hexateuch is K (Kenite), composed in 899. In its original form it gave an extended account of Moses and his leading the people out of Egypt. He thinks K states "very positively that not only had Israel not known the name of Yahweh before this, but furthermore, not having known the name, it could also not have worshiped Yahwe in any way before this time. In this the K document is far more logical than either E or P, and also in far greater conformity with the fundamental principle of Semitic religion, that not until the true name of a deity is known can sacrifices and supplications be directed to him and his worship begin."[1]

Where then shall we look for the origins of this new belief on the part of Moses? We must remember that following his flight

---

[1] "The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch" in HUCA, Vol. IV (1927), p. 31. In this article the above thesis regarding K is expanded. It is accepted by Eissfeldt and George A. Barton. See "Old Testament Studies" in The Haverford Symposium, p. 50.

from Egypt after he had killed a taskmaster he took refuge with the Kenites, and married the daughter of the priest, Jethro.[1] Here he came to know something of Yahweh, the God of the Kenites, who was possessed of conspicuous elements of strength.[2]

The theory, known as the Kenite hypothesis, was first expressed by Ghillany in 1862. He has been followed by many scholars, but perhaps the best known exponent is Budde. The God who appeared to Moses at Horeb must have been the God of the Kenites. Moses was at that time tending his father-in-law's flocks. He must have been on territory belonging to the Kenites; for tribes knew their boundaries and kept within them. There are considerable data regarding the Kenites.[3] Judges 1:16 states that Moses married into the Kenite tribe - a narrower term than Midianite. When Moses, with Israel, left Sinai, he urged his father-in-law to accompany them (Numbers 10:29ff.). The Kenites entered Canaan with Judah and settled in the south where they continued as nomads (Judges 1:16). It was a Kenite woman, Jael, who killed Sisera and was praised in the Song of Deborah (Judges 5: 24 ff.). Jonadab the son of Rechab, associated

---

1 It is to be noted that J, in Exodus 2:18 calls Moses' father-in-law Reuel while in E he is called Jethro. In Numbers 10:29 Hobab, the son of Reuel, appears as the father-in-law. It is frequently thought that in Exodus 2:18 Hobab, son of Reuel, should be read or that Reuel is a gloss. In Judges 4:11 Hobab is called a Kenite. While these variations are confusing, the fact that the father-in-law was the priest of Midian is mentioned in both J and E.

2 George A. Barton has given a quite satisfactory psychological explanation of Moses' experience in his Semitic and Hamitic Origins, pp. 333 ff.

3 Summarized by Karl Budde: The Religion of Israel to the Exile, pp. 19 ff.

with Jehu when he put an end to Ahab's house and struck a blow at Baalism, was zealous for pure Yahweh worship and was recognized as an authority (2 Kings 10:15 f.) The Rechabites, a branch of the Kenites (1 Chronicles 2:55), and descendants of Jonadab, are described in Jeremiah (chapter 35) as following their ancestor's command and holding it necessary to abstain from wine and agriculture, and to dwell in tents - not houses - in order to please Yahweh, the God of the desert. Budde concludes that from all indications the Kenites "did not adopt the worship of Yahweh from others, but were conscious of being the proper, the genuine, the original worshippers of Yahweh."[1]

Anticipating for the moment the deliverance from Egypt, we find in Exodus 18 the account of the meeting between Moses and Jethro at the sacred mountain. Upon hearing the details of the deliverance Jethro exclaimed: "Praise be to Yahweh, who hath delivered you out of the power of the Egyptians; now know I that Yahweh is greater than all gods."

By those who hold the Kenite hypothesis this is taken to mean that Jethro now recognized that his God had proved himself "greater than all gods."

We are now ready to justify the use of E to the exclusion of J. Following E, we have concluded that Moses' experience was the revelation of a new God and that it may be explained by his contact

---

[1] Karl Budde: The Religion of Israel to the Exile, p. 21.

with the Kenites and in his observation of the worship of their Yahweh. It must be said, however, that there are those who question the validity of the Kenite theory and who give to J more value than to E. Meek may be cited as a recent example. He questions whether the Kenite theory still has the vogue it once had. Speaking of J, he says it is our earliest and probably most reliable source (as applied to Exodus 3).[1] Gordon in discussing the experience of Moses says of J that it is the earliest, most natural and trustworthy.[2] Paton,[3] although an exponent of the Kenite hypothesis lists numerous opponents who give to J the place of preeminence. Our answer to those who would follow J rather than E is based upon the origin of the documents. J comes from Judah. It was here that some of the Kenites settled and others came in contact with the Judeans on the southern border. They regarded Yahweh as worshipped from time immemorial. The Judeans, too, came to think of Yahweh as their ancestral God and so his worship is traced to Enosh, grandson of Adam. The northern tribes, who did not have this close association with the Kenites, preserved the tradition more nearly in accordance with the historical facts.[4]

---

1 Hebrew Origins, pp. 86 f.

2 Early Traditions of Genesis, p. 108.

3 "The Origin of Yahweh-Worship in Israel", in BW, Vol. 42 (1906), pp. 14 f.

4 Ibid., pp. 123 f. So Budde: The Religion of Israel to the Exile, pp. 21 f. Barton: Semitic and Hamitic Origins, p. 324.

Another argument for believing that Yahweh was known before Moses is based on the use of proper names. Two are mentioned: "Joshua" and "Jochebed". Joshua, however, first bore the name of Hoshea (Numbers 13:8 and Deuteronomy 32:44). Later Moses gave him the name Joshua (Numbers 13:16). Jochebed, Moses' mother, is referred to by that name in P (Exodus 6:20). Meek rightly holds that P would not have coined this name and used it before Moses.[1] From the occurrence of the name he believes that Yahweh must have been known in small circles of the Hebrews before Moses' time. But to base a theory upon one name is somewhat precarious, and besides, this name, if genuine, may have been changed like Joshua.

A further preference for E lies in the fact that J agrees with E and P in representing all the peculiar rites of Yahweh-worship as introduced by Moses.[2]

The strongest argument against believing that Yahweh was unknown to Israel before Moses proclaimed him in Egypt is that a people would not have followed Moses and an unknown god. In describing the circumstances regarding Moses' relations with the Israelites in Egypt it will be seen that this argument can be satisfactorily answered.[3]

---

1 Hebrew Origins, p. 91.

2 Lewis B. Paton: "The Origin of Yahweh-Worship in Israel", in BW, Vol. 42 (1906), p. 21.

3 Pp. 13ff.

2.

The Exodus

Moses returned to Egypt impelled by his recent Horeb experience to fulfil his commission - to deliver his people. This task was a double one: he must persuade Pharaoh to allow them to leave the country, and he must convince the people that they should follow him.

It is not our intent to dwell at length upon the performance of this mission. The records leave many questions unanswered. Fortunately for our present study many details are not of importance.

If the assumption is correct that Yahweh was originally unknown to Israel it at once becomes evident that the foremost problem which Moses faced in dealing with the people was to persuade them to follow him and an unknown God. The task was made simpler by several factors. In the first place is the genius and personality of Moses. One writer has called him "one of the most remarkable figures that have ever passed across the stage of history."[1] Even though we were to admit with Lods that "it is very hard to say with any certainty who Moses was and what he did" yet with him we would have to recog-

---

[1] T. H. Robinson: A History of Israel, Vol. I, p. 80.

nize that "there must have been a dominant personality" back of the traditions of this period.[1] The qualities of leadership which were possessed by Moses made his task immeasurably easier. Undoubtedly he gave to his fellows some conception of the characteristics of Yahweh which he had observed. He was dominated by the conviction that Yahweh was possessed of power. Whether Yahweh is to be interpreted as a storm-god or a volcanic deity or both, the impression which the various traditions give of his strength justifies at least the belief that Moses would introduce him to his fellows as one able to deliver them.

It must be remembered too, that the number of Israelites in Egypt was relatively small. The figures given by P, Numbers 1:20-47, are preposterous. Numbers 11:21 and Exodus 12:37 (J) are to be regarded as later insertions under the influence of P.[2] Exodus 1:15 probably far more nearly represents the truth in speeking of two midwives for the total population at the period of Moses' birth.

Moses' task with the people was facilitated, also, by their condition of affliction. Offering deliverance to a liberty-loving people who found themselves tasting bitter oppression, - what did it matter if Yahweh were a god unknown to them? Under

---

1 A. Lods: Israel, p. 309.

2 H. Holzinger: Exodus, p. 35, A.R.S. Kennedy: Numbers (New Century), p. 190, and Bruno Baentsch: Exodus-Leviticus-Numeri, pp. 104 f.

the spell of Moses' leadership they were ready to follow him into promised freedom.

With Pharaoh he was not so successful. Just what took place between Moses and the ruler is uncertain. The ease with which he gained access to the court causes immediate suspicion of the historical record. Here it is sufficient to note the pharaoh's unwillingness to allow Israel to leave their task-work. The ten plagues - no one source mentions all - were for the most part events which might quite naturally take place. The account of the death of the first-born of Egypt may go back to a tradition of the death of the first-born of Pharaoh. We may conclude it reasonable, with Professor Robinson that "tradition told of some disaster which fell upon Egypt at a critical moment, thus facilitating the escape of the fugitives, and the imagination and knowledge of Egypt possessed by later generations readily filled in the details."[1] Whatever the plagues, or however explained, they contributed to the total impression being created in the mind of Israel: that Yahweh was delivering them.

When we come at "Yam Suph" to the climax of the deliverance from Egypt, we are confronted by a diversity of opinions as to where the crossing was made. This diversity of opinion is typified in the writings of Oesterley and Robinson. In their History of Israel (Robinson's volume) it is stated that the most nat-

---

[1] History of Israel, Vol. I, p. 85.

ural place for the crossing is north of the modern Suez.[1] In their Hebrew Religion, however, (in a section apparently from the pen of Oesterley; compare p. 154, footnote), the escape is supposed to have taken place at the northern end of the Gulf of Akaba.[2] Where the crossing took place must remain an uncertainty.

Likewise, what phenomenon made the escape possible can never be known. Perhaps a strong wind blew back the shallow water at Suez. Robinson accepts this view and cites supporting authors.[3] Gressmann, who has found a following, attributes the receding sea to volcanic action. He locates Mount Sinai south east of the city of Akaba and places the crossing at the northern end of the Gulf of Akaba. It was the sacred mountain itself, visible from the western side of Akaba, which was in eruption. This volcanic action affected the sea. The waters were driven back and then returned with sudden violence.[4] Phythian-Adams follows Gressmann to the extent that he attributes the recession of the waters to volcanic action, but he differs, as noted above, in the location of the deliverance.

---

1 Volume I, p. 87. W. J. Phythian-Adams in The Call of Israel, pp. 168f. argues rather convincingly for Suez in preference to Akaba. The pursuers with their chariots would have overtaken the Israelites before they reached Akaba unless they delayed starting for some time, and in that case it would have been difficult to pick up the trail.

2 P. 144.

3 History of Israel, Vol. I, p. 87.

4 Mose, pp. 108ff., 416 ff.

It is useless to conjecture further regarding the where and how of the deliverance. But that a deliverance which seemed miraculous did occur is beyond reasonable doubt. The Israelites who received their freedom, together with their descendants believed that Yahweh was the deliverer. This tradition is basic to the idea of election as held by Israel. "An event which stamped itself so deeply on the consciousness of the people as to control all its later thinking, to ratify its religion, and to dictate its theory of history, can by no possibility have been a mere invention."[1]

Galling emphasizes the deliverance as one of the motivations of the election idea.[2] He has gathered passages which illustrate the exodus tradition.[3] These illustrations, it will be noted, come from the various sections of the Hexateuch, from the prophets, and the Psalms.

Morgenstern, in discussing the Exodus, says, "Of the attendant details nothing of the K account, at least so far as we can see at present, has been preserved. But manifestly it must have been brought about through marvelous deeds on the part of Yahwe , which caused the discomfiture of the Egyptian gods, of a character to war-

---

1 T. H. Robinson: History of Israel, Vol. 1, p. 70.
2 Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels, p. 1.
3 Ibid., pp. 5 ff.

rant the utterance of Hobab, when he hears about them, 'Now I know that Yahwe is the most powerful of all the gods.'"[1]

Quite possibly the first mention of the deliverance is the song of Miriam.[2]

> "Sing ye to Yahweh, for he hath triumphed gloriously;
> The horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea."
>
> - Exodus 15:21

This passage constitutes a part of the fullest record of the deliverance: Exodus 14-15. Aside from this account the following references occur:

> "the chastisement of Yahweh your God, his greatness, his mighty hand, and his outstretched arm, and his signs, and his works, which he did in the midst of Egypt unto Pharaoh the king of Egypt and unto all his land; and what he did unto the army of Egypt, unto their horses, and to their chariots; how he made the water of the Red Sea to overflow them as they pursued after you..."
>
> - Deuteronomy 11:2-4

> "Thus saith Yahweh, who maketh a way in the sea, and a path in the mighty waters; who bringeth forth the chariot and horse, the army and the mighty man (they lie down together, they shall not rise; they are extinct, they are quenched as a wick)!"
>
> - Isaiah 43: 17-18

---

1 "The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch", HUCA, Vol. IV, pp. 135f. Underlining mine.

2 Julius A. Bewer: The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 2. Eissfeldt, in his Hexateuch Synopse lists this as an L passage.

"Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of Yahweh...
Is it not thou that driedst up the sea, the waters
of the great deep; that madest the depths of the
sea a way for the redeemed to pass over?"

- Isaiah 51: 9-10

"He turned the sea into dry land;
They went through the river on foot:"

- Psalm 66: 6

"He rebuked the Red Sea also,
and it was dried up:
So he led them through the depths,
as through a wilderness.
And he saved them from the hand
of him that hated them,
And redeemed them from the hand of the enemy.
And the waters covered their adversaries;
There was not one of them left."

- Psalm 106: 9-11[1]

The phrases, "with a strong hand, and with an outstretched arm", used in several passages, plainly refer to the deliverance. In Psalm 136:10-15 which is recounting their experience in Egypt and in leaving, this formula occurs in verse 12.[2]

Other passages attest the Exodus but speak less clearly of Yahweh's actual part.[3] "Ein wichtiges Zeugnis für das Alter der Auszugstradition ist die Notiz in I Reg 12: 28. Jerobeam I (um 925) bezeichnet das stiergestaltige Baal-Jahwebild ausdrücklich als den Gott, der Israel aus Ägypten geführt habe. Das ist

---

1 Compare Psalm 136: 13-15.

2 Compare Exodus 32: 11, Deuteronomy 4:34; 5:15; 7:19; 9:29; 26:8; Jeremiah 32:21.

3 For example, Amos 2:10, Hosea 11:1; 12:9; 13:4, Micah 6:4, Jeremiah 2:6, Ezekiel 20:5-6.

mit einer besonderen Spitze gegen Jerusalem gesagt: dort mag man auch Jahweverehrung üben, aber der rechte Kult ist in Dan und Bethel, und dasz er der rechte ist, wird kurzerhauf dadurch dekretiert, dasz der Jahwe hier der Gott des Auszuges sei..."[1]

These quotations all state or imply that Israel had been delivered by the hand of Yahweh. They are cited, not to prove the fact of the Exodus but to show how, given this historical event, the event so vividly gripped their thinking.

That the relationship between Yahweh and Israel had as its foundation an historical event - the deliverance from Egypt - was of incalculable significance. It could lead eventually to only one conclusion, as Gressmann has said: "Dieser Gott hat Israel zu seinem Volk erkoren, so küren wir ihn zu unserem Gott!"[2]

---

1 Kurt Galling: Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels, pp. 8f.

2 Mose, p. 445. See also Elmer A. Leslie: Old Testament Religion, pp. 82f. and A. Lods: Israel, p. 314.

3.

The Wilderness

When the attempt is made to determine the course taken by Moses and his followers after the deliverance, the records are found to be confusing and far more unproductive of certainty than the sections of Exodus upon which one depends for a knowledge of pre-wilderness events.

Reading the record as it stands in the Hexateuch, Israel upon leaving Egypt had as its goal Mount Sinai. The chapters in Exodus following the crossing of the Sea, describe this journey. From the arrival at Sinai the remainder of the book ofExodus, Leviticus, and Numbers 1:1-10:33 is given over to the stay there. Then comes the sojourn in the wilderness, the period in the Plains of Moab, which is followed by the conquest. Of this material a considerable portion comes from P, viz., all the material from Exodus 34:29 to Numbers 10:28: also the section, Exodus 25:1-31:18a. The accounts of the E Decalogue, the Book of the Covenant, and the "J Decalogue" will be discussed in a later section when reasons for so doing will be given. Hence, the reconstruction of events following the deliverance will have to be made on the basis of rather scant materials.

The first clue in E to a geographical location following

their rescue from the Egyptians follows immediately the Song of Miriam:

> "There he made for them a statute and an ordinance,
> And there he proved them."
>
> - Exodus 15:25b

These words are "apparently a fragment of an ancient poem... The allusion contained in the last words shows that the scene took place at Massah (proving), i.e., at Kadesh. Hence according to this ancient text it was Kadesh and not Sinai which saw the birth of the Mosaic legislation."[1]

E next mentions the smiting of the rock in Horeb (17:3-6). 17:1b-7, really a JE passage, tells of the people's complaint because there is no water and of the provision made by Moses. There are several doublets here: 2b ^{a} and 2b^{b}, 1b^{b}, 2a^{a} and 3, 5a^{a} and 5a^{b}. There are two variants in verse 7, a Massah and a Meribah tradition. Verse 6b is concerned no longer with the people but merely with the elders.[2] If we may suppose with Baentsch[3] that <u>in Horeb</u> (verse 6) is a later addition, then we have in this compositite passage mention only of Massah, i. e., Kadesh, and Meribah, which in a later tradition is placed at Kadesh.

---

1 A. Lods: <u>Israel</u>, p. 177. Compare Elmer A. Leslie: <u>Old Testament Religion</u>, p. 86.

2 H. Holzinger: <u>Exodus</u>, p. 55.

3 <u>Exodus-Leviticus-Numeri</u>, p, 160. "בחרב ist höchst verdächtig, denn nach E sind wir noch nicht am Horeb, sondern gelangen erst Ex 19 dahin.... Deshalb muss בחרב die Glosse eines Späteren sein, der sich den Felsen, auf dem Jahve erscheint, nur am Horeb, dem alten Gottesberge, vorstellen konnte."

Chapter 18 tells of a visit by Jethro to Moses. The scene is in the wilderness at the mount of God, which, by itself one would expect to mean Horeb. However, when Jethro leaves Moses he "went into his own land" (27b). This statement makes it necessary to suppose that the visit took place at some place other than Horeb for we saw above[1] that Horeb was in the district where Jethro lived. Accordingly this visit should be placed away from Jethro's home and quite reasonably at Kadesh.[2]

Of course, it might be argued that Exodus 18 contains two episodes. The second half of the chapter is E (Ein intakter Zusammenhang aus E ist, abgesehen von v. 20, worüber nachher, v. 13-27[3]). The first half evidences much more revision.[4] If two separate events were merged here then 27b would not necessarily refer to the visit of Jethro which culminated in the sacrificial meal.

There is, however, no difficulty in supposing that Jethro and the elders of Israel participated in such a meal in Kadesh rather than near Horeb-Sinai. It would, to be sure, be more natural to suppose that this event took place where Yahweh had his dwelling. Yet Yahweh could be operative outside his own bounds - evidence his conflict with the gods of Egypt.

---

1 P. 18.

2 Bruno Baentsch: Exodus-Leviticus-Numeri, p. 169.

3 H. Holzinger: Exodus, p. 61.

4 Compare ibid.

Lods seems to imply a telescoping of the events in J and to take the mention, in 15:22 of a three days journey into the wilderness as a reference to the arrival at Kadesh. He thinks "the inference is that for this stage of the tradition, Kadesh was the goal, or at least the first halting-place, of the flight of the Israelites from Egypt..."[1] If his view is correct then J andE agree upon the importance of Kadesh as the center of activity for Israel during the wilderness sojourn.

The JE tradition in Numbers - that the Israelites went directly to Kadesh from Sinai and were there when permission was asked to go through Moab (chapter 20) - is probably correct to this extent, that it makes Kadesh the residence throughout the greater part of the period.[2]

What significance does this wilderness period have for the development of the idea of election?

It may be said that the accounts of the miraculous provision of food and water were calculated to convey the belief that Yahweh had cared for his people whom he had chosen.

When we review our study of the period as historical background for the development of religion, it must be said, however, in all frankness that results are mainly negative. The accounts, as they stand, in Exodus, cannot be relied upon as furnishing any sub-

---

1 Israel, pp. 176f.

2 Compare G. B. Gray: Numbers (ICC), p. 260 and S. R. Driver: Deuteronomy (ICC), pp. 31 ff.

stantial data. Yet as will be evident from a subsequent survey of Israel under Moses' leadership a welding process was going on, a process in which religion was of prime importance.

Exodus 18 describes the visit of Jethro to Moses. Those who accept the Kenite hypothesis see in 18:1-12 a furthering of the relationship between Yahweh and Israel. Moses had, when among the Kenites, received his revelation of Yahweh. Israel had experienced Yahweh's power in their deliverance. Now Jethro, upon hearing of this victory of his God exclaimed "Blessed be Yahweh, who hath delivered you... Now I know that Yahweh is greater than all gods." He, the priest of Yahweh proceeded to offer a burnt-offering and sacrifices. Aaron and all the elders of Israel partipipated with him in a holy sacrificial meal.[1] This passage, then, is descriptive of the furthering of the relationship between Yahweh and Israel. It marks an advance in the process of unifying the tribes for only by association with a new God could these tribes find unity.[2]

We quoted Gressmann above[3]: "Dieser Gott hat Israel zu seinem Volk erkoren, so küren wir ihn zu unserem Gott!" These words might, in a sense, be called the motif of the Exodus story. In

---

1 K. Budde: The Religion of Israel to the Exile, pp. 22ff. Oesterley and Robinson: Hebrew Religion, p. 148. George A. Barton: Semitic and Hamitic Origins, p. 335.

2 T. H. Robinson: History of Israel, Vol. I, p. 90.

3 P. 29.

Exodus 24 is to be found an account of the concretizing of this motif. Minimizing the significance of Sinai and placing the decalogues at a later stage of development does not rule out the possibility of a "germinal covenant" in this early period. It may well be that the Sinai episode was participated in by only a representation of the tribes resident at Kadesh.[1]

The record in Exodus 24 comes from J and E: 9-11 from the former and 3-8 from the latter. The E verses are late. J. does not speak of a covenant but a sacrificial feast is mentioned in which Yahweh was supposed to join, thus cementing friendship. This represents the most primitive aspect of covenant. "It involves an anthropomorphic idea of God such as must have belonged to a very early stage in Israelite thought.... It may be taken for granted that if any part of the Sinai-Horeb narrative is historical it is this."[2]

In the prophets the relation between Yahweh and Israel is not a natural one but, as T. H. Robinson says, "artificial". Israel was not a natural unity. Yahweh "was the god of a confederation, so that here the idea of a covenant religion is entirely justified."[3]

---

1 A. Lods: Israel, p. 178, p. 314.

2 A. H. McNeile: The Book of Exodus (Westminster), p. 152.

3 W. R. Smith: Religion of the Semites (1894), p. 319.

Just how much this nascent covenantal idea involved is wholly conjectural.[1] "Il est vrai que, dès l'époque préhistorique, le rapport entre Israël et Mahvé a été considéré comme une 'alliance';"[2] but Mowinckel sees the berith simply as between the various tribes. "Il se peut que sous Moïse une 'alliance' ait été conclue solennellement entre plusieurs clans hébreux, et qu'elle ait eu, comme toujours, un caractère religieux.... il est tout aussi possible qu'il se soit agi tout simplement d'une alliance générale de fraternité et de paix entre les tribus;"[3] That more than such a tribal covenant was involved is probable.

The essence of the covenant may well be imagined to be expressed in the words of Jeremiah:

> "For I did not speak with your fathers
> Nor did I command them in the days when I brought
> them forth from the land of Egypt,
> Concerning (soLXX) burnt offering and sacrifice.
> But this word I commanded them, saying,
> 'Obey my voice, and I will be your God,
> And ye shall be my people'".
>
> - Jeremiah 7:22-23b[4]

---

1 Some have regarded the Covenant Code (Exodus 20-23) as representing the terms upon which the wilderness covenant was made. The E Decalogue has its supporters while there are those who favor the "J Decalogue". Several scholars accept the Mosaic authorship of the E Decalogue, at least in a simple form. This is the only one of the three possibilities worthy of consideration but it will be our contention that it comes from a later period.

2 S. Mowinckel: Le Décalogue, p. 136.

3 Ibid., p. 137.

4 Elmer A. Leslie: Old Testament Religion, p. 93.
A. Lods: Israel, pp. 314f.

It is easy to idealize the religion of Israel in this wilderness stage. It must be remembered that it undoubtedly bore a strong resemblance to the religion of other Semitic peoples. Yet in this initial period - from Moses' experience at Horeb through the years in the wilderness - there were two factors which were to influence the future development: Yahweh, a new God, had delivered them from Egypt. Because he had thus "chosen" them they entered into a relationship with him which partook of the nature of a covenant even if there were no formal ceremony.

4.

The Settlement in Canaan

The settlement of Israel in Canaan was accomplished only after a prolonged effort. The account found in Judges 1:1-2:5 is a portion of an old document and is more historical than the longer one in Joshua 1-12. The older account differs from Joshua in stating that: (1) the conquest was the result of the efforts of individual tribes, and (2) the settlers were unable to drive out those whom they found living there already.[1] As Israel settled in Canaan, tribes were often separated from each other by sections occupied by the Canaanites. Located thus and without any system of national government it is no wonder that the feeling of national unity ceased to find expression.[2] The unity which had been achieved under the leadership of Moses was somewhat transient and yet the ideal of unity, rooted in religion, was never entirely lost.

Down to the Exile the nation constituted the "unit of religion". In a real sense it is never possible in Judaism to separate nationalism and religion. In the period of the Judges one is struck

---

1 C. F. Burney: Israel's Settlement in Canaan, pp. 16f.

2 Compare W. Robertson Smith: The Prophets of Israel, p. 37.

by the relation between patriotism and the worship of Yahweh. The religion of the Canaanites constituted a menace to the newly settled Israelites. "It was by a series of imperious calls to united national effort that Israel was prevented from wholly forgetting Jehovah. Every invasion which woke the dormant feeling of patriotism woke at the same time something of the old faith."[1] The Canaanite religion consisting of local cults without national significance stood at the opposite pole from Yahweh who represented a principle of national unity.[2]

The Ode of Deborah (Judges 5), giving as it does a picture of life in Canaan shortly after the settlement, is of utmost historical value. If not composed by Deborah herself it was written by a contemporary.[3] Valuable as this ode is from an historical point of view it is equally significant as an indication of the state of the religion of Israel.

The description of Yahweh's coming to battle for his people is revealing as to the contemporary belief in his power.

---

1 W. Robertson Smith: The Prophets of Israel, p. 39.

2 Ibid., p. 40.

3 Julius A. Bewer: The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 6.
G. F. Moore: Judges (ICC), pp. 129, 132.

"Yahweh, when Thou wentest forth from Seir,
When Thou marchedst from Edom's field,
The earth trembled, the heavens also swayed,
Yea the clouds poured water,
the mountains quaked at the presence, of
Yahweh, God of Israel."[1]

The tribes who rallied for battle and those who did not hear the call are contrasted. Issachar, Zebulon, Naphtali fought with Ephraim, Benjamin, and Machir. Reuben, Gilead, Dan and Asher should have responded and are bitterly reproached for their failure. The inference from the omission of any reference to Judah is that the writer did not count Judah among the tribes of Israel. Its absence can hardly be accounted for on the ground of its separation from Joseph by a Canaanite belt. There is no mention either, of Simeon and Levi. Reuben, alone, of the southern group of Leah tribes is mentioned.[2]

The full significance of this ode is excellently summarized by George Foot Moore: "We see from this that the Israelite tribes, although separated and to some extent broken up in the invasion and settlement of Palestine and the transition from nomadic to agricultural life with all its profound changes, felt themselves to be one people. This consciousness must have come down from a time when the tribes were more closely united than they were in the first centuries of their settlement in Canaan. But it does not spring solely from the fact that they were, or believed themselves to be, of one race, or from the memory of the days in which they had wandered and fought side by side; it has a deeper

---

1 Translation by Julius A. Bewer: The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 6.

2 G. F. Moore: Judges (ICC), pp. 133f.

root in their religion. Israel is the people of Yahweh (v.[11.13]); its enemies are his enemies (v.[31]); its victories, his victories (v.[11]). To him the enthusiasm with which chiefs and people offered themselves for the holy war is gratefully ascribed (v.[2.9]); the oracle pronounces his curse on the villagers of Meroz for not coming bravely to his aid. The whole Ode is a triumphal Te Deum to Yahweh, Israel's God."[1]

Bewer lists the Blessing of Noah (Genesis 9:25-27) as perhaps the earliest of a class of poems which are in the literary form of a prediction. These poems may be regarded as documents of the times which they predict.[2]

> "Cursed by Canaan!
> Meanest slave shall he be to his brothers!
>
> "Bless, Yahweh, the tents of Shem,
> and let Canaan be his slave!
>
> "God enlarge Japheth,
> and let him dwell in the tents of Shem,
> And let Canaan be his slave."

The passage is difficult of explanation but this much, at least, seems clear. Shem is a name for Israel. Canaan stands for the Canaanites. The servitude of Canaan to Shem represents some triumph by Israel over those whom they found in Palestine.[3] We need not here go into the problem of explaining the meaning of Japheth. The poem indicates Yahweh's

---

1 Judges (ICC), p. 134.

2 Julius A. Bewer: The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 11. Eissfeldt lists this as an L passage.

3 John Skinner: Genesis (ICC), p. 186.

favor shown to Israel in their triumph over Canaan.

The Blessing of Jacob belongs to the same literary category (Genesis 49). With the exception of the blessings on Judah perhaps, all these oracles come from pre-monarchic days.[1] The poem points out the distinctive features of the several tribes. Prosperity, reverse; chivalry, slackness; power and eminence, impotence and bare independence - to each tribe praise or blame according to its merits.[2] Yahweh is seen in the affairs of the tribes. The conditions and aspirations of the period that saw the consolidation of the Hebrew nationality are reflected here in this series of blessings.[3]

In the Song of Deborah we saw Yahweh coming to the assistance of his people in their hour of need but at the stage of their development described at the close of the Book of Judges, Yahweh religion is an integral part of national life. This transition was accomplished, in part at least, by the establishment of local Yahweh sanctuaries at different locations. Though this was a dangerous procedure, Yahweh remained the God of Israel and became the God of Israel's land. No longer need Israel fear absorption in the Canaanites. It had now become a nation in the true sense.[4]

---

1 Ibid., p. 509. So Bewer (Literature of the Old Testament, p. 12) says that most are earlier than the monarchy. The blessing on Judah presupposes the rule of David, while the blessing of Joseph seems to come from the period of the divided kingdom - in its present form, at least. But Skinner states several arguments for regarding the blessing on Joseph as early; Genesis (ICC), p. 533. The general character of the poem as a whole is not affected by giving a later date to these questioned sections.

2 S. R. Driver: Genesis (Westminster), p. 380.

3 John Skinner: Genesis (ICC), p. 509.

4 W. Robertson Smith: The Prophets of Israel, p. 44.

The final impetus to the realization of national life as expressed in the monarchy came from the pressure by the Philistines. They at first threatened seriously all the tribes who were as a result forced to unite. Samuel was a promoter of unity - David the consolidator.[1]

"It was Jehovah who had given them their victory, and which was more than any victory, had at length given permanent expression to the unity of the nation by placing at their head a king who reigned as the anointed of the Lord. The first crisis was past, and thenceforward Israel could never forget that it was one nation, with a national destiny and a national God."[2]

---

1 Compare
S. W. Baron: A Social and Religious History of the Jews, Vol. I., p. 51.

2
W. Robertson Smith: The Prophets of Israel, pp. 45f.

5.

The Monarchy

The establishment of the monarchy, with its intensification of nationalism, deepened Israel's consciousness of Yahweh's favor. Graham and May call attention to the fact that Yahweh's standing increased along with the developing proficiency in the arts of war and government while the people were en route to nationhood.[1] The glowing colors used to portray the glories of the monarchy have sometimes been regarded as exaggerated. Yet archaeological investigation has revealed that, politically and economically, Israel, relatively speaking, was almost on a level with the great contemporary neighbors as to material culture.[2]

David was a Yahweh enthusiast. Typical of his keen strategy was his selection of Jerusalem as the capital. Here he had the Ark, "the box of Yahweh militant", brought from the Shiloh Temple. Every sanctuary had its ark but the one at Shiloh had by David's time come to be regarded as the ark, and the foremost religious symbol.[3] David's

---

1 Culture and Conscience, p. 178.

2 Ibid., p. 186.

3 The Ark was not peculiar to the religion of Israel. "the existence of the antecedent appellative אֲרוֹן אֱלֹהִים, a sacred box, implies

most enduring work was on the side of religion. "He emphasized and reinforced the conception of a national religion in a fashion which was never forgotten. When he brought the Ark to Jerusalem he laid the foundations of an idea which was to endure for a period whose end is yet in the far future. ... the Ark perished in the flames that devoured the first Temple, but by that time the work was done, and men were ready to learn a new conception of religion, in which no material embodiment of Yahweh was needed more, when men should no longer speak with regret of the Ark of the covenant of Yahweh, nor should it enter their thoughts, but their spiritual life should be built on a new Covenant, placed in their inward parts and written on their hearts."[1]

Of the literature which comes from the days of the early monarchy may be mentioned the Oracles of Balsam. These are characterized by the same "prophetic" element which was noted in the "prophetic Blessings". As these oracles now stand in the record they are to be regarded as brought together by JE: Numbers 23 is E, and 24 is J. Brightman, in speaking of the oracles in chapter 24 says that they

---

that it was a common Palestinian institution.... The expression ארון אלהים was pretty certainly of Palestinian origin. Whether the thing itself was known to the Israelites under another name before their settlement in Canaan, we have no means of saying. The earliest historical sacred boxes of which we have record date from the period of the Judges." W. R. Arnold: Ephod and Ark, pp. 132f. The bringing of the Ark, which had undoubtedly been adopted by Israel in Canaan, to Jerusalem "was a climactic act in the coalescence of the Israelites and the Canaanites." Elmer A. Leslie: Old Testament Religion, p. 126.

1 T. H. Robinson: History of Israel, Vol. I, p. 236.

are generally regarded as among the oldest sources used by J.[1] Bewer regards the four oracles as "poetic descriptions of the time of Saul and of David, during which they were composed."[2]

The first oracle (23:7-10)[3] speaks of Israel's freedom from the curse of Yahweh:

"How shall I curse, whom God has not cursed?
And how shall I denounce, whom Yahweh has not denounced?"

of their position of special privilege:

"For from the top of the rocks I see him,
And from the hills I behold him:
Lo, it is a people that dwells alone,
And that reckons not itself among the nations."

and of their numbers:

"Who can count the dust of Jacob,
Or number the myriads of Israel?"

The second oracle (23:18-24) describes Yahweh's unchangeable attitude toward Israel:

"God is not a man that He should break His word,
Neither the son of man, that he should change his mind.
Should He promise and not do it?
Or speak and not make it good?
Behold, I have received orders to bless:
And He has blessed and I cannot reverse it.
He has not beheld calamity in Jacob;
Nor seen trouble in Israel:
Yahweh his God is with him,
And the shout for his king is among them."

In the third oracle (24:3-9) the beauty and fertility of the

---

1 E. S. Brightman: Sources of the Hexateuch, p. 104.

2 Literature of the Old Testament, p. 13.

3 The translations of this oracle, and of the three following, are by Julius A. Bewer in The Literature of the Old Testament, pp. 14-15.

land are described, to the credit of Yahweh:

"How beautiful are thy tents, O Jacob,
thy tabernacles, O Israel!
Like valleys are they spread forth,
like gardens by the river-side,
Like cedars which Yahweh has planted,
like palms beside the waters."

Here, as in the second oracle, reference is made to the deliverance from Egypt. In the power of Yahweh

"He shall devour the nations, his adversaries,
and break their bones in pieces,
and shatter their loins."

The king and the monarchy are extolled.

"Blessed is every one that blesses thee,
and cursed is every one that curses thee..."

expresses a sense of the solidarity between Yahweh and Israel to the extent that all who bless Israel are blessed and all who curse Israel are cursed.[1] This is the effective climax of this oracle. Balaam dared do nothing else than bless Israel.[2]

The fourth oracle is climactic in the series. Moab itself is to perish.

"I see him, but not now;
I behold him but not nigh:
A star has shone forth out of Jacob,
a sceptre has risen out of Israel,
And it smites through the temples of Moab,
and the skulls of all the sons of tumult (?)."[3]

---

1 Compare A. R. S. Kennedy: Leviticus and Numbers (NC), p. 330.

2 G. B. Gray: Numbers (ICC), p. 366.

3 See p.46 , footnote.

The characters Balak and Balaam "are in reality subordinate figures in the story; the protagonists are Israel and Moab; the overruling thought is Yahweh's power to defend His people and His purposes of good concerning them; and the fatal madness of those who, through them, oppose Him."[1]

Comparable with the Blessing of Judah is the Blessing of Moses (Deuteronomy 33) although the latter comes from a later period. The date lies somewhere between the division of the kingdom and the fall of the North: to be more exact, either shortly after the rise of Jeroboam I or in the midst of the prosperous reign of Jeroboam II. Perhaps the earlier date is to be preferred.[2] In contrast to the Blessing of Jacob all of the blessings here are eulogistic. The Blessing of Moses "breathes from end to end a national spirit."[3] Ease, tranquility, contentment characterize the period pictured. The serene, happy spirit of the early narrative of Kings is reflected.[4]

---

1 G. B. Gray: Numbers (ICC), p. 316.

2 S. R. Driver: Deuteronomy (ICC), p. 388 favors the early date. So Bewer: Literature of the Old Testament, p. 19: "the form of the poem with its 'blessings' for the individual tribes presupposes a strong tribal consciousness which was still awake at the time of Jeroboam I..."

3 Julius A. Bewer: Literature of the Old Testament, p. 69.

4 Compare S. R. Driver: Deuteronomy, pp. 385ff.

The two sources, J and E, reveal certain characteristics which are indicative of the regard in which Yahweh, the God of Israel, was held previous to the time of their composition.

The national spirit, so conspicuous in J, colors his whole historical outlook. For J history is "the working out of the purpose of God." Israel's position as a prosperous nation is the result of Yahweh's favor. While E is more theocratic and less nationalistic yet it gives the impression of national prosperity, and both J and E have a confident hope for the nation's future.

For the mass of people a mark of Yahweh's favor was detected in bountiful crops. In becoming the God of the agriculturist, Yahweh had naturally become Baalized. We have already noted how, for all practical purposes, Yahweh was regarded as a Baal, yet it was Yahweh whom Israel still worshipped. The ninth century saw the position of Yahweh severely threatened by the introduction of the Phoenician Baal. But the ninth century witnessed also the activity of a new Yahweh champion, Elijah. It was under his leadership that there came the solution of the struggle - Yahweh or Baal. As a result of Elijah's influence Yahweh, and he alone, was recognized as Israel's God.

Elijah, and Elisha too, lived, however, more in accordance with the spirit of their predecessors than of their successors. These men were great political prophets. They were in the company of those who looked towards the future of the nation with hope. In fact, the national hope which was later attacked by Amos may have been molded

by them. The victory of Yahweh over Baal on Carmel was symbolic of the status of his people. Under his aegis they too will be supreme and enjoy a blissful national existence.

# # # #

Yahweh has shown his continuous protection and favoritism to Israel from the time when he first revealed himself to Moses. Through several centuries the belief in his guidance has been sustained by concrete evidences, and it finds its culmination in a sense of national well-being. It remains now for a religious genius to penetrate, to interpret, the deeper implications of Yahweh's relationship to Israel.

1.

The Eighth Century Prophets

In so far as prosperity was regarded as a criterion of the favor of Yahweh, the major portion of the eighth century left no room for doubt that both kingdoms were held in his high regard.

Under Jeroboam II the northern kingdom saw the return of prosperity such as had not been known since Solomon's reign. His success was in large measure the result of "foreign affairs". Adadnirari III struck a decisive blow against Damascus in 805. Shalmanezer IV (782-773) further weakened Damascus. By the time internal strife in Assyria (763) made it possible for Damascus to recover a free hand, Jeroboam was too well established to be materially affected.[1] Judah enjoyed during almost the same years a conspicuous revival under Uzziah. An extremely wealthy class arose - offset, however, by one equally poor.

After the death of Jeroboam II the northern kingdom came to a quick end. One ruler followed another until Samaria fell. That which had looked like prosperity was only veneer. The country "was rotten to the core."

---

[1] Compare Rud. Kittel: Geschichte des Volkes Israel, Vol. II, p. 346.

Judah was made anxious by the Syro-Ephraimitish war. Assyria was kept off for a time by the payment of tribute by Ahaz. Hezekiah gave up the payment of tribute and turned to Ethiopia. Eventually Sennacherib attacked Jerusalem. Though unsuccessful in this venture, he devastated the rest of Judah, and Hezekiah was compelled to pay tribute.

In the midst of this seeming prosperity and very real adversity emerged the great prophets of the eighth century.

(1) Amos

It was to the earliest of these religious geniuses, Amos, that the deeper meaning of Yahweh's relationship to Israel came. He began his message at Bethel in a manner calculated to attract instant attention - by attacking Israel's enemies. So intent were his hearers upon these condemnations, so fully in sympathy with the prophet, they were quite unprepared for his climax:

> "Thus saith Yahweh: For three transgressions of Israel, yea, for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof" (2:6).

The effect was electric. They had rejoiced in the punishment of other nations, for Yahweh in punishing them was acting expressly for Israel. But for Amos to say that Yahweh would punish Israel even as one of the outside nations was "both unpatriotic and blasphemous".

Amos' audience at Bethel was typical of the masses of his day. For them Yahweh was God of Israel and of Israel alone. He was one among many for every nation had its own god. His interest

was confined solely to Israel. In fact nationalism was so much a factor that it was inconceivable that Yahweh could exist without his people. It was largely because of this indissoluble relationship which the people believed existed that religion had reached such a xtate. Yahweh could be counted on to be satisfied with the cultus as practiced. The abundant prosperity was taken as a mark of his high favor.

Harper has pointed out two corollaries of nationalism. First, Yahweh must protect their political interests without reference to their moral conduct. He must identify himself with his people bound so closely to him. In the second place, aside from being obligated to fight Israel's battles against enemies Yahweh had nothing to do with these outside nations.[1]

Amos stands as the first representative of the prophetic movement in direct contrast to the popular opinion. For him, Yahweh is a being of power - in nature and in history. He is so unqualifiedly superior that it amounts to practical monotheism.

Amos stands on common ground with the people in stressing Yahweh's special interest in Israel. "My people" is the descriptive phrase which he puts into the mouth of Yahweh. But Amos reached a new conclusion. His hearers agreed with him in his statement, "You only have I known of all the families of the earth" but he followed with a conclusion which was utterly unheard of - "Therefore will I

---

[1] Amos and Hosea (ICC), p. cxii.

visit upon you all your iniquities" (3:2).[1] Yahweh's relation to Israel was not "natural". He had selected this one nation from among the many - an act of free grace. The deduction from the fact was not, as popular opinion held, license to sin, but heightened responsibility. Israel must expect a severer judgment because of her special privilege.

Amos was a pioneer in expressing the international implication of Yahweh's unlimited power. If his power knew no limits then the world must be under his control. Hence,"all nations are on the same level. There is no place before him for special pleading."[2]

Two events were regarded as giving proof of Yahweh's favor for Israel - the deliverance from Egypt and the day of Yahweh. While Amos does not deny Yahweh's part in the Exodus he reminds his hearers of Yahweh's favor as shown to their enemies.[3]

---

1 רַק אֶתְכֶם יָדַעְתִּי

Only you have I known. Among the meanings of יָדַע is to know a person, be acquainted with. In this sense the verb may be regarded as meaning take notice of, regard. So of Israel as chosen people, Amos 3:2 (Brown, Driver, Briggs). Harper takes the verb here with the preposition לְ to mean to distinguish from, to choose, and compares the use with Genesis 18:19, Jeremiah 1:5 and Isaiah 58:3 (W.R.Harper: Amos and Hosea((ICC)), p. 96). The usual word for Yahweh's choosing Israel is בָּחַר. Cripps points out that possibly Amos is here echoing - and perhaps with irony - a watchword of the people - "us only has Jehovah known." (A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Amos, p. 151). However this passage may be translated, a selection is implied.

2 Henry J. Cadbury: National Ideals in the Old Testament, pp. 104f.

3 Compare Henry J. Cadbury: National Ideals in the Old Testament, p.105.

> "Are ye not as the children of the Ethiopians unto me, O children of Israel? saith Yahweh. Have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir? Behold, the eyes of the Lord Yahweh are upon the sinful kingdom, and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth" (9:7-8a).

As Yahweh had had the right to choose Israel, likewise he had the right to reject.[1] Yahweh would, moreover, exercise this right! The Day of Yahweh, for which Israel longed would come - but how different it would be from that commonly expected. "Der Tag Jahwes ...endlich ist nicht mehr der Tag, wo der partikularistische Gott Israels gegen die Feinde seines Volkes siegt, sondern der Tag, an dem Jahwe der Gott der sittlichen Macht und der Gerechtigkeit, triumphiert auch gegen Israel."[2]

Nor could Israel escape the consequence of her sin under the comfortable philosophy of her cultus. Because Yahweh was Israel's God alone, because he was interested in them exclusively, they reasoned he would be satisfied with the worship they rendered him through the cultus. That injustice, inhumanity, were involved in defraying the lavish cost of gifts to him, of pilgrimages and praises, meant nothing. Provided the routine of sacrifice was faithfully performed "nothing more" was required.[3]

Amos directly attacked this popular attitude. The sacrifice and external cult upon which so much reliance was placed had never been required by Yahweh (5:21-25). On the other hand, it was positively ob-

---

1 W. R. Harper: Amos and Hosea (ICC), p. 66.

2 Karl Marti: Das Dodekapropheten, p. 149.

3 W. R. Harper: Amos and Hosea (ICC), pp. cxii f.

noxious. In the oracle against Israel, the prophet specifies some of the sins of which the people are guilty - bribery, slavery, greed, inhumanity, sacred prostitution, social indifference. As we read his words contained in the central portion of the book we note his attack on the social evils growing out of the popular idea of religion. He calls the storing up of wealth in palaces "violence and robbery" (3: 9-10). His indictment of the women of Samaria is most biting. They oppress the poor in order that they may the more fully enjoy their luxury (4:1-3). Yahweh is profaned - not honored - by the practice of cultic prostitution (2:7). Criticism of this originally Canaanite practice was something new in Israel. - What Yahweh does want is justice, "righteousness in social expression." "Let roll along like the waters, justice, And righteousness like a perpetual wady" (5:24).[1]

With Adam Welch we recapitulate Amos' interpretation of Yahweh's special relationship to Israel: "All He has done for them was a deliberate and sustained act of self-conscious will, and as such, revealed in the very nature of things a purpose. ... He has poured out His benefits on this people that thereby He may make known what He is, and may mould Israel into an instrument of His will. ... To know and serve the will of their God was the very reason for their possession of the land, and therefore, while the Philistines came from Caphtor and knew not why, Israel was led to Palestine and told the reason of their coming. But they thought to keep the land and to stifle the voice of the prophets. Their sin... is treachery to the

---

[1] Translation by Elmer A. Leslie in Old Testament Religion, p. 170.

common purpose which bound God and people together...they have flouted ...Jahveh, who... meant to perfect good in this one nation. ... The nation no longer expresses anything more than any other nation which Jahveh guides;..."[1]

Amos believed in an out and out annihilation of the people should they persist in their perversity. Nor did he apparently anticipate repentance. He probably never asked the question, what would become of the religion of Yahweh should all his people be destroyed.[2] Intense soul that he was he delivered his message and believed it implicitly.

From the point of view of this study, the advance step which Amos took was, beyond reaffirming Yahweh's past and present relationship to Israel, asserting that because of their selection their responsibility was proportionately the greater. Israel would receive no further privilege without an assumption of responsibility. "Die Prärogative Israels ist kein Ruhekissen zur Einschläferung des Gewissens, sondern, richtig verstanden, eine treibende Kraft zur Erfüllung der einfachsten wie der Höchsten Pflichten; daraus erwächst...für Israel selbst das Privileg, zum Heile der Welt zu leiden...Man sieht, wie gut dieses Wort, das eine neue Religionsphase inauguriert, und das daher nicht bloss dem Buche Amos, sondern der ganzen israelitischen Prophetie bis zu Deuterojesaja als Motto dienen könnte, an die Spitze der Redesammlung Cap. 3-6 passt."[3]

---

1 Religion of Israel Under the Kingdom, pp. 83f.

2 Karl Marti: Das Dodekapropheton, p. 150.

3 Karl Marti: Das Dodekapropheton, pp. 172f.

(2) Hosea

Hosea, for whom Yahweh was preeminently the God of love, came to his full realization of Yahweh's relation to Israel through his own bitter matital experience.[1] The prophet had fallen in love with Gomer who responded to him. After several years of married life she was lured away by her paramours. Torn as he was in his sensitive soul he continued to love his unfaithful wife. Brooding over his own sorrow he realized how similar his experience was to that of Yahweh with Israel. But Yahweh still loved Israel in spite of its disloyalty. So Hosea in loving forgiveness "bought" her back and kept her in restraint until her old love should reawaken. The following table illustrates his line of reasoning:

Hosea	Gomer	Paramours	Children
Yahweh	Israel	Baalim	Corrupted Israelites

"Never before had the relation between God and Israel been comprehended with such strong emotional passion. Love is the keynote of this relation."[2] It was because Yahweh had loved Israel that the nation had come into being.

> "...I am Yahweh thy God from the land of Egypt..". (12:9. Compare 13:4).
>
> "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt" (11:1).

This was gracious love on the part of Yahweh. His early delight

---

1 We do not need here to consider the various theories regarding Gomer's position before her marriage, nor of how Hosea came to marry her.

2 Julius A. Bewer: The Literature of The Old Testament, p. 98.

in Israel is expressed in the figure of a "thirsty wayfarer finding grapes."

> "I found Israel like grapes in the wilderness...." (9:10).

He cared for Israel tenderly.

> "... I taught Ephraim to walk; I took them on my arms; but they knew not that I healed them" (11:3).

The prophet continues to trace this history of the relationship between Yahweh and Israel in figurative terms. Israel, when the period of marriage began, came to dwell in Yahweh's land and to receive his gifts.[1] Israel's history showed one unique reality: it was the history of God's love to it."[2]

Yahweh's tenderness is expressed in what George Adam Smith calls "the greatest passage in Hosea."

> "How shall I give thee up, Ephraim?
> how shall I cast thee off, Israel?
> How shall I make thee as Admah?
> how shall I set thee as Zeboim
> My heart is turned within Me,
> My compassions are kindled together.
> I will not execute the fierceness of Mine anger,
> I will not return to destroy Ephraim:
> For I am God, and not man,
> the Holy one in thy midst, and not mortal"
> (11:8-9).[3]

---

1 Welch *sees* thus an explanation of the apparent discrepancy between the conception of Israel as a child and as a wife which has led sometimes to a questioning of the text of 11:1. (Harper, et al, note textual difficulties here.) Yahweh did not merely love Israel when it was full grown, and did not choose the nation already in its proud independent strength to bear his name." Religion of Israel Under the Kingdom, p. 109.

2 Ibid. p. 112.

3 Julius A. Bewer: The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 96.

Israel's 'unfaithfulness' was manifest in three ways: in religion, morality, and in politics.

The chief of these three sins was the whole cultus of the time. When the various passages in Hosea are put together a most startling picture of the Baal cult is presented. At the High Places this licentious cult was carried on in the name of Yahweh. One phase was sacred prostitution. Hosea gives us the earliest clear indication of how complete had been the Israelite absorption of this aspect of the Canaanite cult (4:13ff.).[1]

In connection with his condemnation of license in the cult he attacked the worship of images (10:5). He sarcastically ridiculed the practice of kissing the images - "Let the men that sacrifice kiss the calves" (not bulls) 13:2. The calf is no god.

> "He hath cast off thy calf, O Samaria; mine anger is kindled against them: how long will it be ere they attain to innocency? For from Israel is even this: the workman made it, and it is no God; yea, the calf of Samaria shall be broken in pieces" (8:6-7).

Along with sins religious, in connection with the cultus was sin which manifested itself morally. What a picture of degradation he paints in 4:2; 7:1; 10:4- theft, murder, drunkenness, sexual vice. The blame for a degenerate morality and a degraded worship is placed upon the priesthood.

---

1 Elmer A. Leslie: Old Testament Religion, pp. 179f.

> "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I also will forget thy children. As they were multiplied, so they sinned against me: I will change their glory into shame. They feed on the sin of my people, and set their heart on their iniquity. And it shall be, like people, like priest; and I will punish them for their ways, and will requite them their doings" (4:6-9).

Hosea was deeply concerned over the political situation. To him Yahweh was Israel's only Saviour. "Der Grund des politischen Verfalls, der sich vor aller Augen in Israel vollzieht, ist für ihn der Abfall von Jahwe, die Buhlerei mit dem Auslande. 'Liebesgeschenke' sind es, die man nach Assur und Ägypten bringt (8:9)".[1] Ephraim is like a silly dove calling upon Egypt and going to Assyria (7:11-13). All help coming from such quarters is vain."... them went Ephraim to Assyria, and sent to King Jareb: but he is not able to heal you, neither will he cure you of your wound" (5:13). Nothing but ruin awaits Ephraim. "Strangers have devoured his strength, and he knoweth it not: yea, gray hairs are here and there upon him, and he knoweth it not" (7:9). An alliance with other nations involved some sort of formal acknowledgment of the god or gods of the ally. Thus to call on another nation was an insult to Yahweh and a breach of trust.[2] In internal matters Hosea sees the same

---

1 Gustav Hölscher: Die Profeten, p. 219.

2 J. M. Powis Smith: The Prophets and Their Times, pp. 61f.

faithlessness. Harper interprets Hosea as holding that Israel's home policy has been wrong from the beginning. Israel's kings are not of divine appointment, while Judah's are. He attacks the anarchy and confusion of his day.[1] Probably the condemnation of kings is meant to include only the kings of his own time, of whom there were many. These kings won the throne, generally by violence. Then they resorted to foreign alliance to aid them. It is little wonder from all that we know of the period, that Hosea condemned the national life so bitterly.

Instead of faithlessness, Israel should give Yahweh a grateful recognition of what he has done for them, of what he is, and of what he requires.

To understand Hosea's interpretation of the life Yahweh requires one must remember the magical rites which were a part of the religion of the day. For example, in the Adonis cult little basket gardens were planted. Seedlings which would grow up rapidly were planted and forced. They withered just as rapidly as they grew. "This was a form of primitive magic, the purpose of which was to bring the dead Adonis, the corn and fertility god, to life, and to restore to the earth the fructifying waters."[2] But Hosea points out that such sowings do not avail. Rather:

---

1 W. R. Harper: Amos and Hosea, p. clii.

2 Elmer A. Leslie: Old Testament Religion, p. 186.

> "Sow to yourselves in righteousness, reap according to kindness: break up your fallow ground; for it is time to seek Yahweh, till he come, and rain righteousness upon you" (10:12).

Here Hosea brings out the contrast between magic and a religion of righteousness. Yahweh cannot be appealed to by magic.

Neither does Yahweh want baal images. We have seen that reliance on all earthly power is displeasing to him. He is not pleased with sacrifice. Even apart from the Canaanitish element he does not delight in it.

> "As for the scrifices of mine offerings, they sacrifice flesh and eat it; but Yahweh accepteth them not ..." (8:13).

Stated positively, the demand of Yahweh is for hesed (4:1; 6:4-6; 10:12; 12:6). "Das Wort חסד ist schwer zu übersetzen. 'Liebe' wäre zutreffend, wenn man darunter versteht, was eben von חסד gesagt worden ist. Für 'Liebe' aber sagt Hosea אהבה. Man könnte חסד vielleicht am besten durch 'Religiosität' wiedergeben oder durch 'pietas'."[1] "Hesed on the side of Jahveh is that sure and unmerited goodness to which Israel owes everything... Hesed on the side of Israel as a community is, first and fundamentally, the grateful recognition of its debt, with the resultant loyalty which springs from the acknowledgment that men owe everything to a God who had His own purpose in all He has done for them. It is what Dr. G. A. Smith has called leal love- a love which issues in loyalty."[2]

---

1 Nelson Glueck: Das Wort hesed, p. 23.
2 Adam Welch: Religion of Israel Under The Kingdom, p. 123.

Yahwth's due was an exclusive loyalty- a loyal love in line with his own character. He wanted whole-hearted, undivided affection and fidelity to himself- qualities which have their origin in himself.

Hosea anticipated a temporary suspension of the relation between Yahweh and his people. He calls Israel to repent but unless the call is answered Israel must be punished. And the punishment will be severe. Judgment seems inevitable and near at hand. Israel is moth-eaten and rotten (5:12), sick and full of sores (5:13), a half baked cake (7:8), a worthless pot (8:8), grey-haired (7:9), and withered at the roots (9:16). Occasionally there are announcements that Palestine will become a wilderness or that Israel will be destroyed by the peoples but generally it is Yahweh himself who will be the adversary and always he is behind it all.

For those who reject the hopefullpassages in the book, Hosea has no bright message and Israel's future is one of doom. But the very nature of his belief in God demands a continuance of the relationship between Yahweh and Israel. After judgment, salvation. The judgment was not viewed by Hosea as an isolated fact. "He is continually dwelling on how God's act in interfering for the people's sake implies more than a mere isolated act, since it implies something of an eternal character on God's side."[1]

---

[1] Adam Welch: Religion of Israel Under The Kingdom, p. 138.

Fundamental to Hosea's whole message is his belief that Yahweh chose Israel. By the use of the figures 'wife' and 'son' Hosea set forth the significance of the relationship between Yahweh and Israel. His own experience enabled him to realize the more fully the depth of this relationship. So deep was Yahweh's love for his chosen Israel that it must triumph over their sin and cure Israel who will return to Yahweh in penitance.

> "And I will betroth thee unto me for ever; yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness, and in justice, and in lovingkindness, and in mercies. I will even betroth thee unto me in faithfulness; and thou shalt know Yahweh" (2:19-20).

(3) Isaiah

Isaiah, in line with the other prophets, believed in Israel's unique relation to Yahweh. Unlike Hosea and Amos, he had little to say of the origins of this relationship. "I have nourished and brought up children" (1:2b) reminds one of Hosea's figure (chapter 11). The prophet uses a Vineyard Song (chapter 5) to describe Yahweh's tender care for Israel. Cultivation brought forth only wild grapes. Hence the vineyard will now be abandoned to destruction. "For the vineyard of Yahweh of hosts is the house of Israel, and the men of Judah his pleasant plant." Skinner paraphrases "and his rod shall be over the sea, and he shall lift it up after the manner of Egypt" (10:26b) thus: "and His rod (which was stretched out) over the (Red) Sea (at the Exodus from Egypt), he shall lift up as it was lifted up to destroy the Egyptians."[1] But while there may be little mention of origins there is no uncertainty as to the fact that Israel is Yahweh's people.

For Isaiah, Yahweh was the ruler of the world, both of nature and of man. But this world ruler had chosen Israel as his people and Zion as his dwelling place. "Israel is the immediate sphere of Jehovah's royal functions." There is in one sense a universalism but it is particularly related to the national element in Judah.

Isaiah - almost alone - uses the title for Yahweh, "the Holy One of Israel, i.e., the Holy Being who is the God of Israel. Here again Israel is conceived as the community within which Jehovah re-

---

[1] Isaiah, (Cambridge), p. 99.

veals Himself as He truly is, and by which His character as the Holy One is to be recognized, and exhibited to the world."[1]

It was from his overpowering sense of the holiness of Yahweh which came to him in his inaugural vision that he derived the conviction of the gulf between Yahweh and his people. He is at one with the contemporary prophets in his ethical emphasis. Israel has cut itself off because of its "uncleanness". (The prophet found himself "in the midst of a people of unclean lips".) Idolatry, elaborate ritual, an oppressive upper class, perversion of justice - these are among the evils.

Isaiah was more creative in his interpretation of the positive quality of the religion of Yahweh than Amos and Hosea had been. His generation had faith, only it was misplaced - in magic and idolatry, in fortifications and military power - in other words, in the material and human realm. Three noteworthy sayings express this conviction:

> "If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established" (7:9).
>
> "he that believeth shall not be in haste" (28:16).
>
> "In returning and rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength" (30:15).

A capacity for faith was synonymous with religion; but the people did not have faith and therefore there would be no political salvation. The prophet was faced with failure for he could not kindle faith in

---

1 John Skinner: Isaiah (Cambridge), p. lvi.

the hearts of his hearers. Out of his apparent failure came his teaching about the remnant.

It was with Isaiah that the idea of the remnant came to the front. How did this idea, which is one of his most characteristic teachings, originate? In the account of Elijah's vision at Horeb we find the idea in germ. In the turmoil and slaughter to take place in the northern kingdom, seven thousand faithful shall be spared - those who have not bowed unto Baal. Amos had spoken of a remnant, but it was to consist of chance survivors at best. Little value for the future was attached to any such remnant. There is one passage in Isaiah which closely resembles Amos' description of two legs or a piece of an ear rescued from the mouth of the lion: "...there shall be left...gleaninga, as the shaking of an olive-tree, two or three berries in the top of the uppermost bough, four or five in the outmost branches of a fruitful tree..."[1] (17:6)

When Judah was threatened by the Syro-Ephraimitish alliance fear seized people and king. Isaiah took his little son, Shear-Yashub,[2] and went out to meet King Ahaz, hoping to awaken in the king a confidence in the protective care of Yahweh and to keep him from turning to Assyria. Since the child was apparently old enough to walk,[3] and since this encounter with Ahaz took place in 735, Isaiah's idea of the remnant must have developed early in his career as a prophet, perhaps as a direct outgrowth of his inaugural vision.

---

1 Owen Whitehouse regards this as perhaps the earliest oracle of Isa. Isaiah (New Century), p. 215. Duhm, too, dates it early.

2 שאר ישוב Remnant-shall-turn, i.e., turn to Yahweh. John Skinner: Isaiah (Cambridge), p. 54.

3 G. B. Gray: Isaiah (ICC), p. 117.

> "Then said I, Lord, how long? And he answered, Until cities be waste without inhabitant, and houses without man, and the land become utterly waste, and Yahweh have removed men far away, and the forsaken places be many in the midst of the land. And if there be yet a tenth in it, it also shall in turn be eaten up: as a terebinth, and as an oak, whose stock remaineth, when they are felled; so the holy seed is the stock thereof" (6:11-13).

The last clause does not appear in the LXX - σπερμα αγιον το στηλωμα αυτης appearing in the margin. Even with this interpolation removed, Skinner still believes that as the tree has life in its roots and will again spring up, so Israel contains an indestructible element.[1]

Unlike Amos and Hosea he had met with a measure of success in that he was able to attract and hold a group of disciples. In abandoning his public utterances and in turning to the task of "consolidating the remnant" he is consciously attempting to form an inner circle which shall become the nucleus of the future people of God.

> "(I will) tie up the testimony (and) seal the teaching in (?) my disciples. And I will wait for Yahweh who hideth his face from the House of Jacob, and I will look for him. Behold, I and the children whom Yahweh hath given to me are for signs and portents in Israel from Yahweh of Hosts who dwelleth in Mount Sion" (8:16-18).

Thus G. B. Gray translates this passage. He thinks "these words read like the conclusion of the autobiographical memoir which recorded Isaiah's teaching during the Syro-Ephraimitish war... They also give the impression that Isaiah realized that a stage in his ministry was closed".[2] Gray emphasizes that with Isaiah it is less the doctrine

---

1 Compare Isaiah (Cambridge), p. 51.

2 Isaiah (ICC), p. 154.

of the remnant idea than the practical step of creating the remnant.

Isaiah's doctrine constitutes one of the radical ideas of the Old Testament. Against the background of nationalism and a religion which was comprehended in national or group terms, his teaching stands out in sharp relief. The significance of his thought and action is strikingly expressed by W. Robertson Smith. "Till then no one had dreamed of a fellowship of faith dissociated from all national forms, maintained without the exercise of ritual services, bound together by faith in the divine word alone. It was the birth of a new era in the Old Testament religion, for it was the birth of the conception of the Church, the first step in the emancipation of spiritual religion from the forms of political life."[1]

Here then is the important beginning of the narrowing of the idea of election. Within Israel - Yahweh's chosen people who had separated themselves from him by their "uncleanness" - there was an Israel, a remnant which would continue in his fellowship and constitute the hope of the future.

Two passages which come from the latter part of Isaiah's activity have a bearing here. The one, 10:20-23[2] is called by Skinner the most explicit application of the idea of the remnant. According to

---

1 The Prophets of Israel, pp. 274f.

2 The genuineness of the passage has been questioned by Duhm, Marti, Gray, et al. Skinner dismissed the matter by saying that the grounds advanced by the critics are not convincing. Isaiah (Cambridge), p. 93. Whitehouse in arguing for the passage states that Cheyne concedes that "the whole passage is to a great extent a mosaic of Isaianic expressions and images" and he thinks Duhm admits his fallibility by admitting the subjective element in separating the genuine passages from

this passage, the remnant will consist of those spared in the final visitation. Their turning from trust in earthly power to quiet reliance on God, advocated by Isaiah, will show their conversion.[1] Here it is the eschatological aspect of his teaching with which the prophet is concerned.

The other passage does not mention the remnant specifically. "Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone of sure foundation: he that believeth shall not be in haste" (28:16). The LXX reads ὁ πιστεύων... οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ. Duhm comments thus on the LXX reading: "das יָחִישׁ der LXX ist ein wenig trivial, aber es bildet eine Brücke zu dem von Cheyne und Cuthe vorgeschlagenen יָמוּט."[2] Nevertheless, though not mentioned, the "stone" is obviously a symbol for the remnant.[3] The passage expresses the stability and permanence of Yahweh's relation to Israel, but really a relationship to the new Israel.[4]

That the true Israel will not be destroyed is promised in the prophet's teaching of the inviolability of Zion. In fact, a complete destruction would be impossible because of the remnant. At times it

---

interpolations. Isaiah (New Century), Vol. I, pp. 166f. If this passage is definitely rejected it makes no material difference to the total conception of the remnant in the prophet's teaching.

1 Isaiah (Cambridge), p. 98.

2 Das Buch Jesaia (1892), p. 177.

3 John Skinner: Isaiah (Cambridge), p. lxviii.

4 Ibid.

is difficult to tell whether Isaiah is speaking of Zion actually or ideally but that he had the actual city in mind in some of his oracles there can be no question. A teaching which at the time was a source of inspiration developed in later hands into a dangerous dogma.

We now consider the Messianic passages, for, if genuine, they have a bearing on the idea of election, as Welch indicates. The worldly kingdom must pass away for with its worldly aims [it] was perverting Judah, so that the nation could neither see nor welcome Jahveh's purpose with them and through them. ...The old kingdom must go to make room for the new thing which Jahveh is bringing to pass."[1]

The genuineness of the Messianic passages in Isaiah is disputed. Welch, in accepting the Isaianic authorship, quotes from Nowack who states that neither language nor idea need exclude such authorship. Nowack's defense seems logical. Since by the time of the Exile the idea of the Messianic Kingdom was thoroughly established, the hope must presumably have attached itself to the kingdom before it had come to an end.[2]

In contrast to Judah as it was Isaiah saw the nation as Yahweh had originally intended it. The ideal ruler will be in sympathy with that which Yahweh had intended from the beginning. Isaiah pic-

---

1 Religion of Israel under the Kingdom, p. 181.

2 Ibid., pp. 282 f.

tures this ideal ruler - king - as belonging to the Davidic dynasty (9:2-7).[1] He will be endowed with an ideal character. "His name shall be called Wonderful Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace." This King will be able to judge rightly with keen insight, and he will have the power to execute his judgments. He will have a passion to serve. Peace without end will be established. There is a strong religious element in his character. He will be richly endowed with the spirit of Yahweh which is more fully stated as "the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of Yahweh" (11:2 and 11:1-9). When this ideal leader is enthroned, rallying the nations about him, he will influence the whole world. The knowledge of God will fill the earth.

The ideal reign is further described in chapter 32:1-8. "Isaiah had a childlike faith in the importance of the personality of the king. He expected an ideal age from the rule of the ideal monarch and the administration by righteous office holders. The golden age was to him the purification and glorification of the old order."[2] His was not a vision so much of society established as reformed.[3] Skinner is quite right in pointing out that we have

---

1 It is recognized that those who do regard this passage as Isaianic do not agree upon its date. We do not attempt a definite date, but regard the passage as expressing the hope for a leadership in contrast to that in evidence.

2 Julius A. Bewer: The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 116.

3 George Adam Smith: Isaiah, Vol. I, p. 249.

here no lowering of the ideal of Messianic kingship. The perfect discharge of the functions of royalty is a task of such transcendent importance as to require a unique endowment of divine virtues which is the distinctive feature of the ideal portraits of the Messiah.[1]

For Isaiah, Yahweh was a world ruler but Zion was his dwelling place and through Israel his real nature was revealed. In the Messianic passages Isaiah showed how the old order must pass away, for the chosen people had been perverted so that Yahweh's purpose was no longer realized in them. In the new era Yahweh will again be enabled to realize his purpose. For the idea of election, however, Isaiah's outstanding contribution is his teaching about the remnant.

---

[1] John Skinner: Isaiah (Cambridge Bible), p. lxi.

2.

The Covenant - Old and New

The seventh century stands in marked contrast to the eighth. Manasseh's reign of more than fifty years was a period of religious deterioration. Nothing constructive came to the front during his lifetime. His grandson Josiah came to the throne after a short reign by Amon (638). He was a very different character from his grandfather. His reign was conspicuous for religious reform, which was embodied in Deuteronomy. It was during his reign, too, that Jeremiah, perhaps the greatest of the prophets, began his active career. In their teachings we have represented that which is distinctive between the old and the new covenants.

(1) Deuteronomy

As the study of Deuteronomy is developed, we shall attempt to show that the document is of exceptional significance for the subject of our investigation.

It is now well over a hundred years since it has been generally agreed that the book comes from the seventh century B.C. Of late, the date, together with other well established judgments relative to Deuteronomy - its connection with Josiah's reform and the centralization of worship in Jerusalem - has been questioned by some. We must

examine their opinions, since the relationship Deuteronomy is believed to bear to the literature which preceded and which followed it makes the date a matter of great importance. That the book occupies a pivotal position in the study of Old Testament history, literature, and religion is the accepted dictum of scholarship. It is "a sort of Meridian of Greenwich, a fixed point in chronological and psychological relationship to which most other literature can be placed."[1]

While theories advocating a post-exilic date for Deuteronomy have appeared sporadically for over a century, it is only recently that any serious attention has been given to such views. G. R. Berry and R. H. Kennett raised the issue here and in England previous to the appearance of Hölscher's article, "Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums." Hölscher bases his case principally on the impracticable idealism in the book. On the other hand, the theory has been advanced by Oestreicher and Welch that the book should be given an early date. Oestreicher's thesis is that its concern is with Kultreinheit and not with Kulteinheit. Welch, too, regards it as fallacious that D demanded centralization. The problem confronting the writer was Yahwism versus Baalism.

The whole subject has been thoroughly treated in a symposium in which Professors Bewer, Paton, and Dahl participated.[2] Bewer ex-

---

1 W. C. Graham: "The Modern Controversy about Deuteronomy." in JR, Vol. VII (1927), p. 397.

2 "The Problem of Deuteronomy", in JBL, Vol. XLVII (1928), p. 305ff.

amined and answered the theory of an early date; Paton of a post-exilic; Dahl stated the case for the currently accepted view. We accept the results of their critical investigation and proceed, regarding Deuteronomy as coming from the seventh century.[1]

Deuteronomy is called by Driver "a prophetical law-book."[2] Bertholet has this to say: "Seine Entstehung will also verstanden sein als ein Krystallisationsprocess prophetischer Gedanken und Anregungen."[3] While one has only to read its pages to get the sense of the blending of the two strains it must be remembered that the prophetic element is of great significance. H. Wheeler Robinson has well said Deuteronomy would be inconceivable without the great prophets of the eighth century.[4] In fact, it has been conjectured that Deuteronomy represents the outgrowth of the work of the prophetic party, with Isaiah's disciples an important element carrying on quietly in the reign of Manasseh.[5]

We may well examine some of the central ideas of Deuteronomy and see the creative influence of the prophets.

Central in Deuteronomy are the unique claims of Yahweh. He alone is to be worshipped. Of chief importance in the introduction

---

1 By the Deuteronomy of the seventh century we refer to chapters 5-26 and 28.

2 Deuteronomy (ICC), p. xxvi.

3 Deuteronomy, p. xiii.

4 Deuteronomy (New Century), p. 33. The materials, p. 33f, have been utilized in the following pages.

5 This remains true whether deuteronomy is dated in Manasseh's reign or later.

to the sermon are the words:

> "Hear, O Israel: Yahweh is our God, Yahweh alone" (6:4[a]).[1]

There is no denial that other gods exist, as is evident from:

> "Ye shall not go after other gods, of the gods of the peoples that are round about you" (6:14).

One is at once reminded of the practical monotheism of the eighth century prophets, who though they did not deny other gods, made Yahweh of such importance that none other is at all worthy of significance. Amos had looked in the direction of monotheism in his righteousness which transcended national lines (chapters 1 and 2). He had shown, and was the first to do so, that Yahweh will punish wickedness everywhere. Hosea did not have the same broad outlook that Amos had yet he could say"... I am Yahweh thy God from the land of Egypt: and thou shalt know no god but me, and besides me there is no saviour" (13:4). While Hosea does not state that there is no other god, at least he does assert "that no other god has exerted his power on behalf of Israel."[2] Monotheism with Isaiah was not absolute yet the deities of other nations were of trifling significance: "Their land also is full of idols; they worship the work of their own hands, that which their own fingers have made" (2:8). "And the idols shall utterly pass away" (2:18). In his

---

[1] Taking the last marginal reading.

[2] W. R. Harper: Amos and Hosea (ICC), p. 397.

rebukes of foreign peoples Yahweh's universal sovereignty is presupposed.[1] With Micah, Yahweh, "Lord of heaven and earth...(was) able to move the nations at his will (1[3.4.10-16])."[2]

Deuteronomy prohibited the use in worship of any image or material representation of Yahweh (compare 7:25; 12:2-5; 16:21, 22 and 5:8). Here we see a marked connection with Hosea who first among the prophets had condemned images. Sarcasm, indignation, and ridicule mark his attack. Calves and not bulls are referred to by him. "And now they sin more and more, and have made them molten images of their silver, even idols, according to their own understanding, all of them the work of their craftsmen: they say of them, Let the men that sacrifice kiss the calves" (13:2 compare 10:5). Isaiah, in an early oracle, had spoken of the day which must come when Israel's idolatry must cease (2:20). For Isaiah idolatry had been utterly contemptible. Bewer has called Micah the chief forerunner of Deuteronomy in his words: "...I will cut off thy graven images and thy pillars out of the midst of thee; and thou shalt no more worship the work of thy hands" (5:13) - in which words he goes beyond anything found in Hosea.

Deuteronomy stands with the prophets in stressing the ethical qualities of Yahweh. In a passage, which in its introductory words reminds one of Micah - "And now, Israel, what doth Yahweh thy

---

1 Owen C. Whitehouse: Isaiah (New Century), Vol. I, p. 53.

2 J. M. Powis Smith: Micah (ICC), p. 25.

God require of thee, but to fear Yahweh thy God, to walk in all his ways, and to love him" - the statement is made that Yahweh "regardeth not persons, nor taketh reward (10:17). One need but recall the many statements in the prophets of the demands which Yahweh makes of his worshippers to realize their attitude towards the character of Yahweh (For example Amos 5:14, 15, 24; Hosea 4: 1f.; Isaiah 1:15f.).

Deuteronomy made a two-fold demand: that Yahweh be given whole-hearted love and that one treat his fellow man rightly. Deuteronomy "is the spiritual heir of Hosea" in assigning so much prominence to the emotional side of religion.[1]

Yahweh first "loved" Israel. His true worshipper loves Yahweh and his fellow-Israelite. "The primal love of Jehovah to Israel fills the foreground of each writer's discourse (i.e. Hosea and Deuteronomy), and all human relationships within the Israelitish community are rooted in this."[2] Yahweh is to be loved, not because of any reward which one may receive for so doing, but for what Yahweh is. He stands in relation to Israel, not as judge or ruler, but as

---

1 Deuteronomy like Hosea acknowledges Yahweh "as the true Giver of nature's bounty". Hosea was the first to make explicit that Yahweh in the realm of nature is "the giver of every good and perfect gift" (Hosea 2:8ff. Compare 13:4-6). With Deuteronomy the thought is developed: "And he will love thee, and bless thee and multiply thee; he will also bless the fruit of thy body and the fruit of thy ground, thy grain and thy new wine and thine oil, the increase of thy cattle and the young of thy flock, in the land which he sware unto thy fathers to give thee" (7:13. Compare 8:7 ff., 11:13 ff. and 26:10).

2 S. R. Driver: Deuteronomy (ICC), pp. xxviif.

friend and father. The chief ground, says H. Wheeler Robinson, for holding that Hosea influenced Deuteronomy is found in the word - "Thou shalt love Yahweh thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might" (6:5). He points out the influence of the betrothal concept which resulted "in a new inwardness of motive." Likewise Hosea's father and son figure, "When Israel was a child then I loved him", is adapted in "And thou shalt consider in thy heart, that as a man chasteneth his son, so Yahweh thy God chasteneth thee" (8:5).[1] In addition to the words already mentioned (6:5)[2] Deuteronomy asks for love for Yahweh on the ground that Yahweh has chosen Israel for his people (7:6-8. Compare 14:2), a teaching which we shall have occasion to consider in a little more detail later.

"Humanity is the author's ruling motive" in the practical form in which devotion to Yahweh is expressed. Sacrifice and ritual are subordinated to the great requirement of social righteousness. The prophets had been insistent in their demands that righteousness take the place of offerings. They had taught the principle but had not formulated a program. Deuteronomy "sought to state in definite and easily grasped laws what exactly constituted the content of Jahveh's claims."[3] In thus presenting a social program Deuteronomy was guided by prophetic principle. Amos had insisted upon justice. We mention but a few illustrations of his spirit. "For they knew not

---

1 Deuteronomy (New Century), pp. 41f.

2 Other passages stressing Israel's duty to love Yahweh are 10:12; 11:1,13,22; 13:3; 19:9.

3 Adam C. Welch: Religion of Israel under the Kingdom,, p. 227.

to do right...who store up violence and robbery in their palaces" (3:10). He addressed the "kine of Bashan...that oppress the poor, that crush the needy" (4:1. Compare 8:4ff). Sacrifices and tithes were scathingly condemned (4:4f; 5:21ff.). Amos had stated positively Yahweh's demand thus: "...let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream" (5:24).

Hosea had put into one word - חסד - that which Yahweh required, a requirement which grew out of the relationship between Yahweh and Israel. This teaching is found in 4:1; 6:4,6; 10:12 and 12:6. It was חסד and not sacrifice that was pleasing to Yahweh.

Isaiah shared Amos' opinion that religion was supremely ethical. After criticizing the cult he expressed that which was obligatory: "Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek justice, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow" (1:16-17). Chapters three and five convey vividly his feeling for the social conditions of his day.

Micah's message was predominantly moral. He felt deeply the brutal oppression of the poor.

This brief survey is indicative of the prophetic influence on Deuteronomy.

It now becomes necessary for us to study in more detail the whole idea of the covenant in the light shed by Deuteronomy. As a prelude to this investigation we must note that the Deuteronomic school gave the first formal expression to the idea that Yahweh chose

Israel.

The first appearance of 'chosen' in a theological sense appears in 6:6ff.[1]

> "For thou art a holy people unto Yahweh thy God: Yahweh thy God hath chosen thee to be a people for his own possession, above all peoples that are upon the face of the earth. Yahweh did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all peoples: but because Yahweh loveth you, and because he would keep the oath which he sware unto your fathers, hath Yahweh brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondage, from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt."

We quote the other passages which bear upon the subject. "... Yahweh had a delight in thy fathers to love them, and he chose their seed after them, even you above all peoples..." (10:15). "For thou art a holy people unto Yahweh thy God, and Yahweh hath chosen thee to be a people for his own possession, above all peoples that are upon the face of the earth" (14:2).

The expression עַם סְגֻלָּה is translated "a people of special possession," specially treasured and prized. The force of סְגֻלָּה is seen from I Chronicles 29:3 and Ecclesiastes 2:8 where it applies to the private treasure of kings.[2]

Yahweh has chosen Israel out of all the peoples of the earth for his own possession. Israel is thus the unique recipient of his grace. This element of grace on the part of Yahweh cannot be too

---

[1] בחר in its various forms is a common expression in Deuteronomy and II Isaiah.

[2] S. R. Driver: Deuteronomy, p. 100.

strongly emphasized. Nothing inherent in Israel had caused this choice. He had loved them and had given to them favor which they had done nothing to deserve.[1] For Deuteronomy, as for the prophet Amos, the election of Israel involved duties as well as privileges. These duties are set forth in this law. The Deuteronomist "was able to combine the highest patriotism with humility and freedom from national egoism".[2]

Throughout their several centuries of history Yahweh had given concrete evidence of the principle which is here for the first time formulated in a theological fashion, although it had been felt and expressed by the prophets in a less formal fashion. The unchangeable character of God's mercy to this chosen people is expressed by saying that Yahweh entered into a covenant with them. Our chief problem in connection with Deuteronomy arises just here. What is the source of its covenant idea, and what is the relation of the covenant here to that found elsewhere?

It can be said rightly that Deuteronomy is a logical outgrowth of history. Israel had experienced the favor of Yahweh. He was their God, he alone. We have already traced this historical development and validation in part one.

Of significance in the development of the Deuteronomic covenant is J. The national spirit, so noticeable in J's histor-

---

1 Compare ibid., p. xx.

2 Henry J. Cadbury: National Ideals in the Old Testament, p. 142.

ical outlook, was briefly commented upon above.[1] Here the influence of J upon Deuteronomy should be noted a little more carefully. J begins with the creation and traces a selective process which results in the favor shown to Abraham. The story of his descendants is told and of their eventual removal to Egypt. The narrative is carried on from the deliverance and concludes with the settlement in Canaan.

J places at the beginning of his account of the patriarchs the promise of Yahweh to Abraham.

> "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto the land that I will show thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and be thou a blessing.[2] and I will bless them that bless thee, and him that curseth thee will I curse: and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed" (12:1-3).[3]

---

1 P. 49, in Part I.

2 וְהְיֵה בְּרָכָה This pointing is questionable since the preceding verbs are simple futures (Compare Gesenius-Kautzsch, section 110i). Accordingly וה׳ה has been pointed as a consecutive perfect והי׳ה and the clause then read "and it (the name) shall be a blessing."

3 3b is usually translated (as above) "and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." The LXX reads καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς (and so all Versions). The translation of Rashi is, however, quite widely accepted: "by thee shall all .... bless themselves." "The clause is thus an expansion of 2b: the name of Abram will pass into a formula of benediction, because he himself and his seed will be as it were blessedness incarnate." (John Skinner: Genesis (ICC), p. 245.) Genesis 18:18 and 28:14 use וְנִבְרְכוּ as in 12:3. In 22:18 and 26:4 we find וְהִתְבָּרְכוּ which is reflexive and translated "bless themselves". In view of this use of the hithpael in two of the five similar passages, and since the niphal may have a reflexive sense as well as passive (Gesenius-Kautzsch #51 c.f.h.) it would seem logical to take the reflexive sense here. It must be noted however, that 22:18; 26:4; 18:18 and perhaps 28:14 belong to secondary materials in J. So they may not necessarily be determinative for 12:3. (John Skinner: Genesis (ICC), p. 245.)

Of verses 2f, Skinner says: "The blessings here promised express the aspirations of the age in which the narrative originated, and reveal the people's consciousness of its exceptional destiny among the nations of the world. They breathe the spirit of optimism which is on the whole characteristic of the Yahwistic treatment of the national legends, as contrasted with the primitive and cosmopolitan mythology of chapters 2-11....."[1]

The first mention of a covenant of Yahweh with the patriarchs is found in Deuteronomy (7:12 and 8:18). Of the thirty-one passages in JE where the concept is found (Kraetzschmar's count which Skinner says may well be reduced) all but three are from the hand of the redactor (Deuteronomic). Of these three 12:7 is merely a promise. In 24:7, וְאֶשְׁבְּעָה looks like a gloss. 15:17f. probably comes from no earlier than the seventh century and thus represents an attempt on the part of popular religion to gain assurance.[2]

Although there is no covenant in J, Yahweh, in becoming the God of Abraham, is of course the God of Israel. "The plan of God, thus traced back to the earlier period, gave the sort of assurance to believers which later was derived from an abstract theory of the divine election."[3]

The patriotism of the Deuteronomist is thus quite evident -

---

[1] Genesis (ICC), p. 243.

[2] Compare John Skinner: Genesis (ICC), p. 284.

[3] H. P. Smith: The Religion of Israel, p. 96.

his pride in his nation and its history.[1] Yahweh made Israel "high above all nations that he hath made, in praise, and in name, and in honor" (Deuteronomy 26:19[a]). J's interpretation of history made for a pronounced national self-consciousness. The scheme which Deuteronomy adopted placed it at the beginning of their national life but as Cadbury points out "its spirit agrees with its real date and presupposes a sense of national continuity."[2]

The current nationalism contributed to the development of the covenant idea. Deuteronomy linked the past with the present. "The election of Israel was not a mere isolated act of the past. Israel is still a people of God's own possession. The covenant of Sinai [in Deuteronomy's scheme] is a perpetual covenant, to be observed not merely by the generation that had been present, but by the generations which had not seen and yet had believed. It secures the continuance of a consistent national policy."[3]

We have stressed in the first part of this section the influence of the prophetic conception of Yahweh upon Deuteronomy. With this outlook the more popular patriotism or nationalism of J, which we have just been studying, was merged.

It will now be instructive to give a brief summary of the content of the Deuteronomic code (12-26), and to show in a parallel

---

1 Compare Henry J. Cadbury: National Ideals in the Old Testament, p. 140.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid., p. 141.

column the materials from the Exodus Book of the Covenant. At a glance the elaboration made by Deuteronomy will be evident.[1]

---

[1] The following table is based on Julius A. Bewer: The Literature of the Old Testament, pp. 124 f., S. R. Driver: Deuteronomy (ICC), pp. iv. ff., R. H. Pfeiffer: "The Book of the Covenant" in HTR, xxiii (1931), p. 103, and Carpenter and Harford-Battersby: The Hexateuch. All figures refer to the text of the American Standard Version.

COMPARISON OF DEUTERONOMY

WITH

COVENANT CODE

	Deuteronomy	Exodus
I. Religious Laws		
The place of sacrifice	12:1-28	20:24
***		
Against the worship of other gods	12:29-13:18	22:20
Against disfigurement in mourning	14:1-2	
Against eating unclean food	14:3-20	
Against eating fallen animals	14:21a	22.31
Against boiling the kid in its mother's milk	14:21b	23,19b
***		
Tithes	14:22-29	
Year of Release (1) of debts (2) of slaves	15:1-18	23:10f.
Firstlings of ox and sheep	15:19-23	23:30
Three yearly festivals: Passover, Weeks, Tabernacles	16:1-17	23:14-17 (omit 16 - a^B and b^B)
***		
Against the Asherah and pillar	16:21f.	
Against blemished sacrifices	17:1	
II. Officers of authority		

Judges and just judgment	16:18-20	23:1-3, 6-8
Criminal procedure against an idolater	17:2-7	23:13
Supreme court	17:8-13	
***		
The law of the king	17:14-20	
***		
Levitical priests	18:1-8	
True versus false prophet	18:9-22	

III. Judicial Procedure

Murder and cities of refuge	19:1-13	
Expiation of untraced murder	21:1-9	
Theft, removal of boundary stones	19:14	
Law of witness	19:15-21	23:1

IV. Military Service and War 20

V. Family Laws

Marriage with a female captive	21:10-14	
Inheritance of first-born	21:15-17	
Disobedient sons	21:18-21	

VI. Various Laws

Hanged criminals	21:22f	
***		
Lost property of a neighbor	22:1-3)	...23:4f.
Aid to fallen beasts	22:4)	
Sparing of the mother bird	22:6f.	
Protection of roofs	22:8	
***		
Against mixtures	22:5, 9-12	

VII. Chastity Laws

Charges against a bride	22:13-21
Adultery	22:22-27
Seduction	22:28f.
Incest with a father's wife	22:30

VIII. Exclusion Laws

Absolute: eunuchs, bastards, Ammonites, and Moabites	23:1-6
Qualified: Edomites and Egyptians	23:7f.

IX. Various Ritual and Humane Laws

Cleanliness in the camp	23:9-14	
Runaway slaves	23:15f.	
Against religious prostitution	23:17f.	
Usury	23:19f.	22:25[a]
Payment of vows	23:21-23	
Regard for neighbor's crops	23:24f.	

X. Humane Laws

Divorce and remarriage	24:1-4	
Exemption of newly married from war service	24:5	
Pledges	24:6,10-13	22:26f.
Against stealing Israelites for slaves	24:7	
Against neglect of leprosy	24:8f.	
Treatment and payment of wage-earner	24:14f.	
Family of criminal not to suffer with him	24:16	
Justice to stranger, widow, and orphan	24:17f	22:21[a],23
Gleanings for them	24:19-22	
Moderation in inflicting flogging	25:1-3	
Against muzzling the threshing ox	25:4	

XI. Various Laws

Levirate marriage	25:5-10	
Reckless assault by a woman	25:11f.	
Just weights	25:13-16	
Destruction of the Amalekites	25:17-19	

XII. Ritual Formularies

For first-fruits	26:1-11	23:19a
For tithes	26:12-15	

The laws fall, then, under three main headings: religious (12-16), civil (17-20), and social (21-25).

Before drawing conclusions regarding the covenant we turn to a study of the Decalogue. Deuteronomy places it at the beginning of its introduction to the code (5:1-21). This Decalogue parallels the one found in Exodus 20:1-17. There is in addition to these two the so-

called "J Decalogue" (Exodus 34). It is now time to ask the question - What is the real nature of this so-called "J Decalogue"?

Goethe in 1773 published an article in which he stated that in Exodus 34:10-26 we have a decalogue. It was seventy-five years before any Biblical scholar made mention of this article. A few scholars considered, independently of this thesis, some of the problems concerned and finally Goethe's position was adopted. When Wellhausen accepted the theory he had, and he still has, a considerable following.

Professor Knudson has called attention to one very practical difficulty with regard to this decalogue - what exactly are the ten commands here? He gives a table showing the opinions of thirteen scholars. There is a conspicuous lack of uniformity in their results.[1]

The two expressions - "the words of the covenant", and "the ten words" - appearing together as they do, are suspicious. On the basis of the view about to be examined we shall see that "the words of the covenant" are a gloss.

Professor Pfeiffer has examined three hypotheses regarding Exodus 34: (1) This decalogue is an integral part of J. (2) It is therefore older than the Covenant Code in E. (3) It is a product of the religion of Yahweh.[2]

He takes the J and E stories of the giving of the law and compares them with the parallels in Deuteronomy. His conclusion is

---

1 "The So-called J Decalogue" in JBL, Vol. XXVIII (1909), p. 87.

2 "The Oldest Decalogue", in JBL, Vol. XLIII (1924), pp. 294 ff.

that the Deuteronomic writer (10:1ff.) had read J in the edition of Rje before a later redactor inserted the legal matter (34:6-26). Thus from external evidence, it is seen that the legal material of Exodus 34 is secondary.[1]

The next step is to compare the legal portion of Exodus 34 with the Covenant Code wherever parallels occur. They agree to such an extent that one must depend upon the other, or else both come from a common source.

There is no parallel in the Covenant Code to 34:10:17. Here are found two laws - "Thou shalt worship no other god" (verse 14), and "Thou shalt make thee no molten gods" (verse 17) - which bear a resemblance to the first two commandments, noticeable at once. These two laws, without parallel in the Covenant Code, made a total of twelve and not ten.

In the "J Decalogue" certain striking verbal differences are evident. The "feast of harvest" becomes the "feast of weeks". In the old Canaanite calendar the feast of ingathering came in the fall ("at the exit of the year"). With the change in the Exile to the Babylonian calendar whose year began in the spring, this feast came "at the revolution of the year." (This term was applied to the two solstices and the two equinoxes.)

By a slight change in the sections the same order in both codes is obtained.

---

[1] R. H. Pfeiffer: "The Oldest Decalogue" in JBL, Vol. XLIII (1924), pp. 299 ff.

The conclusion regarding this second hypothesis is that the Covenant Code is prior to Exodus 34. Exodus 23:13 "...make no mention of the name of other gods..." is much weaker than the prohibition of Exodus 34. 34:14 cannot be separated from its Deuteronomic context.[1]

The text of Exodus 23 from which the redactor composed the "J Decalogue" must have read thus:

> "Six days thou shalt do thy work, but on the seventh thou shalt desist.
> The feast of unleavened bread shalt thou keep, according as I commanded thee, at the appointed time in the month Abib; for in it thou camest out of Egypt.
> And none shall appear before me empty.
> And the feast of harvest, the first fruits of thy labors.
> And the feast of ingathering at the exit of the year.
> Three times in the year shall all thy males appear before the Lord Yahweh.
> Thou shalt not sacrifice with leaven the blood of my sacrifice.
> Neither shall there remain all night the fatof my feast until morning.
> The first of the first fruits of thy ground thou shalt bring unto the house of Yahweh thy god.
> Thou shalt not boil a kid in its mother's milk."[2]

When may these laws be dated? Professor Pfeiffer's answer is that they are earlier than the monarchy in their primitive form. Furthermore, aside from redactions, there is nothing in them specifically Israelitish. He concludes that back of Exodus 23 lies a Canaanitish decalogue which reads as follows:

---

1 R. H. Pfeiffer: "The Oldest Decalogue" in JBL, Vol. XLIII (1924), pp. 299 ff.

2 R. H. Pfeiffer: "The Oldest Decalogue" in JBL, Vol. XLIII (1924), p. 307. It will be noted that in this text the law of the first born has been severed and misplaced. For a conjecture as to how this happened see ibid., p. 306.

"1. Six days thou shalt do thy work, but in the seventh day thou shalt desist.
2. The feast of the unleavened bread shalt thou keep at the appointed time in the month of Abib.
3. And the feast of harvest, the first fruits of thy labors.
4. And the feast of ingathering at the exit of the year.
5. Three times in the year shall all thy males see the face of the Lord [Yahweh interpolated].
6. The first-born of thy sons shalt thou give unto me; thus shalt thou do to thy ox, thy sheep and thy ass.
7. Thou shalt not sacrifice with leavened bread the blood of my sacrifice.
8. Neither shall there remain all night the fat of my feast until morning.
9. The first of the first-fruits of thy ground shalt thou bring into the house of thy god. [Yahweh interpolated]
10. Thou shalt not boil a kid in its mother's milk."[1]

It is conjectured that these laws may have been written on two tables of stone and may have stood at the entrance of some Canaanite shrine, perhaps Baal Berith at Shechem.[2]

We may, then, in the further study of the decalogue leave out of consideration Exodus 34 for its relation is rather to the Covenant Code than to Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5.[3]

---

1 R. H. Pfeiffer: "The Oldest Decalogue" in JBL, Vol. XLIII, (1924), pp. 308 f.

2 Ibid., p. 309. We mention in passing the account in Joshua 24:25ff. of a covenant and a writing down of laws by Joshua at Shechem. Various conjectures are offered as to the meaning of the book of the law of God, depending upon whatever view of the authorship of the passage is held. Some would place here in the original narrative (wholly or partly) the Book of the Covenant. Compare H. Wheeler Robinson: Joshua (New Century), p. 384. This could not refer to the Covenant Code in any advanced stage.

3 The article referred to above by Professor Knudson - "The So-called J Decalogue" reviews the possibility of the priority of Exodus 23 over Exodus 34 (p. 93f.). He mentions the view of Budde that Exodus 34 was intended for Canaanites who attached themselves to Israel during the establishment and the early monarchy.

Let us compare the two decalogues (Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5) as they stand. The first, and the sixth to ninth words are the same in both cases and are stated in terse sentences. The other words are accompanied by amplifications. Aside from minor dissimilarities the main differences appear in connection with the fourth and tenth words. Deuteronomy assigns a philanthropic motive for sabbath observance - "that thy man-servant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou" - which is not found in Exodus 20.[1] The reason given by Deuteronomy for the observance of the sabbath is, "... thou shalt remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and Yahweh thy God brought thee out thence by a mighty hand and by an outstretched arm: therefore Yahweh thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day." Both these statements are "thoroughly in line with the humane character of the Deuteronomic legislation."[2] In E the reason is given, "for in six days Yahweh made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore Yahweh blessed the sabbath day and hallowed it" (20:11).[3] In the tenth word Deuteronomy has, "Neither shalt thou covet thy neighbor's wife; neither shalt thou desire thy neighbor's house..."[4]

---

1 Julius A. Bewer: The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 31.

2 Compare, however, Exodus 23: 12b in the Book of the Covenant. This is "in the vein of the Deuteronomic Code."

3 "Had D's copy of the Decalogue contained this verse, it is hardly likely that he would have replaced its lofty suggestiveness by a less potent motive." (Carpenter and Harford-Battersby: The Hexateuch, Vol. II, p. 112. So S. R. Driver: Literature of the Old Testament, p. 35, who thinks 20:11 rests upon two verses of P: Exodus 31:17b and Genesis 2:3a.

4 Although Deuteronomy uses two verbs - "wait", "Desire" - this is

whereas Exodus reads, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house" and then mentions wife, servants, etc. Deuteronomy, by singling out the wife elevates her above mere property.[1] In Exodus, "house" seems to be a covering term including wife and possessions.

When are we to date the Exodus 20 Decalogue? The present trend is to ascribe these ten words, in a simple form at least, to Moses. Another view, held by George A. Barton, is that this decalogue "took shape to embody and perpetuate the teachings of Elijah."[2] Still another view, still held by many scholars, is that this decalogue is a result of the teaching of the eighth century prophets. Finally, it was post-deuteronomic.

Let us answer this fourth possibility first. Mowinckel has pointed out that were this Decalogue of exilic origin it ought to contain a commandment regarding circumcision since this rite then assumed, along with the sabbath, so much importance. The most conclusive argument is the type of message proclaimed by the early post-exilic prophets - so different from the point of view of the Decalogue.[3]

In stating our position for a date between Isaiah and Deuteronomy we shall sufficiently answer those who see a Mosaic origin or who ascribe a date previous to the eighth century prophets.

---

done apparently for variation as the two verbs חָמַד and אָוָה mean substantially the same thing. S. R. Driver: Deuteronomy (ICC), p. 86.

1 Julius A. Bewer: The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 31.

2 "Old Testament Studies" in The Haverford Symposium, p. 51 and Semitic and Hamitic Origins, pp. 352f. Compare C. G. Montefiore: Hibbert Lectures, p. 555, who gives a date in ninth or even tenth century.

3 S. Mowinckel: Le Décalogue, pp. 108ff.

While it is possible to concede an early origin for parts of the Decalogue the second word offers a significant argument against such a date. If Moses gave this teaching it is almost inconceivable that no notice was taken of it until the eighth century. It is evident that Yahweh was worshipped with images without a protest until the prophets inveighed against the externality of religion.[1]

Montefiore has questioned the likelihood that the fourth word goes back to a nomadic stage. An agriculturist needs, and can have, rest. On the other hand a nomad stands in no particular need of rest from a comparatively idle life and besides what work he does have to do needs to be done every day without any remission.[2]

"It is 'the house', and not, as in Arabic, the tent (Ahl: Heb. Ohel), which stands for a man's familia or household" - a further argument advanced by Addis.[3]

Suppose, however, a Mosaic authorship were accepted, there is nothing before Deuteronomy to indicate that the Decalogue of Exodus was the basis of a Sinai Covenant. The E text, as we have it, certainly does not connect the Decalogue with events at Sinai.[4]

---

1 Hosea 13:2 is indicative of the beginning of the prophetic protest, but this is narrower in its scope than Exodus 20:4. McNeile (Exodus, p. lxiii) notes a considerable Hoseanic influence. In the case of six of the ten words similarities to Hosea may be seen. His view is, at least, suggestive.

2 Hibbert Lectures, p. 554.

3 W. E. Addis: The Documents of the Hexateuch, Part I, p. 139.

4 R. H. Pfeiffer: "The Oldest Decalogues" in JBL, Vol. XLIII (1924), p. 297. It is to be noted that J, too, did not regard the giving of the Decalogue as a formal covenant.

We return now to a summary statement regarding the Book of the Covenant. We have disposed of the origin of the decalogues. What may be said of the Book of the Covenant? Exodus 24:3-8 gives an account of the ratification of a law code and of an accompanying covenant ceremony; but if this passage is from the redactor it has no bearing here. There is wide agreement that the Book of the Covenant comes at a post-Mosaic period, agreement to such an extent that it is not necessary here to give evidence. (Beyond this point, there are to be found numerous theories to account for "how" and "when".) As a consequence we have no data to determine the terms of any covenant that might have been established between Yahweh and Israel. The early stage of the relationship between Yahweh and Israel has been described above.[1] From our study of Deuteronomy we see that now for the first time has the idea of covenant (berith) really become a definitely formulated idea.

Deuteronomy's "Sitzung im Leben" accounts for the spirit of nationalism and exclusivism. While its humanitarian principles have been noted, they are meant for Israel alone. However necessary such a narrow attitude may have been as a preservative, it must be recognized that Deuteronomy represents a recession. With the prophets the faithful had come to be regarded as the hope for the nation. Here, then, is a return to the nation as the basis of "reconstituted religion." "The fundamental error of the Deuteronomists, the πρῶτον ψεῦδος running

---

1 P. 25 f.

through and tainting all their work, was that they saw nothing higher than a national religion."[1]

---

1 Adam C. Welch: Religion of Israel under the Kingdom, p. 233.

(2) Jeremiah

"As the Kingdom of Israel on its downfall bore in Hosea its noblest prophetic fruit, so in the time immediately preceding the destruction of Judah we find the sublime figure of Jeremiah."[1]

With Jeremiah we find no particular advance beyond the eighth century prophets in doctrine aside from the two phases of his teaching with which we shall here concern ourselves primarily. But if he thus added little that was new to the words of his predecessors he was a living embodiment of their great teachings". ... we shall be inclined to feel that Jeremiah, not through his words, but through his experience, gave the world more than any other single person in the whole history of Israel."[2] Nor is this to minimize the value of his words.

In many of the oracles, short for the most part, which are to be dated before the Josianic reform, the influence of Hosea in particular is evident. חסד expresses the nature of the relationship between Yahweh and Israel: "which means kindness or grace on the part of Yahwe and loyal piety on the part of Israel."[3] Like Hosea he uses

---

1 C. H. Cornill: The Prophets of Israel, p. 91.

2 Oesterley and Robinson: An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament, p. 312.

3 John Skinner: Prophecy and Religion, p. 321.

the husband-wife figure. In the wilderness the relationship had been unspoiled but in Canaan Israel turned away from Yahweh.

The Deuteronomic reform put an end to idolatry and religion profited in a measure by centralization. Nevertheless sin was rampant just as it had been heretofore: theft, murder, opporession, justice perverted. The people thought they stood well with Yahweh. What with Isaiah had been a message of comfort - the inviolability of Jerusalem - had now become a dogma. There was absolutely no disposition to heed Yahweh's commands. Sin had become so much a habit that his hearers were morally impotent.

> "Can the Ethiopian change his skin,
> or the leopard his spots?
> Then may ye also do good,
> that are accustomed to do evil" (13:23).

Jeremish was a transitional prophet. His roots were in the past but in his message he belonged to the future. With him we have religion national becoming religion personal.

His own personal experience shaped his thinking. "... all his life he had to stand alone... He was filled with a double passion, a patriotism like that of Hosea which meant an overwhelming love for his people, and an equally overwhelming devotion to his God. The consuming desire of his soul was to see the two united in a valid and permanent bond which no human sin could break; but all his life, save perhaps for two short intervals...he was doomed to disappointment."[1] The

---

[1] Oesterley and Robinson: Hebrew Religion, p. 262.

tension thus created was at times intense. By force of circumstances Jeremiah was isolated from his fellows and thrown upon Yahweh as his sole support. Out of a long life of sore agony that which was most vital for the faith of Israel was born: individualism.

Closely related to the conception of the individual in his relation to Yahweh may be placed his great teaching: the New Covenant.

Jeremiah first mentions the covenant in chapter 11. This passage is generally taken as a reference to Deuteronomy. The prophet was charged to speak to the people and to tell them: "Cursed be the man that heareth not the words of this covenant." Further he was instructed to proclaim the words of the covenant in the cities of Judah.

The passage has been regarded as unhistorical by some critics (Duhm and Cornill for example) because there would seem to have been no occasion for such a proclamation in the time of Josiah when the reform was conducted aggressively. By the time of Jehoiakim Jeremiah would have lost all enthusiasm for the movement.

Yet with major emphases of Deuteronomy Jeremiah must have been in sympathy: its look toward monotheism, its humanitarianism, its abhorrence of idolatry and heathen practices.[1] His espousal of the reform stirred up bitter hatred against him - even among friends and relatives who planned to destroy him (11:18ff).

---

[1] A. S. Peake: Jeremiah (New Century), Vol. I, pp. 12f.

Skinner holds that unless chapter 11 is denied to Jeremiah, one must believe that the prophet publicly advocated the principles of the reformation and gave it his moral support.[1]

In all probability Jeremiah's realization of the New Covenant came through the failure of the Deuteronomic reformation. He soon saw, even if he were friendly to the movement, that something more than legislation was needed to produce genuine reform. That "something more" was inward, spiritual relationship between the individual and Yahweh. It has been questioned whether anything so vital as this immediate fellowship with God could have been expressed by Jeremiah in terms as external as a covenant.[2] It may be answered, however, that Jeremiah used the covenant only with reference to the house of Israel.[3] The covenant is described negatively in verse 32, while verses 33-34 give the positive side.

"I will put My law in their inward parts,
and in their hearts will I write it:
And I will be their God
and they shall be My people.
And they shall no more teach
every man his neighbor,

---

1 Prophecy and Religion, pp. 101ff.

2 Duhm: Das Buch Jeremia, p. 255: "Es ist mir unmöglich, an der jeremianischen Abkunft dieser Stelle länger festzuhalten; ich finde darin nur den Erguss eines Schriftgelehrten, der es für das höchste Ideal hält, dass jedermann in jüdischen Volke das Gesetz auswendig kennt und versteht, dass all Juden Schriftgelehrte sind." Skinner: Prophecy and Religion, p.331, states, however, that the antithesis between 33a and 34 a is thus meaningless. Why, he asks, does the legalist even speak of a Berith?" Committing to memory is "a purely human exercise, whereas what is promised in the text is a divine operation in the hearts of men."

3 John Skinner: Prophecy and Religion, p. 325.

And every man his brother, saying,
"Know Yahweh!"
For they shall all know Me,
from the least of them unto the greatest of them:
For I will forgive their iniquity,
and their sin will I remember no more"
(31:33-34).[1]

The only hope for the future lay in a readjustment of the relationships between Yahweh and Israel. The new covenant meant new relationships. It contained three features: (1) Inwardness: "I will put my law in their inward part". (2) Individualism: "All shall know me." (3) Forgiveness of sins: "Their sins I will remember no more." The central truth on which the emphasis rests is the inwardness of true religion.[2] While the people still remained the unit "... the advance he makes is that Israel's side of the covenant is perfectly fulfilled, because religion has become a matter for the individual. ... Thus we may say that individualism guaranteed the reality of national religion.[3]

Although Jeremiah did not transcend national boundaries he was looking unconsciously in the direction of universalism. Welch has pointed out two elements here: (1) He knew himself to be a prophet with a commission to all nations. (2) He thrust into the background anything in Yahwism which made it incapable of becoming the faith of

---

1 Julius A. Bewer: The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 165.

2 John Skinner: Prophecy and Religion, p. 328.

3 A. S. Peake: Jeremiah (New Century), Vol. II, p. 107.

all men.[1]

With Isaiah the idea of the remnant became operative, an Israel within Israel. Jeremiah went further. With him Yahweh came into fellowship with the individual Israelite.

---

1 Adam C. Welch: Jeremiah, His Time and His Work, pp. 191f.

3.

The Seventh Century Religious Thinkers

Although the three lesser religious thinkers - Zephaniah, Nahum, and Habakkuk - are hardly worthy of a section by themselves, nevertheless it is a fact that they stand quite apart from their contemporary, Jeremiah. Their message makes it appropriate to consider them together. They were all active in the last quarter of the seventh century.

We have already noted briefly, in connection with the previous section, thehistory of Judah in the latter part of the seventh century. This period for the world at large was "one of the great critical epochs in history."[1] Assyria, long mistress of the east, met a crushing defeat. Ninevah was destroyed in 612, and lay forgotten for centuries. Egypt, though grown weak before Assyria, like her more powerful rival went down at Carchemish in 605 B.C. With the defeat of Assyria and Egypt, Babylon came to the fore.

The Scythian invasian was another factor to be remembered in this period. All the near East, Palestine included, was overrun by these hordes from north of the Black Sea. Their destructive and

---

1 Oesterley and Robinson: Hebrew Religion, p. 259.

terrifying activity contributed materially to the fall of Assyria.

These historical events are responsible for the message of our three prophets. One point they had in common. "In the midst of the rise and fall of world empires, amid the crash of kingdoms old and new, they were aware of a majestic permanence. Through all the flux of change the Eternal remained unchanged... And because God remained, such was their assurance, the good, and the nation that did the good, would remain, surviving all the catastrophes and cataclysms of history."[1]

Zephaniah

Zephaniah had at least one thing in common with Jeremiah. They were both impelled to prophesy by the Scythian invasion. Zephaniah read in their advance a sign of the approaching Day of Yahweh. It was he who first believed that this Day would be universal.

> "I will utterly consume all things from off the face of the ground, saith Yahweh. I will consume man and beast; I will consume the birds of the heavens, and the fishes of the sea, and the stumbling-blocks with the wicked; and I will cut off man from off the face of the ground, saith Yahweh" (1:2f.)

Although he did not originate the idea of world judgment, he endeavored to adjust an old conception to the new conditions of his own day.[2]

If Judah is to escape the impending crisis, Yahweh's positive requirement must be met:

---

1 Charles Venn Pilcher: Three Hebrew Prophets, p. 16.

2 J. M. Powis Smith: Zephaniah (ICC), p. 179.

> "Seek ye Yahweh, all ye meek of the earth, that have kept his ordinances; seek righteousness, seek meekness: it may be ye will be hid in the day of Yahweh's anger" (2:3).

A later writer with a universal sympathy saw an implication in Zephaniah's message of universal punishment and added a significant passage: "For then will I turn to the peoples a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of Yahweh, to serve him with consent" (3:9).

Zephaniah sensed in his day of uncertainty something of the reliability of Yahweh.

> "Yahweh in the midst of her is righteous; he will not do iniquity; every morning doth he bring his justice to light, he faileth not..." (3:5).

He may be expected to act with "absolute and unwavering righteousness" just as surely as he operates in nature.

Nahum

Naham's one burden was the fall of Nineveh. Upon this one theme he concentrated. He has been regarded with little favor. It is easy to see the reason for this attitude toward him. It lies in his nationalism and in his "spirit of exultant revenge".

Oesterley and Robinson, in their Hebrew Religion, pass Nahum by with this comment: "Nahum is negligible for our present purpose, since he deals solely with the ruin of Nineveh from the standpoint of an Israelite patriot."[1] Yet it is just at this point that for us his

---

[1] P. 260.

message has significance. He gives expression "to the outraged conscience of mankind."

He stands in contrast to be sure to all his predecessors. For them, Israel's sin had been of prime concern. To maintain the unique relationship between Yahweh and Israel they had called for repentance. There is nothing of their message with Nahum. For Nahum, and his kind, "the relation between Yahweh and Israel was indissoluble." Yahweh would not abandon his people. "The teaching that for a lack of fundamental, ethical qualities Yahweh was intending to bring destruction upon his nation was branded by them [Nahum, et al] as treason both to Israel and to Yahweh. Patriotism and religion combined in requiring the belief that Yahweh was able and willing to deliver his people out of every danger. ... The overthrow of Nineveh not only brought to Nahum and those of like mind satisfaction of the natural, human desire for vengeance, but it also enabled them to justify the ways of God to man. ... Hence, the joy of Nahum is... the glad cry of an assured faith in the God of the fathers."[1]

For Nahum the destruction of Nineveh would be an indication of the justice of Yahweh. The city would be reaping its just desert.[2] Though Israel did not benefit directly nevertheless the prophet sensed that Nineveh's fall would validate the special place which Israel held

---

1 J. M. Powis Smith: Nahum (ICC), pp. 281f.

2 Compare A. Bertholet: Die Stellung der Israeliten und der Juden zu den Fremden, pp. 105f.

with Yahweh.[1] Nahum is more than a narrow patriot. "Rather is he a passionate believer in the divine control of history, who saw in the fall of savage Nineveh a brilliant vindication of the moral order".[2]

Habakkuk

Habakkuk, the third of these religious thinkers, was baffled by the problem having to do with the moral government of the world. He looked upon a world in which many circumstances seemed to deny Yahweh's control. The day in which he prophesied was one of oppression under Jehoiachim following the death of the beloved Josiah. How could Yahweh permit such a state of affairs to continue? (Compare 1:2-4). Habakkuk was concerned with more than the difficult lot of his own people. He included in his interest every people that felt the tyranny of the oppressor.

He seemed to receive an answer in the advance of the Chaldeans who he believed were a part of a Yahweh-controlled order. But he was still baffled. How could Yahweh allow these Chaldeans to punish Judah?

> "O Yahweh, thou hast ordained him for judgment; and thou, O Rock, hast established him for correction. Thou that art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on perverseness, wherefore lookest thou upon them that deal treacherously, and holdest thy peace when the wicked swalloweth up the man that is more righteous than he...?" (1:12f.)

---

1 Pilcher, in Three Hebrew Prophets, regards the book of Nahum as a "Prophetic Liturgy", composed after the fall of Nineveh. The "Liturgy" opens with a hymn celebrating "the everlasting justice of Yahweh, the God of Israel and the Judge of the whole earth, so significantly manifested in the overthrow of the tyrant empire of Nineveh." (pp. 66f.) Two Woes are followed by a Taunt Song.

2 J. E. McFadyen: Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 239.

The answer comes at length. Strong as the Chaldean may appear, in reality he is hastening toward his ruin. "Patience and faith are the watchwords of the prophet... There was a time when he had expected an adequate historical solution to his doubts in his own day, i.e., but, as he contemplates the immoral progress of the Chaldeans, he recognizes his difficulty to be only aggravated by this solution, and he is content to commit the future to God."[1]

> "For the vision is yet for the appointed time, and it hasteth toward the end, and shall not lie: though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not delay. Behold, his soul is puffed up, it is not upright in him; but the righteous shall live by his faith" (2:3f.).

"That purpose wills the triumph of justice, and though the righteous may seem to perish, in reality he lives, and shall continue to live, by his faithfulness."[2]

Habakkuk is illustrative of the fact "that faith is always an achievement, not a mere inheritance. The Hebrews, of the exilic and post-exilic periods at least, had to fight for their faith. It was difficult to believe in Yahweh as the supreme God [and peculiar God] when Yahweh's people were rapidly losing all place and power in the political world"[3] Yet it stands to the credit of Habakkuk that a wavering faith in Yahweh was strengthened, that the faith in Yahweh's care was vindicated.

---

1 J.E. McFadyen: Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 246.

2 Ibid.

3 J. M. Powis Smith: The Prophets and Their Times, p. 133.

These three thinkers, unimportant as they all were in comparison with Israel's great seers, each made his contribution to the total consciousness of election: Zephaniah, with his pronouncement of universal judgment and call to Israel, in the prophetic spirit, to seek Yahweh and righteousness; Nahum with the vindication he saw of Yahweh's favor to Israel in the destruction of Nineveh; and Habakkuk, preserver of faith in Yahweh, God of Israel, in a time of stress for Israel.

4.

The Exile

Out of the bitter experiences of the Exile came two prophetic voices. Ezekiel and the great unknown prophet, Deutero-Isaiah, are significant in and of themselves, but especially so for their part in the development of two tendencies, which were to be prominent in the succeeding centuries, the one tendency toward particularism, the other toward universalism.

(1) Ezekiel

Until recent years the Book of Ezekiel has been regarded as one writing about which there was little question as to authenticity. In fact, McFadyen, less than a decade ago wrote that in Ezekiel we have "the rare satisfaction of studying a carefully elaborated prophesy whose authenticity has, till recently, been practically undisputed. It is not impossible that there are...occasional doublets... but these in any case are very few and hardly affect the question of authenticity. The order and precision of the priestly mind are reflected in the unusually systematic arrangement of the book."[1] McFadyen does take note of the current criticism of the book but says it is

---

1 Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 187 (1934 Reprint of the 1932 new and revised edition).

too early for an adequate evaluation of these theories.

To be sure, doubts and difficulties about the Book of Ezekiel have existed from earliest times; and for about two centuries now, its homogeneity and authenticity have been questioned; but none of those who advanced such theories were taken seriously.[1] Within our own century, however, the names of Kraetzschmar, Hermann, Hölscher, Torrey, Herntrich may be mentioned as among those who have successfully attracted the scholarly ear. Their theories in the main either reject a large part of the book as from Ezekiel, or like Torrey's regard it as a pseudepigraph.[2] Without doubt, if the traditional view were to be abandoned, Herntrich offers the most adequate hypothesis: Ezekiel was active in Jerusalem from 593-586. We have a record of his prophecies of this period which constitute the bulk of the book. These sections were worked over and added to by an exilic redactor.

In the work of G. A. Cooke (ICC) published in 1937, notice is taken of all the recent Ezekiel studies. The author feels warranted in holding more closely to the traditional position than do his contemporary critics, although he too recognizes that the Book has undergone some revision and that materials have been added. Especially is this true of 40-48.

In our study we shall be guided by the judgment, of which

---

[1] Shalom Spiegel: "Ezekiel or Pseudo-Ezekiel" in HTR, Vol. XXIV (1932), pp. 245 ff.

[2] Compare Charles C. Torrey: Pseudo Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy, pp. 5f.

Cooke is representative, that the Book of Ezekiel offers evidence for religion in the Exile and that it exerted a potent influence on succeeding thought.

We may consider briefly in how far Ezekiel agreed with his predecessors and then turn to a consideration of the advance in the idea of election which may be attributed to him.

He makes but one specific mention of Yahweh's selection of Israel.

> "Thus saith the Lord Yahweh: In the day when I chose (בחר) Israel, and sware unto the seed of Jacob, and made myself known unto them in the land of Egypt, when I sware unto them, saying, I am Yahweh your God; in that day I sware unto them to bring them forth out of the land of Egypt into a land that I had searched out for them..." (20: 5f.).

The chapter of which this is a part seems to be constructed on a plan: Israel in Egypt (5-9), in the wilderness (10-14), in the wilderness and in Canaan (15-22, 23-26). In each stage they were disobedient, yet Yahweh spared them. They were just as guilty in the time of the prophet (30-32).[1] This brief summary shows that for Ezekiel there was nothing good in Israel's history. "To older prophets a halo surrounded Israel's earliest time, though it soon fades away."[2] But for Ezekiel even from the beginning Israel had been utterly disloyal to Yahweh.

In his portrayal of infidelity the prophet was deeply in-

---

1 Compare G. A. Cooke: Ezekiel (ICC), Vol. I, p. 213.

2 A. B. Davidson: Ezekiel (Cambridge), p. xliv.

fluenced by Hosea's conception of Israel. Chapter 16, an allegory of Jerusalem, describes Yahweh's unfaithful Spouse. Cooke thinks the basis here a popular story which Ezekiel adapted. The story ran thus. A babe who had been exposed was found by a traveler who saved her life. She was left to grow up in the wilds. The traveler passed that way again and found her grown to maidenhood. He married her and she, his queen, became renowned for her beauty, far and near. The application is obvious. The foundling is Jerusalem, i.e., Israel. In spite of love and gifts she became notoriously unfaithful so that she deserved death as an adulteress. Israel has, through her whole history, shown eagerness for Canaanite religion and morals. Seeking to ally herself with foreign nations she has forfeited her rightful place.[1]

A further example of his despair over the nation's history is found in chapter 23: the allegory of Oholâ and Oholîbâ. Although there is a similarity here to the allegory just mentioned, a different theme is found. Here it is political alliances. The two sisters, Samaria and Jerusalem have defiled themselves by pursuing the heathen: Oholâ, Assyria who humiliated and then killed her; Oholîbâ, also Assyria and Babylonia besides. The latter should have learned her lesson from her sister's destruction but she did not and so will suffer a like end. By such a harsh measure, the destruction of Judah, will harlotry be uprooted. "Ezekiel has a keen realization of the mingling of the political and the religious and sees the intimate connection

---

[1] Ezekiel (ICC), Vol. I, p. 159.

which existed, as the prophets regularly taught, between Israel's policy of political alliance with foreign powers and the consequent religious corruption."[1]

While Ezekiel thus condemned the infidelity of Yahweh's people and proclaimed sure punishment, yet he had a message of restoration also. It was grounded in the nature of Yahweh, in what Bewer defines as Yahweh's "wonderful grace".[2] Yahweh was deeply obligated to Israel. Despite their breach of faith they were bound to him by an indissoluble tie. Though there will be no covenant with Israel, Yahweh will make a covenant of peace for them (37:26). "...the ancient covenant had been broken again and again (cp. 16[59]) [though in the comment on that passage Cooke questions if it is from Ezekiel] ; but Jahveh promises to renew His intimate relations, and to grant a covenant for Israel, a gracious dispensation ensuring peace and security."[3]

The motive behind Yahweh's redemptive work is "for his name's sake."[4]

---

1 Elmer A. Leslie: Old Testament Religion, p. 223.

2 The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 177.

3 G. A. Cooke: Ezekiel (ICC), Vol. II, p. 403.

4 Compare ibid., Vol. I, p. 71, where it is stated that this phrase, so characteristic of Ezekiel, occurs sixty-three times with the verb in the second or third person.

> "Therefore say unto the house of Israel, Thus saith the Lord Yahweh: I do not this for your sake, O house of Israel, but for my holy name, which ye have profaned among the nations, whither ye went, and I will sanctify my great name, which hath been profaned among the nations, which ye have profaned in the midst of them; and the nations shall know that I am Yahweh, saith the Lord Yahweh, when I shall be sanctified in you before their eyes" (36: 22f.).

A. B. Davidson has pointed out that this conception of Yahweh acting "only for his name's sake...is capable of being set in a repellant light. It seems to make the divine being egoistic, and his own sense of himself the source of all his operations. The way too in which he brings the nations to know that he is Jehovah, through judgments mainly, invests the idea with additional harshness... Perhaps two things...would help to explain the prophet's idea. One is his lofty conception of Jehovah, God alone and over all, and his profound reverence before him.... And the second thing is this: the conception arose out of the conflicts of the time. There were antagonisms without, between Israel and the nations. These conflicts on the stage of history were but the visible forms taken by a conflict of principles, of religions, of Jehovah God with the idolatries of which the nations of the earth were the embodiments."[1]

Ezekiel's hopeful message is found particularly in chapters 34-37 - a description of a new age about to dawn. "Jahveh's purpose is to bring back Israel to its ancient home, and there to create a nation outwardly and inwardly renewed, which shall devote

---

1 Ezekiel (Cambridge Bible), pp. xliif.

itself wholly to his service."[1] A picture is presented of the gathering and return of the scattered flock by Yahweh himself (34), to the transformed homeland (36), where the nation will be purified (36: 16-38). Israel will be raised to new life (37).

The initiative is taken by Yahweh. The inner purification of this remnant is symbolized by the sprinkling of water.

> "And I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and
> ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness,
> and from all your idols, will I cleanse you" (36:25).

In words which remind us of Jeremiah, the new heart and spirit which Yahweh will bestow, are described:

> "A new heart alwo will I give you, and a new spirit
> will I put within you; and I will take away the sto-
> ny heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a
> heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you,
> and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall
> keep mine ordinances, and do them" (36:26f.)

To combat the despair which had settled down upon the exiles the prophet describes his vision of the reanimation of the dry bones (37). The current thinking of the people may have suggested the vision: "Our bones are dried up, and our hope is lost; we are clean cut off" (v.11). Just as they thought figuratively of their condition so he spoke in figure of the restoration of the nation. The dry bones of the valley came together, bone to its bone. Sinews with flesh covered the bones. Then breath came into them and they lived.

> "I will put my breath in you, and ye shall live,
> and I will place you in your own land: and ye
> shall know that I, Yahweh, have spoken it and per-
> formed it, saith Yahweh" (v. 14)

---

[1] G. A. Cooke: Ezekiel (ICC), Vol. II, p. 372.

Ezekiel, as no other prophet, recognized the freedom of the individual. Much concern was felt by his generation for their condition. There was a current proverb: "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge" (18:2). Jeremiah had realized the problem (31:29) but Ezekiel represents present relief rather than future. Laws of heredity and social forces were ignored. Man will not be responsible for the sins of his fathers. On the other hand he must bear the consequences of his own sins. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die" (18:4).

Yet Ezekiel did not think of religion as individualistic. He was concerned with "building up a society of men and women whose hearts were turned to God, a nation organized on the principle of holiness and brought into regular contact with the temple, where the divine Presence dwells and radiates holiness throughout the land."[1] Within chapters 40-48 is to be found the program of this new age.

It is not necessary here to note the detail of this program, only that it was essentially particularistic. Ezekiel was not thinking of the conversion of the nations nor of their participation in the new era. Speaking of the limitations of the prophet, however, Cooke says: "It was no time to dream of Israel's mission to the world outside; the moment called for concentration, not expansion; if the true religion was to be saved from foundering among the ruins, it must be safeguarded at all costs."[2] Another has expressed Ezekiel's contribution thus: "...he represented the great conservative element in the re-

---

[1] G. A. Cooke: Ezekiel (ICC), Vol. I, pp.xxxf.

[2] Ezekiel (ICC), Vol. I, p. xxxi.

ligion of Judah that kept it true to its own inner spirit and protected it from evaporation, on the one hand, and, on the other, from such amalgamation with pagan religions as would have cost Hebrew religion its very soul."[1] It is easy to see why the prophet has been called the father of Judaism.

The prophet's outlook was quite in line with the practices which were observed in the Exile. To maintain their individuality the Jews placed stress on sabbath observance and circumcision. Dietary regularions also separated them from others. There arose thus during the Exile among the Jews as never before, the consciousness of their difference from other peoples. They actually stood, "in a religious sense, on a much higher plane than any other people. They felt the need therefore of adopting an attitude of aloofness towards all who stood on a lower religious plane."[2] This sense of separation, born of necessity, coupled with Ezekiel's teaching which too, as has been shown, was necessary in helping to preserve the identity of his people, gave a set to one line of thought - particularism - which was to prevail in subsequent history.

---

1 J. M. Powis Smith: The Prophets and Their Times, p. 176.

2 Oesterley and Robinson: Hebrew Religion, p. 287.

(2) Deutero-Isaiah

Deutero-Isaiah stands at the end of one era and at the beginning of another. The long reign of Nebuchadrezzar (604-562) was followed by strife which presaged a breaking up of the great empire. While the disintegration was taking place Cyrus of Persia was making rapid advances into power. He overthrew Astyages and thus came into control of the territory of the Medes. A coalition - Lydia, Egypt, Babylonia, and Sparta - attempted to check his progress but Cyrus attacked and subjected Croesus of Lydia before the allied powers had had an opportunity to strike. In little more than a decade he had made himself a world ruler. Our prophet, cognizant of the impending fall of Babylonia,[1] uttered the great words which we have in Isaiah 40-55.

For the prophet Cyrus was the agent of Yahweh.[2] In two passages he is mentioned by name: "(Thus saith Yahweh) that saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd and shall perform all my pleasure" (44:28) and "Thus saith Yahweh to his anointed, to Cyrus..." (45:1).

---

1 Compare chapters 40-48 for mention of Babylonia and Cyrus, either explicit or implied: 41:2, 25; 43:3; 47:20. Etc.

2 It is exceedingly interesting that Cyrus regarded himself as chosen by the Babylonian god Marduk for the conquering of Babylonia. "He (Marduk) sought out an upright prince, after his own heart, whom he took by his hand, Cyrus, king of the city of Aushan.... Marduk, the great Lord, the guardian of his people joyfully beheld his good deeds and upright heart. To his own city Babylon his march he commanded...like a comrade and helper he marched at his side..." (From the Cyrus cylinder, quoted in W. O. E. Oesterley: History of Israel, Vol. II, p. 64.)

An important element in Deutero-Isaiah's message is signalized by his first word - Comfort. He must create in his people a mood of expectancy. They must be prepared "to take advantage of their freedom when the opportunity should come."[1]

It is Deutero-Isaiah who, for the first time, teaches monotheism explicitly. The idea, implicit in his predecessors, is unfolded and developed by him.

> "...before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. I, even I, am Yahweh; and besides me there is no Saviour" (43:10f.)

> "I am Yahweh, and there is none else; besides me there is no God...I form the light, and create the darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I am Yahweh, that doeth all these hhings" (45:5-7).

Not only has Yahweh created but he finishes what he has begun. The fact that Yahweh is everlasting, the Creator, utterly unwearied and wise beyond comprehension, constitutes a basis of hope for Israel.[2]

That the prophet taught absolute monotheism makes his biting criticism of idolatry all the more logical. Furthermore, he had had ample opportunity to observe the worship of Marduk and Nebo. In chapter 46 he contrasts the weakness and frailty of man who made images with the power of Yahweh who has made and will bear, who will carry and deliver. In chapter 44 (9-17) he sets forth in telling picture the folly of idolatry. The carpenter cuts out a figure which he

---

1 J. M. Powis Smith: The Prophets and Their Times, p. 179.

2 Compare chapter 40.

makes into an idol. "Half of it he burns in the fire, and upon the coals thereof he roasts flesh; he eats flesh and is satisfied, he warms himself also and says: Aha, I am warm, I feel the glow; and the residue he makes into a god! Makes it into an image and bows down to it! He prostrates himself before it and says: Rescue me, for thou art my god!"[1]

A corollary of monotheism is universalism. If there is but one God he must of necessity be the God of the whole world.

> "...the God of the whole earth shall he be called" (54:5).

> "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" (45:22f.).

From Deutero-Isaiah's world-view of Yahweh's sovereignty, we see how reasonable it was for him to regard Cyrus as the agent of Yahweh. In the whole world he was able to use whom he would, whatever his nationality.

"The unity of God was the one pole of Deutero-Isaiah's teaching of God. The other, which he emphasized just as strongly, was Israel's special relation to Him."[2]

Chapter 40 is among the finest passages in the Old Testament. How can Jacob and Israel say their way is hid from Yahweh? Their God

---

1 H. P. Smith, Religion of Israel, p. 251.

2 Julius A. Bewer: The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 204.

is eternal, creator of the very ends of the earth. He never faints nor wearies and imparts his strength to those in need.

> "...they that wait for Yahweh shall renew their strength;
> They shall mount up with wings as eagles;
> They shall run and not be weary;
> they shall walk and not faint" (40:31).[1]

In another passage of deep tenderness he says:

> "...Zion said, Yahweh hath forsaken me,
> and the Lord hath forgotten me.
> Can a woman forget her sucking child,
> that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb?
>
> Yea, these may forget,
> Yet will not I forget thee" (49:14f.).

The husband-wife figure is used to give expression to Yahweh's deep love for Israel:

> "For a small moment have I forsaken thee;
> but with great mercies will I gather thee.
> In overflowing wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment;
> but with everlasting lovingkindness will I have mercy on thee,
> saith Yahweh thy Redeemer" (54:6f.).

Redeemer - this is frequently used word in these utterances. There is no passing over of sin with the prophet. The people have been deservedly punished. "Thy first father sinned, and thy teachers have transgressed against me. Therefore I have profaned the princes of the sanctuary; and I have made Jacob a devoted thing, and Israel a reviling" (43:27f). But in the same context we read: "I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake; and I will not remember thy sins" (43:25). Or again: "I have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions, and as a cloud, thy sins: return un-

---

[1] Ibid., p. 205.

to me, for I have redeemed thee" (44:22).

Yahweh's restoration of Israel is unmerited by them. It is but an evidence of his grace and love.

In Deutero-Isaiah redemption proceeds from righteousness as Professor Leslie has shown. The prophet's conception of Yahweh represents a synthesis of these two elements, righteousness and redemption.[1] There is an insight into Yahweh's relationship with Israel which comes from his very nature in that he is righteous."... the term 'righteous' and its cognates convey...in Second Isaiah at least...the constancy of God's purpose regarding Israel, His trustworthiness in all His dealings with His people, even in His chastisements."[2]

We have now noted what Professor Bewer has called the two poles of the prophet's thought, the unity of Yahweh and Israel's special relation to him. Is there not in these concepts something mutually exclusive? Must Yahweh not of necessity be concerned with the affairs of all peoples? What relation does this view, taken in its full significance, have to the historic belief in the peculiar relationship of Yahweh to Israel? The solution of this problem is to be found in Israel's mission. They have been chosen to mediate the knowledge of Yahweh to the nations. Yahweh is restoring Israel, - to be sure because he is obligated to do so, as was said above, - that his grace may be shared. The classic expression of Israel's mission is to be

---

1 Old Testament Religion, pp. 233f.

2 A. B. Davidson: TheTheology of the Old Testament, p. 379.

found in the Servant Songs of Deutero-Isaiah, to which we now turn.

In our approach to a study of the so-called Servant Songs one perplexing problem confronts us, however. Who was the servant? Was it a collective group, Israel or a part of Israel, or was it an individual? In a recent monograph, Les Chants du Serviteur de Jahvé, a good historical summary of the views regarding the servant may be found.[1] A hundred years ago the collective hypothesis which Stephani had set forth in 1787 was predominant among protestant scholars. Towards the end of that century and in our own this view began to lose ground to those who held to an individual interpretation, although as we shall see the collective view has by no means been abandoned. Historically both collective and individual interpretations have been given. Eissfeldt points out that the LXX took the passage collectively. ("Jacob" is inserted before "my servant" and "Israel" before "my chosen".) In the early church, on the other hand (compare Acts 8:34 f.), the Servant was regarded as Jesus the Messiah.[2] Thus early the uncertainty existed.[3]

Mention of the Servant is by no means confined to the Servant

---

1 J. S. van der Ploeg, pp. 1-6.

2 Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterojesaja, p. 1.

3 Van der Ploeg mentions the Targum as earliest evidence. Here in chapter 42 the servant was the Messiah. Chapter 49 was applied to Israel. Later, chapter 53 was regarded as messianic by many Jews although collective explanation has always had its exponents among Jewish scholars. Origen cited chapter 53 to Rabbis with whom he was discussing the claims of Jesus, and their reply was that the whole people were referred to by the prophet.

Songs. It occurs in 41:8ff; 42:18-22; 44:1,2,21,26; 45:4; etc. In several of these passages the "Servant" is definitely identified with or explained by "Israel" and in the other passages a similar meaning is warranted. Two questions are now to be asked. Do the Servant Songs come from Deutero-Isaiah or were they inserted by him or by another? If they were written by him is there any reason to suppose that the same interpretation is not applicable to all references to the Servant?

Duhm raised the question in his Theologie whether or not the Songs might not be from a different hand. In his Commentary he definitely eliminated them from the work of Deutero-Isaiah on the basis of: (1) style, language, metre; (2) loose connection with context; (3) disparity between what is said in the Songs and in the rest of the prophecy with regard to the Servant. He admitted with regard to his second argument, however, that there were other passages whose relation to their context was as loose as was that of the Songs.

Duhm's followers do not agree among themselves as to the exact bounds of the interpolated poems - which in itself raises doubts in one's mind whether the differences can be quite so evident as claimed.

Eissfeldt, it would seem, rather well answers Duhm and his successors. If the Servant Songs (as well as other portions) stand in their context somewhat loosely this may be explained by the makeup of Deutero-Isaiah, which like other prophetic books consists of separate poems and sayings. Furthermore style and phraseology constitute an

argument for authenticity inasmuch as even critics of authorship by Deutero-Isaiah almost generally recognize similarity between the two.[1] While there is by no means unanimity of opinion we may feel warranted in regarding the Servant Songs as the work of Deutero-Isaiah. If 40-55 then is from one hand, the view that the Servant is the same in all passages is more conclusive.

But is it possible to regard the Servant as one and the same throughout these chapters? There is a considerable group of competent scholars who answer in the negative. They regard the Servant as an individual, but cannot agree as to who he was. Of like influence to the work of Duhm is that of Mowinckel in Der Knecht Jahwe. He regarded the Servant as Deutero-Isaiah himself. Others have attempted to name the Servant. Sellin has over a period of years suggested with characteristic versatility, Zerubbabel, Jehoiachin, and Moses. Duhm thought him a doctor of law. Bertholet regarded him as a priest. By still others he has been regarded as an eschatological figure or the Messiah of the future. Those who hold that the Servant must be an individual rest their position on two claims: (1) While the personification of the people is possible outside the Songs, in them it is so exaggerated as to be impossible; and (2) upon passages where the Servant seems to be distinct from Israel (49:5-6 and 53).

Lods asks how any individual could fulfil literally the requirements of the given description. The servant is a sick man at-

---

1 Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterojesaja, pp. 10f.

tacked by a revolting disease (53:3-4), wounded (53:5-7), an outcast (50:6-7), condemned (53:8). Furthermore he is portrayed as risen from the dead & alive, after his death and burial are described (53: 8-10). Yet, a belief in the resurrection of individuals was not then held, though resurrection as a symbol for the recovery of a nation had been used by Ezekiel (37:1-14).[1]

Those who insist upon the individual interpretation of the Servant are reminded by Eissfeldt[2] of the studies of Pedersen,[3] H. Wheeler Robinson,[4] Stanley A. Cook.[5] We quote Robinson's remark as apropos: "We must not attempt to decide whether the figure drawn in Isaiah liii is individual or national, before we have taken into account the remarkable lengths to which the principle of corporate personality can go."[6]

A solution of the second argument put forth by those who hold the "individual" theory is that 49:5-6 refers to an Ideal Israel and not the nation. Isaiah's preaching about the Remnant - an Israel within Israel - would tend to make such a view tenable. It is advanced by Skinner,[7] Manson,[8] Eissfeldt[9] et al. It is not necessary, however,

---

1 Compare The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism, p. 245.
2 Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterojesaja, p. 13.
3 Israel, its Life and Culture, pp. 52-57.
4 In Arthur S. Peake: The People and the Book, pp. 375-378.
5 Ibid., pp. 64-69.
6 Ibid., p. 378.
7 Isaiah (Cambridge), Vol. II.
8 In a section on The Remnant in The Teaching of Jesus, pp. 175-188.
9 Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterojesaja.

to regard this passage as requiring any interpretation other than that of Israel as the nation.

Professor Bewer has discussed this passage and shown that the collective view is justified.[1] He calls attention to the use of the infinitive construct with ל in connection with oratio obliqua. Citing numerous examples he shows that the infinitive construct with ל here in 49:5 is, too, an example of indirect speech. He translates the verse thus: "And now Yhwh, who formed me from the womb to be his servant, has said that he would bring Jacob back to himself and that Israel should be gathered to him."[2]

Thus in our study of the Servant Songs we shall regard them as from Deutero-Isaiah and as representing the nation, Israel, as the Servant.

The first Song (42:1-4) describes Israel's commission as a "missionary servant".

"Behold, My servant, whom I uphold,
My chosen, in whom My soul delights:
I have put My Spirit upon him,
he will bring forth justice to the Gentiles.
He will not cry, nor lift up his voice,
Nor cause it to be heard in the street.
A bruised reed will he not break,
And a dimly burning wick will he not quench.
He will bring forth justice in truth.
He will not fail nor be discouraged,
Till he have set justice in the earth;
And the isles shall wait for his instruction"
(42:1-4)[3]

---

1 "Two Notes on Isaiah 49, 1-6" in Jewish Studies in Memory of George A. Kohut, pp. 88 ff.

2 So J. M. Powis Smith: The Prophets and Their Times, p. 186.

3 Julius A. Bewer: The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 211.

Here we are introduced to the character and work of the Servant, the chosen of Yahweh. His gentleness and regard for others (2, 3), and persistence in bringing justice into fruition (4), are set forth. The Servant is the recipient of Yahweh's spirit and will be sustained by Yahweh in whom his mission has its origin. It is this relation to Yahweh and no inherent characteristic that qualifies the Servant for his mission. It is justice which is to be universally established - the enlargement and consummation of the earlier prophetic message. He will remain constant to his mission until it is accomplished.

The second passage (49:1-6) complements the first regarding Israel's mission. The servant is to be a light to the nations. Yahweh has been prpparing Israel for its mission. Even from the womb had the nation been called (verse 1, and verse 5). This same figure is used elsewhere to describe the beginnings of Israel's history (44:2, 24. Also 46:3). In verse 2 the servant is described as a weapon ready for Yahweh's use with emphasis upon the element of concealment. It has not yet become evident what an effective instrument Yahweh has at his disposal.

Verse 3 reads: "Thou art my servant: Israel, in whom I will be glorified. Duhm would remove Israel from this line and all who hold to an individual interpretation might well wish that he were right. Professor Bewer has written a note upon this passage. "... in comments on Isaiah 49.3 one comes again and again upon the statement that one Hebrew manuscript omits ישראל."[1] He examines this

---

1 "Two Notes on Isaiah 49, 1-6" in Jewish Studies in Memory of George A. Kohut, pp. 86ff.

one manuscript (Ken. 96) and concludes that it is not a reliable witness in Isaiah 40-66. Furthermore, Israel is mentioned without the customary parallel, Jacob, in 44:21; 45:17,25; 46:13.

Though it seemed to Israel in the discouragement of exile, that all had been in vain yet there is a persistent hope for it is grounded in Yahweh.

> "And now Yahweh did say,
> He that formed me from the womb for His servant;
> That He would bring Jacob again to Him,
> And Israel should be gathered unto Him,
> And I should be honored in the eyes of Yahweh,
> and my God had become my strength;
> And He said, 'The raising up of the tribes of Jacob
> and the restoration of the preserved of Israel
> Are less significant than thy being My servant;
> so I will give thee for a light to the Gentiles,
> That My salvation may be
> to the end of the earth'"
> (49:5f.).[1]

The far reach of this mission is at once evident. Listen, O Isles; hearken, ye people from far. Yahweh's salvation is to reach to the ends of the earth. The restoration "of Israel is not an end in itself but the means to the end." The fact that Israel is to be the Servant is of supreme importance.

The third poem (50:4-9) introduces us to the sufferings of the Servant. (The term Servant does not appear here though it is obvious it is in the writer's mind.) This poem in a sense connects the first songs with the last one.

The close relationship between Yahweh and Israel is here expressed in the figure of master and disciple. Skinner says, "The

---

[1] Julius A. Bewer: The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 210.

stress laid on the Divine education of the Servant is connected with the fact that his ministry of consolation was almost a new departure in prophecy."[1] This symbolism is changed at verse 6, where the persecutions of the Servant are described, which involve intense humiliation. One is reminded of his gentleness as it is described in 42:2, 3. The secret of the Servant's ability to endure insult is found in the support which Yahweh gives to him.

> "For the Lord God will help me;
> Therefore shall I not be confounded:
> Therefore have I set my face like a flint,
> And I know that I shall not be ashamed"
> (50:7).[2]

The final Song (52:13-53:12), longest of the four, "is unsurpassed in its pathos and power." Here in the introductory verses attention is again called to the "abject condition" of the Servant.

> "...many were astonished at him,
> because his visage was so marred that it was
> not that of a man
> and his form so that it was no longer human"
> (52:14).[3]

But his lot is to change. His future is to be in sharp contrast to his present. "...he shall be exalted and lifted up and very high!" (52:13b).[4]

In 53:1-9 (10?) we find the testimony of the heathen. The Servant is described in his suffering as he had appeared to them:

---

1 Isaiah (Cambridge), Vol. II, p. 102.
2 Isaiah (Cambridge), Vol. II, p. 103.
3 Julius A. Bewer: The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 208.
4 Ibid.

"He had no form nor comeliness, that we should look at him,
nor beauty, that we should desire him.
He was despised and forsaken of men,
a man of sicknesses, and acquainted with disease,
And as one from whom men hide their face
he was despised, and we esteemed him not"
(53:2b-3).[1]

However, there has now come to them a realization of the true significance of the Servant's suffering. It has been for them. As Whitehouse has emphasized, the importance of the personal pronoun should be felt in their confession.

"Yet our disease 'twas he who bore,
And our sufferings, he bore their load;
While we, we thought him plague-struck
Smitten of God and humiliated"
(53:4).[2]

"With his bruises we are healed"
(53:5d).

"Yahweh made to light on him
the iniquity of us all"
(53:6b).

Then the prophet in verses 7ff. describes the persecution, and death of the Servant - yet in all his affliction he "opened not his mouth" but bore it with patience.

Recognizing the numerous difficulties in the text Whitehouse has translated verse 11 thus:

"Through the travail of his soul shall he see light in fulness;
By his knowledge shall my servant bring justification to many,
And of their guilt shall he bear the burden."[3]

---

1 Ibid., p. 209

2 Isaiah (New Century), Vol. II, p. 201.

3 Ibid., p. 208.

The last words of the Song are spoken by Yahweh in which he vindicates the Servant. On the basis of the sufferings Yahweh says:

> "I will divide him a portion among many
> And with strong ones he shall divide booty."[1]

There is thus presented a twofold answer to the problem of Israel's suffering. The sufferings have had vicarious value - saving the world from the punishment it deserved. Further, "they will have redemptive efficacy." When the nations realize all that Israel has suffered in their behalf they "will cast themselves at the feet of the true and only God in heartfelt gratitude and adoration."[2]

Deutero-Isaiah broke "over the boundaries of national prejudice.... He boldly announced the social solidarity of the human race.... Israel was but one member in the great family of nations. ... Israel had been chosen of God to bear the punishment necessary for the expiation of the sins of the human race."[3]

In these Servant Songs, Deutero-Isaiah has offered an ideal for his people. Bewer has well said: "He (the prophet) knew that the reality was totally different, Israel was 'a people robbed and plundered, snared in holes, and hid in prison houses,' a 'deaf' and 'blind' servant (42:18-22). They had not taken this suffering upon themselves with willing patience. The prophet had idealized them in his poems. He wanted to rouse them by holding up before them this

---

1 Ibid., pp. 208f.

2 J. M. Powis Smith: "The Ethical Significance of Isaiah, Chapter 53", in JR, Vol. 3 (1923), p. 137.

3 Ibid., p. 139.

high ideal of their world-wide mission."[1]

Torrey's words are fitting with which to sum up the great contribution which Deutero-Isaiah made to the idea of election. We do not need to accept Torrey's thesis in order to borrow his words for they apply equally well in the development which we have followed. "This idea of an emissary charged with a great work is a fundamental element of the prophet's theology. ...The term generally employed is 'ebed'. ...[He quotes numerous passages.] In each and all of these passages the prophet is speaking of Yahwè's eternal purpose, and of the great agent Israel, specially appointed to carry it out. This gives to the idea of 'the chosen people' a content which is active rather than merely passive. Israel is a steward under orders: promised a splendid reward, it is true, but on conditions and not as a mere favorite."[2]

Deutero-Isaiah, in the conception of the Servant of Yahweh and the Mission to be fulfiled, represents the high-water mark of Old Testament religion. His message is unique. To be a light to the Gentiles was the mission which Israel had been chosen to fulfil.

What a tragedy that Israel did not fully realize the prophet's ideal. His message did not, however, go entirely unheeded. After the exile there were a few who followed after him as we shall see in studying their teachings. The particularistic emphasis was not allowed to stand unanswered.

---

1 The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 211. Compare C. C. Torrey: The Second Isaiah, p. 145.

2 The Second Isaiah, pp. 135f.

5.

Post-Exilic Period

We have in our survey of the Exile noted the rise of two tendencies, particularism and universalism. Both grow out of the idea that Yahweh had chosen Israel. The one stresses the narrow implications of this relationship, the other the broad.

"The particularistic attitude conceives of God as the God of Israel, the universalistic attitude would express itself in such words as: 'Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth' (Isa. xlv.22). The former would regard Israel as alone worthy of divine consideration, the latter would include the Gentiles within God's scheme of salvation."[1]

In line with our study of the election of Israel, universalism carried the deeper implication that Yahweh had chosen Israel as "a light to the Gentiles" (Isaiah 49:6).

There were, as we have seen, practices in the religion among the exiles which complemented the teaching of Ezekiel. A development towards separation was natural, so natural that the wonder is that Deutero-Isaiah ever found an echo. As we make a brief survey of the

---

[1] Oesterley and Robinson: Hebrew Religion, p. 315.

history of the post-exilic period in Judah we shall see, even more clearly, that it was by no accident the particularism of Ezekiel was more significant than the universalism of Deutero-Isaiah. There were forces at work which made such a development almost inevitable.

Historical Background

To trace the historical background is to see the conditions which led eventually to the reforms under Ezra and Nehemiah.

We must review first the conditions of Judah during the Exile. In all probability Nebuchadrezzar placed over it a Babylonian governor who would have under him subordinates, very likely Jewish. Undoubtedly Babylonian troops were stationed in the province but not in large number. Neighboring peoples were pushing into Judah without any apparent opposition from the Babylonians. In fact, these quarrels between Judah and her neighbors were probably not regarded by those in control as at all important. Particularly prominent in this movement were the Ammonites and Edomites.

We are told in the closing words of II Kings and in Jeremiah (40:13ff.) how Baalis, the Ammonite king stirred up Ishmael who killed Gedaliah. We read also in Jeremiah (49:1ff.) a pronouncement of doom against Ammon, presumably because Ammon had attacked Judah.

In Ezekiel are to be found more specific charges: "Because thou saidst, Aha, against my sanctuary, when it was profaned; and against the land of Israel, when it was made desolate; and against the house of Judah, when they went into captivity" (25:3).

From the south came the Edomites, though they did not settle

immediately after 586. They in turn were pushed from the south by the Nabataeans so that theirs was not wholly willful aggression. Nevertheless, Judah looked on Edom as its bitterest enemy. For their part in the destruction of Jerusalem Obadiah denounces them in bitter terms:

> "In the day that thou stoodest aloof, in the day that strangers carried away his substance, and foreigners entered into his gates, and cast lots upon Jerusalem, even thou wast as one of them. ...
> And stand thou not in the crossway, to cut off those of his that escape: and deliver not up those of his that remain in the day of distress."
> (verses 11,14)

The message of Obadiah himself (1-14, 15b) is a contemporary witness to the feeling of bitter resentment. While Malachi is in line with Obadiah in its attitude toward Edom, the punishment is referred to as already accomplished. There are also oracles in Ezekiel.[1]

There are to be noted also denunciations against Moab (Ezekiel 25:8-11; compare Zephaniah 2:8).

To be sure, the materials which give us our information regarding conditions in Judah are somewhat difficult to date, but they may be looked upon as coming from the first half of the Exile.[2]

The movements of the neighboring peoples, to whom Judah was racially related, resulted in new blood coming into the country.

The impression which is created of the religious life of Judah during the exile is dismal. Inasmuch as this was now a Babylonian province, Babylonian worship would be compulsory; but from

---

[1] Compare 25:12-14; 35:1-15; 36:1-5.

[2] Compare W. O. E. Oesterley: History of Israel, Vol. II, p. 55.

the description of religious practices mentioned in Ezekiel 8 it is to be inferred that the Babylonian influence had been felt even prior to the fall of Judah. Ezekiel must have been familiar with the Tammuz cult, for example, as it had been practiced in Jerusalem. Practices current before the exile would undoubtedly have continued.

Isaiah 65, although coming from the next century, may be looked upon as evidence for the presence of the old Asherah and Baal cult. Those who returned from Babylon were confronted with a situation as pictured in this chapter. Bewer in speaking of this period has commented upon the difficulty of exterminating the cult because of the close relationship between religion and land. To this day, as he says, peasant and city man have a quite different concept of religion.

It was to a Judah partially inhabited by aggressors and in which the worship of Yahweh had somewhat disintegrated that the exiles returned (538) following the decree of Cyrus and at the beginning of the reign of Darius (521). It is not necessary here to consider the complicated questions which arise from the sources at our disposal. Jerusalem gradually acquired a measure of vitality from those who returned, and from the very nature of the case the remnant would tend to be the dominating influence.

Ezra 4:1-3 is a testimony to the early friction which existed between the Samaritans and the new-comers. While their offer of assistance was refused by Zerubbabel his motive was probably political rather than religious.[1] The actual break between the two

---

[1] So Loring W. Batten: Ezra and Nehemiah (ICC), p. 128.

groups did not occur until later. The returns of these two groups added a new element to the population and their religious outlook constituted another factor which must be considered in the later development.

We know next to nothing of the period which followed the rebuilding of the Temple. Not until Ezra-Nehemiah are we again given any detail. Two documents, however, may be taken to furnish some data for this otherwise unknown period, Trito-Isaiah and Malachi.[1] Religious leadership was apparently lacking. In general Trito-Isaiah reflects a situation in which the people are profoundly discouraged and in need of stimulation. "A new spirit [in contrast to Deutero-Isaiah] breathes through these oracles. The music is frequently in the minor key. We have passed from the brighter world of noble ideals and happy anticipation to the darker realm of disillusionment. ... We are dwelling amid the hard realities of an evil world."[2] Malachi bears witness to the influence of an "inner community of those who feared Yahweh and spoke often one to another"[3] (3:16). But aside from such an influence the impression is one of deterioration - moral and religious - rather than of growth.[4]

Whether one holds the traditional view that Ezra came to

---

1 Malachi is to be dated shortly before Ezra-Nehemiah. Trito-Isaiah cannot be given any one date for here is represented the work of several writers. Around 460 may well be the date for the most of the materials though other elements are earlier.

2 Owen C. Whitehouse: Isaiah, Vol. II (New Century), p. 233.

3 Quoted in W. O. E. Oesterley: History of Israel, Vol. II, p. 98.

4 Ibid.

Jerusalem before Nehemiah or that Nehemiah preceded Ezra matters little in the total effect of their labors in the trend towards particularism. It is our opinion that Ezra may well have arrived in Jerusalem in 458, and in studying their contributions we shall follow this traditional order. Their labors were made necessary, in part at least, by the circumstances which we have noted above. Their work marks a certain finality in the development of particularism. It now remains to trace this development with them and with their successors - while not losing sight of the broader vision which was never wholly lost.

(1) Particularism

W. Emery Barnes, commenting on the work of Nehemiah says it may be summarily described as Habdālāh, 'Separation'. "The conviction of exiles like Nehemiah and Ezra who returned to the 'Holy Land' was that the land was 'defiled' by the heathen strangers (Ezra ix. 11) who had intruded into Israel's territory since the fall of the Northern kingdom in 722 and of the Southern in 586.... Nehemiah's belief was that the only way to break with idolatry was to break with idolaters."[1] The work of Ezra may, with equal aptness, be described as Habdālāh.

The essential purpose of Ezra's journey to Jerusalem, as is evidenced from his firman, was the carrying of the Law. Upon arrival with his followers Ezra gave himself to two great problems:

---

1 "Religion of Israel from the Return to the Death of Simon the Maccabee", in The People and the Book, edited by A. S. Peake, pp. 290f.

the introduction of the law, and mixed marriages. (Compare the Ezra Memoirs: Ezra 7-10 and Nehemiah 7:73-9:38). The one concern in both these issues was to make Israel a holy people.

We need not here attempt to solve the difficult problem as to what law it was that Ezra introduced. Whether Priest Code or Deuteronomy, it was the Priest Code of which he made use, and that in a simpler form than the Priest Code we recognize.

Nehemiah 8 describes the law-reading and its interpretation. The people were so moved that they wept, but Ezra commanded them to rejoice. On the second day a smaller group met for the law-reading - "the heads of fathers' houses of all the people", the priests and the Levites. They found written in the law that the Lord had commanded that the children of Israel should dwell in booths in the feast of the seventh month. (Compare Leviticus 23:42). Thereupon the people went forth to procure branches to make booths. Since the days of Joshua the children of Israel had not done so. The idea thus expressed is that this ceremony is now observed in accordance with the Jewish law.

Following the feast comes a day in which the people make a public confession. On behalf of the people Ezra makes a confession and prays. The law is accepted in a covenant ratified by princes, Levites and priests. The law was new and yet it contained old elements which had been adapted and brought up to date, all being carried back to Moses.

P is dominated by exclusivism. It is interesting to see

how beginning with creation, the story is told in such a way as to emphasize Israel's unique relation to Yahweh. Yahweh the Creator of the World was for P the sole god of mankind. Here at the beginning, then, is a universal note. In chapter 10, P lists the sons of Noah as if the whole world population could then be regarded as one family. Words spoken with regard to the compiler of Genesis have a certain bearing on P also. "The...ultimate goal is the history of the chosen family; he was sensible (in Gunkel's words) 'of the scientific necessity of saying something about the rise of other nations, of the aesthetic necessity of bringing clearly to a close the history of primitive undivided mankind, and last, but not least, of the religious necessity of exhibiting clearly the selection of Israel out of the mass of nations.'"[1] P proceeds at once to narrow his interest to the family of Shem and then to that of Abraham.

For P there were four periods of history: from the Creation to the Flood, from Noah to Abraham, from Abraham to Moses and from Moses to Joshua. Each period is inaugurated by a divine revelation.[2] In two of the periods covenants are found: with Noah, which had significance for all living creatures (Genesis 9:1-17); with Abraham, which had significance for Israel alone. The token of this covenant was to be circumcision (Genesis 17:11). Thus in the first two periods the relationship is general but beginning with Abraham P's interest centers in Abraham and Israel.

---

1 S. R. Driver: Genesis (Westminster), p. 112.

2 John Skinner: Genesis (ICC), p. lx.

Driver has called attention to the promises to the patriarchs. In P, unlike J, they "are limited to Israel itself.... The substance of these promises is the future growth and glory... of the Abrahamic clan; the establishment of a covenant with its members, implying a special relation between them and God..., and the confirmation of the land of Canaan as their possession...the culminating promise is that in Ex. 29:43-46, declaring the abiding presence of God with His people Israel."[1]

The exclusive spirit called for a 'holy', 'separated' people to correspond to the holy Yahweh. We must note its effect upon Judaism. Everything that was defiling required to be removed. Heathen people were included. Since the foreigner was in Palestine and could not be removed regulative steps must be taken. Before the exile such sojourners possessed no political rights nor did they own land. As far as religious duties went they were required only to keep the Sabbath. Since P had as his goal the removal of all impurity, whenever a foreigner became unclean he must purify himself lest he infect others with his impurity. This difference in attitude may be illustrated by comparing pre-exilic law with post-exilic:

> Ye shall not eat anything that dies of itself: thou mayest give it to the sojourner that is within thy gates, that he may eat it; or thou mayest sell it to a foreigner: for thou art a holy people to Yahweh thy God.
> - Deuteronomy 14:21

> And every soul that eats that which dies of itself, or that which is torn of beasts, whether he be a native (Israelite) or a resident stranger, he shall wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and be unclean until the evening, then shall he be clean. But if he wash them not, nor bathe his body, then he shall bear his punishment.
> - Leviticus 17:15f.

---

[1] S. R. Driver: An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, p. 129.

The general law found in P is this: "Ye shall have one manner of law, as well for the sojourner as for the native." Though P did not draw a logical conclusion from this general law, here was a basis for the view held later that religion and not birth, makes the true Jew. Should this sojourner remain long enough, thus partidpating in rites, political equality would be granted in the third generation (Deuteronomy 23:7-8).

Towards other non-resident foreigners an attitude of absolute exclusivism was maintained. With foreigners outside Palestine, the situation was quite otherwise. Even in P, Yahweh is regarded as Creator of the world. This must involve an interest in all mankind on his part. If the foreigner would accept the law he might thus become a Jew.

Thus Ezra, in introducing the law, exclusive as it was, unintentionally led the way to the reception of foreigners as Jews.

The second issue which confronted Ezra was not unrelated to the first: mixed marriages. The various strains which we noted above as becoming a part of the population of Judah account in part for this problem which Ezra met. The Jewish men had married the daughters of the "peoples of the land" - non-Israelites. Mixed marriages, to Ezra, were defiling. All that was defiling must be removed. Therefore mixed marriages must be dissolved. Oesterley makes the point that to a Babylonian Jew mixed marriages were a pollution. Jewish separateness in the exile was almost an article of faith. Ezra was insisting in Palestine on conformity to the Babylonian norm.[1]

---

[1] Oesterly and Robinson: A History of Israel, Vol. II, pp.133-134.

To a certain extent he may be right, but mixed marriages in Babylohia were regarded by many as possible. Ezra was, so far as this problem goes, a fanatic reformer seeking to gain his end by external means. And yet, to his great credit, he did not attempt to win by force. Following the people's confession of guilt an assembly was called which decided to appoint an investigating commission. Three months were spent in trying the cases. In the list of people found guilty are priests, Levites, singers and porters and a large number of laymen. It is the priests alone who promise to put away their wives. Ezra 10:44 as it stands reads: "These all had married foreign wives." Then follow some unintelligible words. There is little doubt that the "Greek Ezra" 9:36 has the original text: πάντες οὗτοι συνῴκησαν γυναιξὶν ἀλλογενέσιν, καὶ ἀπέλυσαν αὐτὰς σὺν τέκνοις.

That this reform was accomplished as easily as it would seem from our sources is to be doubted. Intense and bitter hatred was aroused.

George Foot Moore cites parallels from Athens and Rome for the opposition to intermarriage with other peoples. The motive is to perpetuate a pure-bred race. It is a measure of self-preservation. "There is no equity in judging it otherwise in the case of the Jews under the prejudicial title of exclusiveness."[1] Self-preservation for the Jew, who had no political existence, could be maintained only in the preservation of his national religion. "The separateness of the Jews, their ἀμιξία, was one of the prime causes of the ani-

---

1 George Foot Moore: Judaism, Vol. I, p. 20.

mosity toward them...but it accomplished its end in the survival of Judaism, and therein history has vindicated it."[1] But was the strength of Judaism ἀμιξία, or was this its weakness? That a certain amount of the exclusive tendency was necessary for the preservation of Judaism in such an environment as that in which it was placed is unquestionable. One can, however, but wish that more of the spirit of universalism could have been evident.

Ezra was a man of the deepest religious convictions. He was able, by the sheer force of this power to bring about his reforms in a short period of time. That his reformation was in one sense no advance must be admitted. The hatred for the Jew which he engendered by the dissolution of mixed marriages increased in succeeding generations. That Judaism had its nerve cut in its increasing legalism was inevitable from the basis exclusiveness of the Priest Code.

Nehemiah's work lay more in the realm of the material. His first term in Jerusalem is a blank except for the repair of the walls. In this undertaking he had the backing of the particularist party.

Upon his return he found that the Sabbath was being flagrantly abused. People were working in the fields (13:15). Mer-

---

1 Ibid., p. 21. Compare H. Wheeler Robinson (Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, p. 208) who quotes Ryle: "The permanence of Judaism depended on the religious separateness of the Jews. He fenced off the people against the subtler temptations to idolatry and averted the imminent danger of his time, the fusion of the Jews at Jerusalem with the semi-heathen 'peoples of the land.'" From the exclusive traditionalistic point of view such a course was eminently justified.

chants came from Tyre to sell fish and other wares on the Sabbath (13:16). Nehemiah ordered the gates closed on the sbbbath and placed his own servants on guard. The merchants continued their business just outside the walls until Nehemiah threatened them with personal violence. They did not return.

Ezra's drastic dissolution of mixed marriages had apparently been no solution of the problem. Nehemiah was aroused when he found half-breed children speaking a jargon of Hebrew and Ashdodite. He was so angry that he cursed the fathers, attacked them and pulled out their hair. He exacted a promise that their children should not marry foreigners.

He drove out of the city a grand son of Eliashib, high priest, who had married Sanballat's daughter. This passage, 13:28,29, and Josephus, Antiquities xi: 7,2 and 8:2-7, are our only sources for the Samaritan schism. Josephus dates the schism a hundred years later, but he is probably wrong. His story, in all probability, is meant to parallel the episode in Nehemiah.[1]

In Nehemiah 10 we have the pledges which the people made. They will not intermarry. They will not buy on the Sabbath or holy days. They will forego in seventh year the cultivation of the soil and the exacting of debt. They agree to pay a third of a shekel yearly for the maintenance of the Temple. They will cast lots for the provision

---

1 George Foot Moore: Judaism, Vol. I, p. 23f. Some scholars combine the two sources. A. T. Olmstead: History of Palestine and Syria, p. 595, uses Josephus's names, Manasseh and Nicaso in this incident.

of wood for the Temple. They will bring tithes to the Temple for the Levites and priests. "This covenant is of extraordinary interest. ... These Jews determine the future of the temple and of its cult, not as a result of a written law, not at the suggestion of a cold if not hostile high priest, but through a free-will agreement proposed by a layman and ratified by the whole people."[1]

Nehemiah was remembered by future generations with gratitude. He is mentioned in Ecclesiasticus 49 along with other notables. By opposing mixed marriages he helped to safe-guard religious purity. He was primarily the conservator of values. He was working chiefly for the preservation of religion.

In estimating the significance of the work of these two leaders in its relation to the idea of election we may say finally: "In the end...and very largely owing to the powerful and forceful personalities of Nehemiah and Ezra, the particularistic attitude prevailed in Palestine, as had always been the case among the bulk of the Jews in Babylonia."[2]

We may, for the sake of convenience, consider a group of prophets whose thought was predominantly apocalyptic. J. M. Powis Smith refers to them as "the last fading flower of prophecy."

Joel, or at least the prophecy which bears his name, speaks of an outpouring of the Spirit of Yahweh "upon all flesh" but he has in mind Jews alone. In the valley of Jehoshaphat (Yahweh judges) the nations shall be judged. The third chapter pictures a judgment meted out to the nations to match their conduct towards Judah: "(I) will return

---

[1] A. T. Olmstead: History of Palestine and Syria, p. 596 f.

[2] W. O. E. Oesterley: History of Israel, Vol. II, p. 123.

your deed upon your own head" (3:7b). In the battle in the valley of Jehoshaphat they shall be overthrown by Yahweh "but Yahweh will be a refuge unto his people, and a stronghold to the children of Israel" (3:16b). Bewer remarks: "Nothing but Israel's 'sacred egoism' runs through these prophecies."[1]

The prophecy concludes with a judgment against Egypt and Edom: "Egypt shall be a desolation, and Edom shall be a desolate wilderness, for the violence done to the children of Judah, because they have shed innocent blood in their land" (3:19) and a promise of deliverance for Judah - "But Judah shall abide for ever, and Jerusalem from generation to generation" (3:20).

In Deutero and Trito-Zechariah and Isaiah 24-27, to which we shall return in another phase of our discussion, there is pictured destruction for the enemies of Judah. There are elements of universalism, as we shall see, in these writings. They are universal, too, in that they reckon "with both Judah and the world at large. ... The nations are to receive a well-deserved punishment. But this punishment is revoltingly cruel in some of its features. The old ethical passion of the great prophets has almost wholly disappeared."[2]

In Daniel, so largely apocalyptic, too, we find expression of national pride. The Messianic Kingdom will be for Jew alone - a world-empire of Israel. Other kingdoms of the world shall be overthrown. The Jews are referred to several times as 'saints of the

---

1 The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 397.

2 J. M. Powis Smith: The Prophets and Their Times, pp. 238f.

Most High': "The saints of the Most High shall receive the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever" (7:18).[1] In the narratives the Jews stand out as God's favorites. The four youths surpassed the magicians and enchanters ten times over (1:17ff).[2] Piepenbring says that even the glorification of God by the Gentiles is intended to enhance the glory of the Jews.[3]

> "Nebuchadnezzar spake and said, Blessed by the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, who hath sent his angel, and delivered his servants that trusted in him, and have changed the king's word, and have yielded their bodies, that they might not serve nor worship any god, except their own God. Therefore I make a decree, that every people, nation, and language, which speak anything amiss against the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, shall be cut in pieces, and their houses shall be made a dunghill: because there is no other god that is able to deliver after this sort. Then the king promoted Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego in the province of Babylon" (3:28-30)[4].

The tendency toward national pride comes to its climax in the book of Esther. Possibly this book is the latest in the Old Testament though it probably was written sometime before it won popularity. While its primary purpose was to explain the origin of Purim its second purpose, which is here our concern, was to glorify the Jewish people. Providence justifies Mordecai's refusal to bow before Haman "for the Jews are born to dominion, and all who oppose or oppress

---

1 So also in 7:21f., 25, 27.

2 Compare also: 2:25ff, 46ff.; 3:30; 4:8f, 18; 5:11,14,29; 6:28.

3 Theology of the Old Testament, p. 322. His section on exclusivism has been found helpful at this point.

4 J. E. McFadyen: Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 354.

them must fall."[1] Bewer dates Esther in the third century and thinks it is to the credit of Palestine that the book won its way so slowly; that possibly it was even actively opposed. With national independence a goal in the Maccabaean wars and with the strong national self-consciousness which these wars created Esther came to the front. The Greek version attempted to make it more 'religious' by adding prayers of Mordecai and Esther but these are in the same exclusive spirit.[2]

Esther shows the extreme to which a national exclusivism, given free rein, can go. Although particularism was to the front it must be remembered that it did not express itself in this intense fashion elsewhere.

In concluding this survey of particularism, let it be said that there was a higher and lower form which exclusivism took. We have just noted a vindictive nationalism. On the other hand there were among the Jews those who might be classed as the adherents of Ezra in their devotion to the Law. For them the Law was "the signal proof of God's peculiar love to Israel. ... Its promises sustain [ed] Israel through the centuries of hope deferred."[3] It was in the Law that they found their delight and not in a strident nationalism.

---

1 Ibid., p. 355.

2 Julius A. Bewer: The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 307.

3 George Foot Moore: History of Religions, p. 69.

(2) Universalism

Universalism occupies a relatively small amount of space in the pages of later Old Testament literature. Those who felt that Israel's election had extra-Israelitish implications were in the minority. A tolerant monority, they were characterized by their reserve in contrast to the more vocal majority. Yet, how telling each word that called to thought beyond exclusivism - how forth-telling!

In Trito-Isaiah a catholic note appears in 56:1-8. To be sure the foreigners who are under discussion must fulfil certain obligations (verse 6). They "join themselves to Yahweh, to minister unto him", and it is of course expected that they will keep the Law. The prophet makes two statements. The first represents the fear the foreigner felt: "Yahweh will surely separate me from his people", to which answer is given: "my house shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples." Two things are evident here as Sheldon Blank has pointed out: the presence of exclusivism in Jerusalism, and of universalism in the writer of this oracle.[1]

The beautiful story of Ruth is an answer to the opposition of Ezra and Nehemiah to mixed marriages. The author does not draw the moral to his story, but his motive in writing it stands out clearly. God does not hate mixed marriages. David himself was descended from such a union. It is not race nor nationality but heart relationship that matters.

---

[1] "Studies in Post-Exilic Universalism", in HUCA, Vol. XI (1936), p. 160. Compare Owen C. Whitehouse: Isaiah (New Century), Vol. II, p. 241.

The book of Jonah bears a strong resemblance to Deutero-Isaiah. Israel's election to fulfil a mission to the Gentiles is emphasized. In fact Jonah may be said to give "utterance to a broadth of sentiment toward the gentiles that we find nowhere else in the Old Testament."[1] Sellin is quite right in appraising the book: it "is, in virtue of its universalistic teaching...one of the most precious jewels of Hebrew literature.[2]

The book shows up both the universalistic and particularistic tendencies in Judaism. The prophet is made to serve as the representative of the narrow outlook. The author uses the selfish Jonah as a foil to his own universal sympathies. The last words are a question put to Jonah in his petulent mood:

> "Thou hast had regard for the gourd, for which thou hast not labored, neither madest it grow; which came up in a night, and perished in a night: and should not I have regard for Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than six score thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and also much cattle?"
> (4:10f.).

"The story is a parable, or allegory, of the history of Judah. Jonah represents the people of Judah. They were set in the world to make the goodness and justice of God known to all nations. They failed utterly to realize or accept their task. Therefore they were cast into exile, where they stayed until they came to some consciousness of their iniquity. Finally, they were brought back home

---

1 Ch. Piepenbring: Theology of the Old Testament, p. 325.

2 E. Sellin: Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 174 .

to Judah and given another chance to carry out their world-wide mission. But, like Jonah, they went about their work in a bitter and revengeful spirit, and were therefore open to severe rebuke and criticism."[1]

We have already referred, in connection with our survey of particularism, to the late prophets. Among their utterances are words which have a catholic note. For example in Isaiah 24-27 there is such an expression, occurring in connection with the description of Yahweh's world rule:

> "And in this mountain will Yahweh of hosts
> make unto all peoples a feast" (25:6).

In the passage from which this statement is taken, "Zion, it is true, is still the centre of the world, and the Jews are still considered especially by Yahweh, yet not in order to give them a higher place."[2]

In Isaiah 19:18-25 is an oracle coming from the Greek period in which the universal note is plainly heard. Particularly striking are the following words:

> "In that day shall there be a highway out of Egypt to Assyria, and the Assyrian shall come into Egypt, and the Egyptian into Assyria; and the Egyptians shall worship with the Assyrians. In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth; for that Yahweh of hosts hath blessed them, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance" (19:23-25).

In Zephaniah there has been inserted a short prophecy:

---

1 J. M. Powis Smith: The Prophets and Their Times, p. 226.

2 Julius A. Bewer: The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 401.

"For then will I turn to the peoples a pure language that they may all call upon the name of Yahweh, to serve him with one consent" (3:9).

When we come to the Psalter Torrey says we have a representation of the true religion of the second temple. In the main the psalms speak for the multitude - for the common people who were the bulk of Israel. Here is a faith, warm-hearted and catholic, founded on common sense.[1] This should not be taken to mean that such a catholic and warm-hearted faith is characteristic of the whole Psalter, but surely such an attitude is evident.

Yahweh's universal ownership of the world is asserted:

"The earth is Yahweh's, and the fulness thereof;
The world and they that dwell therein" (24:1).

He was represented as extending his mercy to all:

"Yahweh is gracious, and merciful;
Slow to anger, and ofgreat lovingkindness.
Yahweh is good to all;
And his tender mercies are over all his works....
Yahweh is nȫgh unto all that call upon him,
To all that call upon him in truth"
(Psalm 145: 8f., 18).

"Der Missions beruf, den einst Deuterojesaja dem Judenvolk zugeschreiben hatte, war nicht vergessen."[2]

"Sing praises to Yahweh, who dwelleth in Zion:
Declare among the people his doings" (9:11).

"Therefore I will give thanks unto thee, O Yahweh,
among the nations
And will sing praises unto thy name" (18:49).

Israel is to publish to the world their deliverance:

"Make known among the nations his (Yahweh's)doings" (105:1b).

---

1 Ezra Studies, p. 313.

2 A. Bertholet: Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments, Vol.II,p.151.

Psalm 96, perhaps to be taken as a part of a song of praise, contains a call to praise Yahweh:

> "O sing unto Yahweh a new song:
> Sing unto Yahweh all the earth.
> Sing unto Yahweh, bless his name:
> Show forth his salvation from day to day.
> Declare his glory among the nations,
> His marvelous works among all the peoples" (1-3).

The expressions of the realizations of the catholic phase of the mission of Israel are far less numerous than one could wish. Yet even the words of Deutero-Isaiah and the message of the book of Jonah are sufficient to show the breadth which could be given to the idea of election; sufficient to show how radical was such teaching in a world in which religion and nationalism seemed inseparable.[1]

Without accepting Torrey's hypotheses regarding the date and materials of Deutero-Isaiah, and his low estimate of the work of the Chronicler, we may well imagine that there is a measure of truth in his emphasis: that the Jews of the Persian period were not dispirited particularists. He may quite well be right in the suggestion that the priests who were busy with the law were not the whole people. "The Jews of the Persian and Greek periods....made their way, by degrees, into a new and wider view of their life as the "chosen few"[2] is a statement which, for a minority at least, holds true. And that minority was the really creative element in Judaism.

---

1 Compare Charles C. Torrey: The Second Isaiah, p. 111.

2 Charles C. Torrey: Ezra Studies, p. 313.

Conclusion

Two phases of election in the Old Testament have been studied: the factors in history which gave rise to the belief, and the effect of this belief in thinking and behavior.

While in the historical development we might wish for a much fuller knowledge of the events which created the election-faith, nevertheless we may feel reasonably sure of the essential facts. For example, while there may be no definitive data for believing that the Crossing of the Sea was accomplished as a result of volcanic activity, that is a reasonable hypothesis. A deeper problem exists than that of chronicling historical events and attempting to explain them. Taking the Crossing of the Sea again as an example, was Israel justified in interpreting this phenomenon as an intervention of Yahweh in their behalf?

While from our view-point we would not agree with them in regarding the Crossing as made possible by a special act of God, yet we demand a religious and philosophical explanation of the universe as well as a scientific. Here we are essentially at one with Israel.

But still another question needs to be answered. Are we justified in thinking of any people as""chosen"? We have noted the adverse judgment of history against the belief of ancient nations for their concept did not take them beyond a vigorous nationalism. But

what of Greece and Rome who gave to the world art and science, and law and government? Who cannot say that it was in the divine order of events that they were destined for this mission. Yet with neither of these nations was there a consciousness of mission. Israel alone among the nations making a great contribution to the world believed itself chosen. Also, Israel alone among the nations believing themselves chosen has demonstrated the genuineness of its belief.

Israel's election-faith was validated, beginning with Amos, by the conviction that election implied no special privilege. Rather it laid a heavier burden of moral and ethical responsibility. This conception came to its climax with Deutero-Isaiah and Jonah in their teaching that Israel had been chosen for a world mission - a teacher and servant of the Gentiles.

This universal outlook was never widely held but the minority to whom this conviction was a reality were the creative element in Judaism. Much as we may deplore the more prevalent particularism, it may have been necessary to preserve a faith which could be universal.

History - ancient, medieveal, modern - is the march of "chosen peoples". But chosen how? by whom? for what? Those nations that tramp the path of rampant nationalism under the banner of self-glorification have always met the fate of Israel's contemporaries. - Need one presume the rôle of prophet to say they always will? - But Israel points the secret of security in election: moral and ethical response to the choice, expressing itself in a world mission.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Abstract

Election - the consciousness within a racial or national group that they are chosen to fulfil some special destiny - is a well nigh universal concept. It appears early in the written history of mankind and is still in evidence in our day.

The people of Israel, as did their contemporaries, regarded themselves as a "chosen people". Election, in a nationalistic sense held the expectation of power and self-glorification. Israel, while at times dominated by such an outlook, evolved a philosophy or theology of election, under which they felt it was their mission to be the teacher and savior of the world. The judgment of history has validated Israel's belief and has ruled against the belief held by the other nations of their day that they were "chosen people".

Here is, then, a significant field of investigation: to examine the origin of Israel's election-faith; and ,to see how,under it, they developed so as to demonstrate the genuineness of the choice.

That which differentiated the religion of Israel from all other ancient religions lay in the belief that Yahweh had chosen them at a given point in history, while all other peoples served gods to whom they were bound by natural ties. The event which is given in all the Old Testament literature as the supreme evidence of the election of Israel is their deliverance from Egypt.

Previous to the Exodus Moses had come to a knowledge of Yahweh while resident in Midian, where he married the daughter of a

priest. Exodus 3 is an account of the revelation of Yahweh to Moses and of his call to deliver Israel from Egypt. Moses in Egypt again, dominated by his own conviction that Yahweh was a God of power, introduced him to his fellow Israelites as one able to deliver them.

The events surrounding the deliverance of the Israelites - the plagues and the crossing of the Sea - may be explained as natural phenomena, as results of volcanic activity. However explicable, the events were interpreted as an intervention by Yahweh on behalf of Israel.

During the Wilderness sojourn at Kadesh a welding together of the Israelites was in process. Although the account of the events at Sinai is to be discounted, there developed a relationship between Yahweh and Israel which partook of the nature of a covenant even if there were no formal ceremony.

The early literature gives evidence that Israel read in their success in the Conquest of Canaan evidence of Yahweh's favor. The establishment of the monarchy with its attendant glory deepened this sense of favor.

Through several centuries the belief in Yahweh's guidance was sustained by concrete evidences and found its culmination in a sense of national well-being. It remained then for a religious genius to penetrate the deeper implications of this relationship. Such an interpretation came with the Eighth Century prophets.

It was to Amos that a deepening sense of Yahweh's relationship to Israel first came. Beginning, like the people, with the pre-

mise of election, he reached a different conclusion. "You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore will I visit upon you all your iniquities" (3:2). Since Yahweh's relation to Israel was not natural, but an act of free grace, just as Yahweh had been free to choose Israel, so was he free to sever the relationship. Without an assumption of responsibility, Israel's position of privilege was at an end.

Hosea, for whom Yahweh was preeminently the God of love, came to his full realization of Yahweh's relation to Israel through his own bitter marital experience. In figures overflowing with emotion, the prophet described Yahweh's choice of Israel. He insisted upon faithfulness to Yahweh, expressed in an exclusive loyalty. For Hosea, love must triumph in reestablishing the relationship between Yahweh and Israel.

Isaiah, discouraged by his failure in the face of a threatening enemy to inspire in people and king a confidence in Yahweh rather than in the material realm, concentrated upon his disciples. In this inner circle, the remnant, he placed his hope. His teaching relative to this remnant constitutes one of the radical ideas of the Old Testament. With Isaiah we find the beginning of the narrowing of the idea of election. Within Israel there was an Israel, a remnant, which would continue in Yahweh's fellowship and constitute the hope of the future.

Deuteronomy marks another significant point in the study of election. Here for the first time formal expression is given to the

idea that Yahweh had chosen Israel (although the prophets expressed the idea in less formal terms): a theological formulation of that conviction which throughout their several centuries of history Yahweh had substantiated with concrete evidences. The unchangeable character of Yahweh's mercy to Israel is expressed by saying that he entered into a covenant with them. Just here, the chief problem in connection with Deuteronomy arises. What is the source of its covenant idea, and what is the relation of this covenant to that found elsewhere? By a study of the Decalogues it is concluded that the E Decalogue is late though pre-Deuteronomic. The generally accepted view is that the Covenant Code is post-Mosaic. Consequently we have no data to determine the terms of an early covenant which might have been established between Yahweh and Israel. From a study of Deuteronomy it becomes evident that here for the first time the idea of covenant (berith) becomes a definitely formulated concept.

Jeremiah, active as a prophet at the time of the Deuteronomic reform and after, saw its inadequacy and called Israel to a new relationship with Yahweh which he set forth in terms of a new covenant. Inwardness and individualism are two of its characteristics. With him Yahweh came into fellowship with the individual Israelite.

Three religious teachers of the seventh century, unimportant as they were in comparison with Israel's great seers, each made his contribution to the total consciousness of election. Zephaniah

proclaimed universal judgment, and called Israel to righteousness. Nahum saw in the destruction of Nineveh a vindication of Yahweh's favor to Israel. Habakkuk helped preserve faith in Yahweh in a time of stress for Israel.

Out of the bitter experiences of the Exile came two prophetic voices. Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah are significant of themselves, but especially for their part in the development of two tendencies which were to be prominent in the succeeding centuries, the one tendency toward particularism, and the other toward universalism. Both of these tendencies grow out of the idea that Yahweh had chosen Israel. The one stresses the narrow implications of this relationship, the other the broad.

Ezekiel was a conservative in the real meaning of that term. He protected the religion of Israel from pagan influence and helped, by turning its attention in upon itself, to preserve true religion. His outlook was quite in line with practices observed in the Exile. To maintain their individuality the Jews placed stress on sabbath observance, circumcision, and dietary regulations. There arose thus during the Exile among the Jews, as never before, the consciousness of their difference from other peoples. Ezekiel's teaching, plus the sense of separateness, born of necessity, gave a set to particularism which prevailed increasingly.

Deutero-Isaiah's most important teaching for this study is found in the Servant Songs. Here he summoned Israel to the ideal of a world mission: to be a light to the Gentiles, thus mediating sal-

vation to the ends of the earth. The sufferings of this Servant, Israel, had vicarious value for the nations. Though the prophet's message was never realized, his ideal found lodging with a few.

The first return of Exiles, by Cyrus' leave (538), was followed by a second (521) at the beginning of Darius' reign. These groups became a part of the population which was a blend of those left behind at the Exile and of outsiders who had crowded in following 586.

When the leaders, Ezra and Nehemiah, came to Palestine (458 and 444) their common goal was 'separation'. Both led in reforms which furthered the narrow implications of election. Their point of view was shared in part by the late prophets, the book of Daniel, and was intensified in the Book of Esther.

A minority kept alive the universal outlook. Ruth is an answer to the attitude of Ezra and Nehemiah relative to mixed marriages. Jonah expresses, in the highest degree, a broad sentiment towards the Gentiles. The Psalter illustrates the catholic faith of Judaism. In the universalism of this minority was to be found the creative element in Judaism.

Israel alone among the nations making a great contribution to the world has believed itself chosen. Also, Israel alone among the nations believing themselves chosen, has demonstrated the genuineness of its belief.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations Employed

AJSL American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, Chicago.

BW Biblical World, Chicago.

HDB A Dictionary of The Bible, edited by James Hastings, N. Y., Scribner's.

HTR Harvard Theological Review, Cambridge, Mass.

HUCA Hebrew Union College Annual, Cincinnati.

ICC International Critical Commentary, N. Y., Scribner's.

JBL Journal of Biblical Literature, New Haven, Conn.

JR Journal of Religion, Chicago.

Texts

American Standard Version.

Biblia Hebraica, Edidit Rud. Kittel, Stuttgart, Privileg. Wurtt. Bibelanstalt.

Septuaginta, Edidit Alfred Rahlfs, Stuttgart, Privileg. Wurtt. Bibelanstalt.

General Works

Addis, W. E.: The Documents of The Hexateuch, Part I, N.Y., G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1893.

Arnold, William R.: Ephod and Ark, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1917.

Baentsch, Bruno: Exodus-Leviticus-Numeri, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1905.

Baron, Salo Wittmayer: A Social and Religious History of the Jews, Vol. I, N. Y., Columbia University Press, 1937.

Barton, George A.: "Old Testament Studies", in The Haverford Symposium on Archaeology and The Bible, Biblical and Kindred Studies, No. 6, Haverford College. Published jointly with and distributed by The American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven, 1938.

Barton, George A.: Semitic and Hamitic Origins, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1934.

Batten, Loring W.: Ezra and Nehemiah (ICC), N. Y., Scribner's, 1913.

Bertholet, A.: Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments II, Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr, 1911.

Bertholet, A.: Deuteronomium, Freiburg, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1899.

Bertholet, Alfred: Die Stellung der Israeliten und der Juden zu den Fremden, Freiburg, J. C. B. Mohr, 1896.

Bewer, Julius A.: The Literature of the Old Testament in its Historical Development, N. Y., Columbia University Press, 1922.

Bewer, Julius A.: "Two Notes on Isaiah 49, 1-6", a reprint from Jewish Studies in Memory of George A. Kohut, edited by Baron, Salo Wittmayer and Marx, Alexander, N. Y., Bloch, 1936.

Bewer, Paton, Dahl: "The Problem of Deuteronomy: A Symposium", in JBL XLVII (1928), pp. 305ff.

Blank, Sheldon H.: "Studies in Post-Exilic Universalism" in HUCA, Vol. XI (1936), pp. 159ff.

Brightman, Edgar S.: The Sources of The Hexateuch, N. Y., Abingdon, 1918.

Budde, Karl: Religion of Israel to the Exile, N. Y., G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1899.

Burney, C. F.: Israel's Settlement in Canaan, London, Milford, 1919.

Cadbury, Henry J.: National Ideals in the Old Testament, N. Y., Scribner's, 1920.

Carpenter, J. Estlin, and Harford-Battersby, G.: The Hexateuch, 2 vols., London, Longmans, Green, and Co., 1900.

Cooke, G. A.: Ezekiel (ICC), 2 vols., N. Y., Scribner's, 1937.

Cooke, G. A.: A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscrittions, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1903.

Cornill, C. H.: The Prophets of Israel, Translated by S. T. Corkran, Chicago, Open Court Publishing Co., 1895.

Cripps, Richard S.: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Book of Amos, London, SPCK, 1929.

Davidson, A. B.: Ezekiel (Mambridge), Cambridge University Press, 1900.

Davidson, A. B.: The Theology of the Old Testament, N. Y., Scribner's, 1904.

Driver, S. R.: The Book of Genesis (Westminster), London, Methuen, 1913.

Driver, S. R.: Deuteronomy (ICC), N. Y., Scribner's, 1916.

Driver, S. R.: An Introduction to The Literature of The Old Testament, (New Edition, Revised 1913), N. Y., Scribner's, 1922.

Duhm, B.: Das Buch Jeremia, Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1901.

Duhm, B.: Das Buch Jesaia, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1892.

Eissfeldt, Otto: Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterojesaja, Halle, Max Biemeyer, 1933.

Eissfeldt, Otto: Hexateuch-Synopse, Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1922.

Erman, Adolf: The Literature of The Ancient Egyptians, translated by Aylward M. Blackman, N. Y., E. P. Dutton and Co. (No date except to translator's preface: 1927).

Galling, Kurt: Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels, Giessen, Töpelmann, 1928.

Glueck, Nelson: Das Wort hesed, Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangen der Doktorwurde, Jena, 1927.

Gordon, Alex. R.: Early Traditions of Genesis, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1907.

Graham, William C., and May, Herbert G.: Culture and Conscience, An Archaeological Study of the New Religious Past in Ancient Palestine, Chicago, University Press, 1936.

Graham, William C.: "The Modern Controversy about Deuteronomy", in JR Vol. VII (1927), pp. 396ff.

Gray, George Buchanan: Isaiah (ICC), Vol. I, N. Y., Scribner's, 1912.

Gray, George Buchanan: Numbers (ICC), N. Y., Scribner's, 1906.

Gressmann, Hugo: Mose und seine Zeit, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1913.

Harper, William R.: Amos and Hosea (ICC), N. Y., Scribner's, 1915.

Hölscher, Gustav: Die Profeten, Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1914.

Holzinger, H.: Exodus (Marti Hand-commentar) Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1900.

Kautzsch, E.: "Religion of Israel", in HDB, Vol. V, pp. 612ff.

Kittel, Rud.: Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 2. Band, Gotha, Friedrich Andreas Perthes A.-G., 1922.

Kennedy, A. R. S.: Leviticus and Numbers (New Century), N. Y., Henry Frowde, (no date).

Knudson, Albert C.: "The So-Called J Decalogue", in JBL XXVIII, pp. 82ff.

Leslie, Elmer A.: Old Testament Religion in The Light of Its Canaanite Background, N. Y., Abingdon, 1936.

Lods, Adolphe: Israel, from its Beginnings to the Middle of The Eighth Century, Translated by S. H. Hooke, N. Y., Knopf, 1932.

Lods, Adolphe: The Prophets and The Rise of Judaism, Translated by S. H. Hooke, N. Y., E. P. Dutton and Co., 1937.

Manson, T. W.: The Teaching of Jesus: Studies of its Form and Content, Cambridge, University Press, 1931.

Marti, Karl: Das Dodekapropheton, Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1904.

McFadyen, John Edgar: Introduction to The Old Testament, London, Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., (New Edition), 1934.

McNeile, A. H.: The Book of Exodus (Westminster), N. Y., Gorham, 1908.

Meek, Theophile J.: Hebrew Origins, N. Y., Harper and Bros., 1936.

Montefiore, C. G.: The Hibbert Lectures, 1892 (Second Edition).

Moore, George Foot: History of Religions, N. Y., Scribner's, 1919.

Moore, George Foot: Judaism in The First Centuries of The Christian Era, Vol. I, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1927.

Moore, George Foot: Judges (ICC), N. Y., Scribner's, 1910.

Morgenstern, Julian: "The Oldest Document of The Hexateuch", in HUCA, Vol. IV (1927), pp. 1ff.

Mowinckel, Sigmund: Le Décalogue, Paris, Librairie Felix Alcan, 1927.

Oesterley, W. O. E., and Robinson, Theodore H.: Hebrew Religion, N. Y., Macmillan, (Second Edition), 1937.

Oesterley, W. O. E., and Robinson, Theodore H.: A History of Israel, 2 vols., Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1932.

Oesterley, W. O. E., and Robinson, Theodore H.: An Introduction to The Books of the Old Testament, N. Y., Macmillan, 1934.

Olmstead, A. T.: History of Palestine and Syria to the Macedonian Conquest, N. Y., Scribner's, 1931.

Paton, Lewis B.: "The Origin of Yahweh-Worship in Israel", in BW 42 (1906), pp. 6ff., 113ff.

Peake, A. S.: Jeremiah (New Century), 2 vols., N. Y., Henry Frowde, (no date).

Peake, A. S. (Editor): The People and The Book, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1925.

Pfeiffer, Robert H.: "The Oldest Decalogue", in JBL, XLIII (1924), pp. 294ff.

Pfeiffer, Robert H.: "The Transmission of The Book of The Covenant", in HTR, XXIII (1931), pp. 99ff.

Phythian-Adams, W. J.: The Call of Israel, An Introduction to The Study of Divine Election, London, Oxford University Press (Milford), 1934.

Piepenbring, Ch.: Theology of the Old Testament, Translated by H. G. Mitchell, N. Y., Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., 1893.

Pilcher, Charles Venn: Three Hebrew Prophets and The Passing of The Empires Being a Study of Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah, London, The Religious Tract Society, 1931.

van der Ploeg, J. S.: Les Chants du Serviteur de Jahvé dans la Seconde Partie du Livre d'Isaie (Chap. 40-55), Paris, Librairie LeCoffre, 1936.

Robinson, H. Wheeler: Deuteronomy and Joshua (New Century), N. Y., Henry Frowde, (no date).

Robinson, H. Wheeler: The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, London, Duckworth, 1930.

Sellin, E.: Introduction to The Old Testament, Translated by W. Montgomery, N. Y., Doran, 1923.

Skinner, John: Genesis (ICC), N. Y., Scribner's, 1917.

Skinner, John: Isaiah (Cambridge Bible), Cambridge, University Press, 1915.

Skinner, John: Prophecy and Religion, Studies in The Life of Jeremiah, Cambridge, University Press, 1922.

Smith, George Adam: The Book of Isaiah, Vol. I, N. Y., A. C. Armstrong and Son., 1889.

Smith, Henry Preserved: The Religion of Israel, N. Y., Scribner's, 1925.

Smith, J. M. Powis: "The Chosen People," in AJSL, XLV, pp. 73ff.

Smith, J. M. Powis: "The Ethical Significance of Isaiah, Chapter 53," in JR 3 (1923), pp. 132ff.

Smith, J. M. Powis: Micah (ICC), N. Y., Scribner's, 1911.

Smith, J. M. Powis: Nahum (ICC), N. Y., Scribner's, 1911.

Smith, J. M. Powis: The Prophets and Their Times, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1925.

Smith, J. M. Powis: Zephaniah (ICC), N. Y., Scribner's, 1911.

Smith, Wm. Robertson: Lectures on The Religion of The Semites, London, Adam and Charles Black, 1894.

Smith, Wm. Robertson: The Prophets of Israel and Their Place in History to The Close of The Eighth Century B.C., Edinburgh, Adam and Charles Black, 1882.

Spiegel, Shalom: "Ezekiel or Pseudo-Ezekiel", in HTR, XXIV (1932), pp. 245ff.

Torrey, Charles C.: Ezra Studies, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1910.

Torrey, Charles C.: Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1930.

Torrey, Charles C.: The Second Isaiah, N. Y., Scribner's, 1928.

Welch, Adam C.: The Religion of Israel under The Kingdom, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1912.

Whitehouse, Owen C.: Isaiah (New Century), 2 vols., N. Y., Henry Frowde, (no date).

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

Autobiography

Russell Chase Tuck born in Greene, Maine, July 17, 1903, the son of Frank C. and Celia (Parker) Tuck.

Graduated from Edward Little High School, Auburn, Maine, 1922. A.B., Bates College, 1926; B.D., Newton Theological Institution, 1929; S.T.M., ibid., 1930; A.M. Harvard University, 1932.

Instructor in New Testament Studies, after graduation from Newton; and Assistant Professor of the New Testament since 1934, Andover Newton Theological School.