The Attitude of the Bible
Towards the Human Kingship.

Louis Bernstein.

Hebrew Union College.
May. 1. 1906.

Mic. 5/78

Please note:
Handwritten notes in pencil appear on some facing pages of this thesis hardcopy. In this digital copy, the pages containing notes each immediately precedes the page it refers to. The use of pencil combined with the age of the thesis makes some of these notes difficult to decipher. Every effort was made to create the clearest possible scan.

Table of Contents.

List of works consulted and read.

1. Die Schätzung des Königtums im Alten Testament — Karl Budde. Marburg '03.
2. Das Königsideal des Alten Testaments. Samuel Oettli. Greifswald '99.
3. Lehrbuch der Alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte. Rudolf Smend. Freiburg '99.
4. Prolegomena to Jewish History. J. Wellhausen
5. Geschichte der Israelitischen Religion. Karl Marti.
6. The Prophets of Israel. W. R. Smith London 1902.
7. The Religion of the Semites. W. R. Smith
8. Old Testament History. Henry Preserved Smith. New York 1906.
9. Hebraische Archäologie. J. Benzinger.
10 " " H. Nowack.
11. Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments, Stade.
12. The Theological Aspect of Reformed Judaism In Year Book Central Conference of American Rabbis 1903. Pp. 186-338 Max L. Margolis

13. Judges. International Critical Commentary. G. F. Moore.

14. Deuteronomy I. C. C. S. R. Driver.

15. Samuel I. C. C. H. P. Smith.

16. Critical Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel - - - S. R. Driver.

17. Real Encyclopädie ---- Hauck
Articles - Messias.
Königthum

18 Encyclopedia Biblica --- Cheyne & Black.
Articles. - Messiah.
Eschatology.

19. Jewish Encyclopedia.
Articles. Messiah.
Kingdom.
David.
The Servant of the Lord.

List of Abbreviations

The numbers in this list refer to the title under the corresponding number in the Bibliography.

1. Budde.
2. Kittel.
3. Smend.
4. Well. or Wellhausen.
5. Marti.
6. W. R. Smith P. of I.
7. W. R. Smith R. of S.
8. W. P. Smith O. T. H.
9. Benzinger.
10. Nowack.
11. Stade.
12. Margolis.
16. Driver Crit. Note.
18. E. B.
19. J. E.

I.C.C = International Critical Commentary.

Preface.

It has been my aim, in these few pages, to present the attitude of the different books of the Bible toward the human kingship, established, from one point of view, in direct opposition to the will of God, from the other, as the highest gift and greatest blessing, presented by Jahweh to His people.

The divine kingship, as such, was discussed only incidentally and in so far as it dealt with the human kingship. To have presented this subject in its fullness would have required far more time and far more space than was at my disposal. It is a matter, however, which is so intimately associated with the subject in hand that it was not always easy to distinguish between the divine kingship and the human kingship.

In the course of construction many critical problems presented themselves, prob-

which are still mooted questions or which would require, for a full discussion, more space than is occupied by the present work. Such are for example the questions of "the Messiah" and the "Servant of the Lord." In these instances I have contented myself with a mere presentation of the broad outlines that would throw light on our own subject.

I had to be guided for the most part by the critics and authorities on biblical matters, though, in many instances material had to be rejected, because I could not follow the subtle reasoning, which produced certain results. In cases where the authorities consulted disagreed to any large extent, I have presented both views, sometimes in the footnotes, sometimes in the text itself, in accordance with the importance of the particular point involved. In

those instances where all the critics were agreed, or where two or three were responsible for the same view, it was not deemed necessary to present more than one reference.

It might not be amiss to mention here that the prevailing attitude of the Bible as we have it, seems to be largely in favor of the human kingship as an institution.

Great difficulty was experienced in preserving chapter unity and I am afraid in some instances this law has been to a certain small extent violated.

Louis Bernstein.

Hebrew Union College.
Cinti. May. 1. 1906.

Chapter I
The Founding of the Kingdom

Chapter One.

Founding of the Kingdom.

1. The need for the kingdom.

The founding of the kingdom represents the greatest event in the history of Israel after the Exodus from Egypt and the entrance into Canaan.[1] The end of the period of Judges with all its heroic deeds finds Israel under the iron rule of the Philistines.[2] A centralized organization which should unite the scattered tribes and thus place an obstacle in the path of the advancing foe, was sorely needed.[3] According to one account matters stood thus when the kingdom was first introduced into Israel.

2. The first account of the establishment of the kingdom.

This account which is the earlier

(1) Smend 53. (2) Oettli 6 (3) Nowack 305

and probably the more natural, and historical,[1] continues thus: Saul the son of Kish, a Benjaminite is sent by his father to seek some asses which have strayed away. About to turn back discouraged he is persuaded to visit the Seer Samuel, who lives near at hand, to seek from him information, regarding their whereabouts. Just the day before God has spoken to Samuel these significant words: "Tomorrow about this time I will send thee a man out of the land of Benjamin and thou shalt anoint him to be a prince (נגיד) over my people Israel. He shall free my people Israel from Philistine power, for I have regarded my people when its cry[2] came to me." Saul presents himself to Samuel, is see-

(1) Driver Crit. Notes 64+65. (2) Kautsch and others read here נגש for נגע on basis of LXX.

rally anointed king over Israel and instructed how to act.[1]

Nahash the Ammonite now besieges Jabesh-Gilead and the people offer to submit to him. He, however, wishes to put upon them indignities which their proud spirits can not endure. Messengers come to Gibeah and Saul is aroused by the spirit of God to heroic measures. At his commanding summons the people march against the Ammonites, who, completely surprised are badly defeated. As a reward for his prowess and because of his royal qualities Saul is made king at Gilgal amidst great rejoicing.[2]

3. The Second Account of the establishment of the kingdom.

Next to the above account, or

(1) I S. 9-10[16] (2) I S. 11

rather, intertwined with it is another which contradicts it. Samuel, the last of the judges, has become very old. His sons, who would succeed him are not deemed fit for so high an office. The elders come to Samuel and demand a king, for no other reason apparently than that they may be like the nations round about them. This demand is offensive to Samuel, who sees in it rebellion against himself, the more so since there is peace in the land, since Samuel himself has won a great victory over the Philistines. He, consequently, warns the people against the dangers of such an institution, describing in blackest colors, a typical oriental despot. The people however insist upon their demand being carried out and Samuel is commanded by God to accede to

them. The account concludes with the choosing of a King by lot. The choice falls naturally upon Saul.(1)

4. The two accounts contrasted.

For the sake of convenience, we shall designate these accounts respectively as Sl. and Sm.(2) Sl. takes Saul as its hero and therefore takes a favorable view of the kingdom. Sm. has Samuel as its hero and is theocratic in its viewpoint. According to Sl. the kingdom was a gift from Jahve,(3) showing His favor to Israel and it was as a commission from Jahve that Saul assumed his authority. The people saw in this no break with the past, nor was it intended to be rebellion against Jahve.(4)

---

(1) I S. 8+10 (17-27) For a discussion of these two accounts see Minor Critical Notes, I.C.C. Samuel (2) Cf. I.C.C. Sam. Intro. P. XVIII (3) Sl. Cf. 61 (4) Sm. Cf. 64

5. Samuel's attitude toward the kingdom.

The king was the vice-gerent of God. In its later sense the theocracy did not exist.[1] The exigencies of the time called loudly for union. Without a leader this union could certainly not be accomplished. The kingdom therefore was the logical outcome. In it Samuel, who was by nature a patriot as well as a statesman, saw Israel's only salvation.[2] And this according to St. took place even before the people had thought of a king. When, therefore, Samuel chooses Saul, anoints him as king in Jahweh's name, and is the first to pay him homage, he shows himself not an enemy of the kingdom but its very founder.[3]

(1) Wellhausen 411. (2) Smend 65.
(3) Smend 66.

6. The cause for the theocratic account.

Owing to the ill-success they had with the Kingdom, a later hand added the theocratic account which we have labeled Sm.[1] Here Jahve claims the kingship for Himself, for He has ruled more mildly than ever human king would. They had allowed themselves to be misled through envy of and the desire to imitate their neighbors, thereby forsweering Jahve[2]

7. The theocracy in the Judge-period?

Had this really been the case we would have to presuppose a perfectly organized state under Jahwe's rule.[3] If such a state had ever existed, what had become of the central authority in the period of the Judges?

---

(1) Budde 7. (2) Smend (67) remarks that not once in Judaism is the view of I Samuel 8 prevalent. (3) Wellhausen 412.

We have every reason to suppose that this was a time of anarchy, when the idea of union did not even exist.[1] On the contrary this same anarchy was later attributed to the very fact that, "in those days there were no kings in Israel, and every one did what he himself considered proper."[2]

8. The theocratic formulae in the histories of the Judges.

It is true that many of the Judge histories open and close with a theocratic formula somewhat after this manner: Israel forsook Jahve for other gods and did what was evil in His eyes. For ~~this~~ they were punished by being delivered into the hands of the enemy. When, however,

---

(1) Wellhausen 413. (2) Judges 17[6] 18[1] 19[1] 21[25]. For proof of later origin see I.C.C. Judges on these verses.

they repented. Jahve heard their cry and delivered them through a divinely sent hero, who protected them until they went astray again.[1] Leaving aside the fact that this formula contradicts the other, which attributes all the distress to the absence of kings, if we examine those accounts, which begin and end with it, we see how little do they actually square with the theory.[2]

9. Barak and Deborah.

Only half of those summoned by Barak and Deborah in the great contest against the Canaanites at Kison answer the call and in the Song of Celebration are given great praise therefor.[3] Is it probable that such a thing would have

(1) Judges 3 7-11. 12-15. 30 4 1-3 etc. (2) Budde 12.
(3) Judges 5 15-17

happened if things were as the formula represents them to be?

10. Israel's private as well as national.

Judges Gideon[1] and Barak have really a private quarrel to settle and are not acting in their capacity as leaders of the people divinely raised to deliver Israel from its heavy persecution. Bound however with this personal cause was the national feeling and thus we find Gideon punishing Sukkoth and Penuel for refusing him food when demanded.[2]

11. Abimelech and Samson.

Gideon's son Abimelech made himself ruler by murdering his brothers. His rule was as bad as the method by which he attained it.[3] The man of

(1) Judges 8. (2) Judges 8 4ff. (3) Judges 9

Judah bound and delivered Samson over into the hands of the Philistines because he had fought against those who were their masters.(1)

12. Poor testimony for the theocratic notion.

These incidents would certainly prove poor testimony for the theocratic idea.(2) Add to them, also, the fact that in several cases, those chosen as the leaders were anything but men of the highest character. A point in question is the case of Jephthah. Exiled from his home, in Gilead he is leading the life of a bandit leader. Offended by the Ammonites, the elders of his city persuade him to accept the leadership, promising to make him their chief. This he does and is victorious.(3)

(1) Judges 15 9 ff. (2) Budde 13
(3) Judges 11-12 7

13. Source of theocratic idea not in Judges.

If we seek then the source of the theocratic view we must not look in Judges.(1) In a later chapter we shall discuss and attempt to place the source.

14. Value of Saul's rule.

Saul's kingship was only an unfortunate attempt to solve the problem of placing a kingdom of Jahve's rule on earth, the king to act as his vice gerent.(2) though he was a great war hero, he won no place in the religious history of Israel, because, as Wellh says, he tried in a daring attempt, to wrill draw his kingdom from under Jahve

(1) the entire content of the Judge-period, says Budde (14) points to the kingdom & gives reason to suppose that it would be a blessing for Israel and a gift fo-tiled and granted by God. (2) Wellh.

rule and to be a king in the sense of the heathen nations surrounding them on all sides.(1) In this conception of Saul later Jewish tradition is eminently unfair, for Saul and David together first made of the scattered Hebrew tribes a real people in a practical sense. Indeed

15. David, king par excellence.

Indeed in later generations David is inseparable from the idea of Israel. He is the king par excellence, while Saul is thrown far in the shady background. Both together are, however, the founders of the kingdom and they have, therefore, much wider importance than their successors. They drew the life of the people together at the center and gave it an aim. To

(1) Cheyne 7. (-)

them the nation is indebted for its self-consciousness. All later order was built up on the anomaly and out of it grew all the other institutions.[1]

16. Cause for David's popularity.

David carried on the work which Saul had started but left far from complete.[2] He placed the kingdom on a firm basis and realized more nearly than any one else the true theocracy. He was a king after Jahwe's own heart and left an undying impress on Israel's heart. In the future hope of Israel, he occupies the first place, as we shall later see. This is so not because he broke the Philistine yoke, united ~~the people~~ for the first time

(1) Wellhausen 4/13 (2) J. E. Vol IV p. 452.

the entire people under his sceptre, considerably extended the boundaries of Israel and protected them against their enemies. Rather is he shrouded in romance, the hero of Israel's song and the starting point for the prophetic hope of the Millinium, only because he knew how to place his kingdom under Jahwe's rule.(1)

17. David's character.

Nothing could be more favorable to the kingdom than the history of David's reign. He was no saint nor does the Bible, with its nice regard for truth, attempt to paint him as such. He is human and though his faults are presented with no attempt to palliate them,(2) there runs through the entire history a

(1) Betts 7. (2) Smend 57.

note that moved force even his perverse critics to acknowledge that he was moved and guided by a Spirit of genuine piety and a remarkable faith in Jahve.(1)

18. Relation of the king to Jahve.

The day that saw the ark placed upon Zion's hill amidst great rejoicing(2) was indeed an important one. For from that time forth, Israel's king dwellt, as it were, under one roof with Jahve. In the eyes of all Israel he became Jahwe's guest (13) and no one could approach Zion without taking in at a glance the kings palace and Jahwe's abode.(3)

(1) Jewish Encyc. Vol. IV p. 458. (2) II Sam. 6. (3) Ps. 8.

„Durch seine persönliche Beziehung
und durch sein menschenfreundliches Verhalten
gleichlicher Umstände" says Sarnow,

19. David a child of fortune.

It has been said that David was a child of fortune, that through a chain of fortunate circumstances he became a mighty king.[1] It is true as Smend further remarks,[1] that David was a brave and decisive warrior and a clever politician, who by his persistent victories over the Philistines won the tribes over. It is true that he was a noble and sympathetic man and remained so through a life which led him into the midst of all the troubles of his time. He could recognize his own sins and repent them,[2] as he could magnanimously forgive his enemies. This latter is shown by his remarkable attitude towards his deadliest opponent Saul.

(1) Smend 56 + 62. (2) II Samuel 12 1-15.

20. David's subservience to Jahve.

It is not this for which he stands so high. That which had most weight with the prophets and which gave him his lofty position in their writings was that he was the chosen of Jahve,[1] the עבד יהוה,[2] He himself recognizes his utter dependence he moved only be Jahve's servant,[3] he undertakes nothing without consulting Jahve's oracle[4] and listens willingly to prophetic warning.[5] He leads in Jahve's wars at the head of Jahve's troops and even hears his celestial leader roaring audibly and announcing victory in the trees above him.[6]

---

(1) Cheth. 8. (2) II S. 19[22] See also I S. 24[11], 26[9], II S. 1[14] where the same term is applied to Saul. (3) II S. 7[18-29]
(4) II S. 5[19-23] etc (5) 2. Sam. 7[14 ff.]
(6) 2 Sam. 5[24]

21. Importance of the kingdom to the theocracy

By placing the kingdom on a firm basis David brought about "the kingship of Jahve in that precise sense which we associate with it", that is the true theocracy, a kingdom which was considered a divine institution, the highest gift of God to man. We may safely say that if the kingdom had not succeeded, the idea of the theocracy in the sense that Josephus defines it would never have come into existence.(2) Nor would the religion of Israel, as represented in the Bible have attained its high point of development. Indeed the kingdom gave Israel its basic significance, which from the unfavorable point of view, is generally too little considered

(1) Wellhausen 414 (2) See below page 69

22. The Kingdom and the development of the religion of Israel.

In regard to religion the kingdom gained the greatest results.[1] The religion of Jahve, Israel's Volk-God could never have survived if the Canaanites had not been held in check. By unifying the various tribes the kingdom made possible the victory over their neighbors, thereby insuring comparative peace and tranquility, an absolute essential to religious and intellectual advancement. Judged by this standard all the strivings of the first kings were for the good of Jahve worship.[2] Such passages for example as I S. 28[3-9], I Kings 15[12f], 22[47] would show what the kingdom

(1) Cf Stade p. 62f. (2) Budde P. 19. Cf also Stade P 62f.

accomplished for the purification of the religion.(1)

Stade enumerates under six heads the advantages that accrued to the religion of Israel from the establishment of the kingdom. They sum up so well the preceding paragraph that even at the risk of repeating what has already been set down I place them here. They are as follows. (a) By unifying the tribes it emphasized the Jahve-cult and made it stronger than any other. (b) It gave a new bond of union to the spiritual and therefore to the religious life of the people. (c) It gave a national character to what had heretofore been mere local usage and by unifying the various cults drew the people near-

er

(1) Stade B. 62 Cf. also Smend 68.

er to Yahve. (d) It centralized the cult and made possible laws to regulate it by securing a capital city and a temple. (e) It gave a higher ethical value to the religion and finally (f) through it the Messianic hope had its rise.[1]

In the end, says Budde, it must be acknowledged that with the establishment of the human kingship, the theocracy, or the unconditional and absolute control by God is sanctioned the Kingdom is מדינה הגוי and opposed to Yahve, only in ~~that~~ the sense that it forces itself into His dominion. Once established it can hope for Yahve's favor only as long as its subjects itself to His will revealed through His messengers.[2]

(1) Stade 62 f. (2) Budde P. 9.

Let us now turn to those messengers, the great prophets of Israel, the bearers of Israel's tradition and in a large sense, the moulders of Jewish thought and Jewish religion. Let us see what attitude they adopted towards the kingdom as such.

Chapter II
Pre-exilic Prophecy and the Kingdom

Chapter II.

Pre-exilic Prophecy and the Kingdom.

1. Jahwe's rule of the kingdom.

It is a mistake to suppose that the prophets were opposed to the kingdom as an institution. They recognized that without some human rule the nation was impossible. Indeed the kingdom was to be under Jahwe's direct rule, and any attempt to free it from this, was to threaten its very existence. The idea that had brought Israel into existence and kept it together was Jahwe's rule of all institutions, the kingdom included.(1)

2. The kingdom established by aid of the prophets.

It is safe to believe that the kingdom was established with the aid of

(1) Bettle P. 13.

the prophets, the immediate organs of Jahve. According to one account we have seen, that the first king was chosen, anointed and prepared for his great work by a prophet[1] Saul for his disobedience is removed by God[2] and David is consecrated king in his place, through the command of God, delivered to his mouthpiece Samuel.[3]

3 Elijah and Elishah oppose Ahab.

Elijah is sent by God to anoint Jehu King over Israel,[4] and though it appears that both Elijah and his disciple Elishah were opposed to the kingdom in their contest with Ahab and his house, this must be taken as opposition to the abuse of the institu-

(1) See above P. 2 f. (2) I Samuel 16.
(3) I Samuel 16 1-3. 12. 13 (4) I Kings 19 16

tion, and not against the institution itself.[1] It is, however, possible that this opposition gave the first impetus to the later view, which saw in the kingdom a distinct break with the past.

4. Jahve and Israel related by a moral bond.

Such prophets as Elijah and Amos, only when the national existence was threatened by Syrian and Assyrian inroads, raise Jahve high above the people, sever the natural bond, which had existed between Jahve and Israel since the time of Moses, and put in its place a relation depending upon conditions of a moral character. To them Jahve was first a God of righteousness and then the God of Israel.[2]

---

(1) Budde, Page 15. 2. Wellhausen P. 417

5. Hosea's opposition to the Kingdom.

Most of the critics are agreed that, with Hosea the idea of opposition to the kingdom as irreconcilable with the sovereignty of Jahve, began.[1] He had good reason to reject the kingdom on account of the circumstances of his time.[2] It had become the football for endless strife. He lived in a period of anarchy and saw king after king fall by the assassin's hand. No king was able to restore order. Hosea saw the real ground of anarchy in the godlessness which would not be satisfied with Jahve's rule.[3]

---

(1) Condemnation of the kingdom as in principle irreconcilable with the sovereignty of God, the divine King seems to date from the last age of Israel's years of anarchy between the death of Jeroboam II and the fall of Samaria. It first appears in Hosea in Sellin's history of Israel p. 130

(2) H.R. Smith. P. 184

(3) Smend 209.

6. New kings will not avail.

Equally godless does he consider the way out viz.. raising up a new King. Jahve has destroyed all Israel's kings, so they might call alone to Him for help, but instead of this they give themselves over anew to the way which leads to destruction. "All of their kings are fallen but not one of them calls on me."(1) Early Israel had of its own accord sought the kingdom and early Israel saw in the King with grateful pride and joy a God-given head, a leader and a guide. According to Hosea he is the result of over-confidence and faithlessness on the part of Israel. "Where now is your king! Let him help you! — And all your princes! Let them find you help! Since you said, 'Give me a

(1) Hosea 7 7

king and princes!' I give thee a king in my anger and take him away in my wrath." (1)

7. The founding of the kingdom was in itself a sin.

In 3^4 he puts together not things, some of which are pleasing to Jahve others displeasing, but things which are all displeasing. They shall be for.

---

(1) Hosea $13^{10.11}$ after an emended text quoted by Smend (209) Cf. also Hos. 8^4, $10^{3.5}$. Budde (P. 16.) quoting Hosea $1\,3^{4.6.16.11}$ & citing 3^4, 5^{10}, 6^4, 8^{2-4}, 10^2 says that here we have the undoubted source of I S. 8. Marti (P. 167) says that I S. 8 which sees in the kingdom a falling away from Jahve (V 7) speaks from the view-point of the exile, which was looked on as a result of the kings' wickedness, and can not therefore be taken as the true view of the prophet. Smend (65) makes I S. 8. post-exilic.

If one considers these passages as genuine one must logically hold that Arsa was not opposed to the kingship on principle.

a long time without king and without prince, without sacrifice and without מצבה, without Ephod and therapim.[1] Since the day of Gibeah Israel has sinned i.e since the day of Saul, since the founding of the kingdom which in itself was a sin.[2]

8. Favorable to northern kingdom.

Hosea has in mind the northern kingdom in which he lived.[3] He speaks with favor of David and the king of Judah. He sees the two kingdoms joined at the time of healing, giving themselves a head and returning to Jahve their God and to David their king. In this he agrees with Amos who says Jahve will again restore the Davidian dynasty.[3]

(1) Hos. 3.4 (2) Hos. 9.9 10.9 (3) Amos 9.9.11 Hos. 2.2

cf. Wallis's writings in
Klein Projekt. p. 29
from where you may see that Wallis
held towards the same view as Mercator

9. the critics disagree.

It is interesting to note here how the critics disagree on such important points as this. Hosea, says Wellhausen[1] appears to have regarded the kingdom as such as an evil. In this respect he agrees with most of the critics, as has already been stated. Marti, on the other hand, more conservative in his view, ~~says~~ takes the same passages, on which the Wellhausen school base ~~his~~ theory, and produces results of a directly opposite nature. Hosea,

---

35 these passages Oettli (15) seems to consider genuine, as does W. R. Smith (P & J. pp. 185 ff & p. 137. Wellhausen however (F.N 404) considers all such passages in Amos and Hosea as interpolations, as do a majority of the critics.

(1) Wellhausen 414.

10. Marti on Hosea.

Hosea, he says is one with the people in the opinion that the kingdom is the highest gift of Jahve, but just as in the case ~~with~~ of the law and the cult, Jahve must not be pushed to the back ground. When in 34 he places together the most prized institutions the people possess, he simply means to show that, because they have abused their privileges, they will be denied these for some time. He does not then reject the kingdom as such, but he castigates the abuse of it, which he was unfortunate enough to be compelled to witness,(1) not the kingdom itself but the kingdom which forgets Jahve.(2)

11. Jahve's anger at abuse.

(1) Marti P. 167. (2) Ibid p. 168

Such were conditions in Israel. They had forgotten that Jahve was the real king with the human king as His vicegerent. Of their own accord have they set up kings, without waiting for God's choice, as was the case in earlier days, when Saul and David were anointed by Jahve's express command.[1] No one thinks in all this anarchy to look to Jahve, but only to their kings and their political organization.[2] Because of this Jahve will take care that they should recognize of how little avail their king is without His help. They say we have no king because we have not feared Jahve.[3] On the day of destruction Jahve will show the helplessness of the kings who have not earned His favor.[4]

(1) Cf. Hosea 8[4]. (2) Hosea 7[3-16]
(3) Hosea 10[3] (4) Hosea 13[9-14]

but were conditions in Israel that
forgotten the Jubilee year. The real
thing with the Lord was to keep
prepared. Of their own accord they
they gave up things, without waiting
for this Jubilee, as were the case in
this day, individual and family
[illegible] Johns sermon
"Moses Christ to all
the same of Israel to Judah, but
only to this King and Christ alone
[illegible] Because of this Jubilee
will take care that they should come
into of their lives. If this King is
[illegible] it is. He is everyone there
[illegible]

who merely sums up the work of others

[illegible]

12. Marti's summary.

It may be seen here how the prophets recognize only the authority of Jahve. But just as the Thorah is not responsible for the misuse to which it is put and is castigated therefor, so too the institution of Kingdom must bear the sin to which it has been subjected, by those privileged to rule and to guide it.[1]

13. Latitude in discussing biblical religion.

To reconcile the above two views is entirely impossible. They are placed here, side by side, merely to show what latitude one has in discussing biblical religion.

14. Isaiah and the Kingdom.

When we turn to Isaiah we find

(1) Marti 168.

no such contradiction among the critics. For Isaiah leaves no doubt upon his attitude toward the kingdom as does Hosea. He expresses in unmistakable terms his firm conviction that the future Israel will have a kingdom as before. The first feature in his prophecy is the expulsion of the Baal-ians.(1) But considerable emphasis is laid upon the restoration of the inner basis of the state, the rottenness of which has inevitably brought about ruin. The collapse of the government, the spoliation of the weak by the strong, the scandals which has fallen upon the law, all call for redress. But in the end says Jahve, through His messenger, the prophet, "I will restore your judges as at first and your counsellors at

(1) Wellhausen 415

the beginning, afterwards will they name you City of Righteousness, the faithful community."(1)

15. Messiah in the Bible.

To give a complete exposition of Isaiah's conception of the Kingdom, we must say a word, in regard to one of the noblest ideals which found its source in the Kingdom viz., the Messianic ideal.(2) The name Messiah is never used in the Bible, in its later sense.(3) It is never משיח standing alone, but always משיח יהוה, that is, not "the Messiah," but "Jahves anointed one."(4) two terms which are far different, the first being a purely

---

(1) Isaiah I 21-27 (2) See above P. 22. (3) W. R. Smith Pof J. P. 302 (4) משיח occurs only in Leviticus 4 3.5.16 6 22 in regard to the "anointed priest." See Encyclopedia Biblica Vol. Article Messiah

theological term, meaning the Messianic King, the latter, the name applied to every king of Israel.[1]

16. The ideal King.

Isaiah gave the ideal kingdom its classical form in those passages which we are accustomed to call Messianic. They are not predictions of this or that occurrence but announcements of the aims, which it is true the prophet expects only the future to realize, but which should also be a force in the present, towards which Israel should ever strive.[2] His picture of the ideal king came at a time when he who then occupied the throne little resembled the portrait as presented by the prophet.[3]

(1) I Sam. 2[10.35] 12[3.5] 16[6] 26[9.11.16.23] II S. 1[14.16] 19[21] etc. See Hamburger, Real Encyclopädie III [745]

(2) Wellhausen 414. (3) Duhm 17.

Speaking of their present rulers he calls them children and women, mis-leaders of the people.[1] How much more brilliant by contrast is the picture of the ideal king. He will be called "Wonderful Counselor," "Godlike Hero", "Constant Father", "Prince of Peace".[2] This ideal king will belong to the "House of Jesse". On ~~him~~ God's spirit will rest and he will rule in the fear of Jahve, judging righteously.[3]

17. Character of Isaiah's Kingdom.

Cattle says this Kingdom as conceived by Isaiah is spiritual and not political.[4] Wellhausen, on the other hand, asserts that the task was political in nature. The state was always the national state as it existed,

(1) Is. 3 12. (2) Is 9 5. (3) Is. 11 1-5 (4) Cattle 17

never one distinguished by a peculiar holiness in its organization. The kingdom of Jahve is entirely identical with the kingdom of David. Isaiah is unconscious of any difference between human law and divine law, for the law in itself is divine, having behind it the authority of the Holy One of Israel.[1] "On that day shall Jahve Zebaoth be a crown of glory and a diadem of beauty to those that remain of His people, and a spirit of judgement to him who sits in judgement."[2]

18. Isaiah's view of the Messianic time

We sometimes think of the days of the Messiah as an entirely new and in some way miraculous event. This was not in any sense Isaiah's view.[3]

(1) Wellhausen 414. (2) Is 28 5-6. (3) W.R. Smith (P.I.) 303

To him Israel's restoration meant, not the commencement but merely the continuation of Jahve's personal sovereignty over His people. But the human kingship will not then cease, for its ruler is Jahves representative.[1] Our earthly ruler in no way interferes with the kingship of Jahve. Even the glorious kingdom of the future cannot dispense with him. "Then a King will reign in righteousness."[2] Those that survive the Assyrian trouble will see the King in all his glory.[3]

19. Cause of Isaiah's ideal picture.

This is sufficient to show us that Isaiah took an altogether favorable view of the kingdom, recognizing that it was an integral part of the theocracy.

---

(1) Deut. 18. (2) Isaiah 32 1a.
(3) Isaiah 33 17

Loss of confidence in the reigning kings who were as a rule unsatisfactory, alone, gave rise to his hopes for the ideal man, who should one day come, divinely sent, to rule over Jahwe's people. The virtues with which he adorns this ideal future king, as seen in Chapter XI show sufficiently well what his notion of the true theocracy was.[1]

20. Micah

The other prophets of this period agree with Isaiah. Micha, his younger contemporary envisaged the king in Jerusalem shall cry out in terror since the king is gone and shall suffer because of his loss.[2] His future hope too.

(1) Cf. W. R. Smith P. of J. 303-305. (2) Oettli 19.
(3) Micha IV 9. This is the interpretation given the verse by Oettli. Others, however, say that the

includes the restoration of the Davidic dynasty.[1]

21. Jeremiah

Jeremiah has no detailed account of the future kingdom, nor has he much to say in regard to the Davidian king, except incidentally, but what little he does express is of great significance.[2] His future hope in general agrees in all essentials with that of Isaiah.[3] The Messiah will be of Davidian stock or as he puts it, "a righteous sprout of David," who will rule justly. Under him Israel and Judah, reunited will live in safety and his name will be יהוה צדקנו, Jahve our Justifier.[4] This same name, how-

~~the word "Jahve" as the name of the kingdom, should refer to Jahve.~~

(1) Micha 4[8]. (2) Pettit P. 20.
(3) Jewish Encyc. VIII 506.
(4) Jeremiah 23 5-6.

ever, occurring in a later chapter is applied to Jerusalem.[1] In the verse following this Jeremiah says that there shall never fail a descendant of David to sit upon the throne.[2] And when the days of the exile are accomplished, those, who return to the land of Israel, will serve Jahve their God and David their king.[3]

22. Important testimony of Lamentations.

Finally we may see from Lamentations, how deep was the regard felt for the kingdom. In the very hour of ruin, though, their king was by no means the ideal, his loss signified the destruction of their entire organization.[4]

---

(1) Jer. 33[16]. Some critics think this verse did not originate with Jeremiah. See J. E. VIII 506. Cornill (20) seems to consider it genuine. (2) Jer. 33[17]

(3) Jer. 30[9]. (4) Lamentations 4[20].

Chapter III.
Exilic and Post-exilic view.

Chapter III.

Exilic and Post-exilic Views.

1. Hope of a universal world power.

Destruction overtook the commonwealth. The people were led away into exile. And now the religious hopes were no longer limited to existing political conditions. They became tinged with enthusiasm and cast off all restrictions. Prior to this the hope had been centred in the national state as it had existed under David. In its place there was now built up in imagination a universal world power, which was to arise in Jerusalem over the ruins of the heathen powers. Prophecy was no longer bound by history nor supported by it.[1]

(1) Cf. Wellhausen Page 419.

2. the necessity for uniting the remnant.

In former times the nation had not been so seriously threatened that, in spite of its dangerous crises, a view should ever arise, that its continual existence was anything but natural. Now, however, the tables had been turned and things certainly took on a new phase. There was danger that, even as the Samaritan exiles had been assimilated by the heathen among whom they dwelt, so would the Jewish exiles under Babylonian rule. In order, therefore, to keep alive the Messianic hope, which would, of necessity, perish with its professors, it was imperative to unite and to solidify the few who still remained.[1]

(1) Wellhausen Page 420.

3. Ezekiel's attitude toward the kingdom.

Ezekiel has two distinct views in regard to the kingdom, which seem to contradict each other.[1] As soon as he heard the news of the destruction he changed from his scolding messages to comforting ones. Occupying the centre of the picture stands the shepherd whom God will give to His reunited people. "Then will I make them one nation in my land upon the mountains of Israel and they shall have one king, and be no more two nations, neither shall they any more be divided into two kingdoms. And my servant David shall be king over the reunited nation.[2] There is no reason for doubting that Ezekiel expected the reinstitution of the Davidian dynasty, a human kingship under

(1) Budde 23. (2) Cf. Ezek. 37 22.24.

Write 1st part of the novel?

the guidance of God.[1] He places at the head of the future Israel a national prince, in whom the Davidian dynasty shall revive.[2]

4. Ezekiel's later view.

Later, however, his view changed. When after fifteen years he wrote down his prophecies concerning the restoration little remained about the kingdom.[3] ~~the~~ rule of this shadowy kingdom is נשיא and not מלך, prince and not king.[4] His duties are very narrow in comparison with those of former kings.[5] He supplies the priests with the great sin-offerings.[6] He has a stipulated income from the people which goes to sup-

(1) Bertholet P. 21. (2) Ezek. 17 ff. 21[32] (Cf. Smend P. 336). (3) Budde 24. (4) מלך only in 34[24], 37[22], 24 (Cf. 17[12]) (5) Benzinger 315. (6) Ezek. 45[19].

for the cult.[1] He dare not force other sums from the people, being allowed a certain fixed amount for his personal use.[2] Even in regard to laws and the administration of justice he will be superseded by the priests.[3] So we see that such a king would hardly fit into the category of an ordinary kingdom either as despot or as ruler.[4]

5. Ezekiel's peculiar merit.

Around the ruined sanctuary the community once more raised its head. Ezekiel first pointed the way suited for the time. He is the connecting link between the prophets and the law. He claims to be a prophet and starts from prophetic ideas. They are not, however, his ideas, but those of his predecessors which he

(1) Ezek. 45 9-15 (2) Ibid. 45 7-8 (3) Ib. 44 24. (4) Bertholet 21

turns into dogmas. His peculiar merit lay in the fact that he enclosed the soul of prophecy in the body of a community which was not political but was founded on the temple and the cult.[1]

6. Deutero-Isaiah.

Deutero-Isaiah, the great prophet of the exile greets Cyrus as the Messiah.[2] David's greatness according to him lies in the past and not at all in the future. Jahve had, at one time, set him up as a prince and a ruler of nations, but this high calling now passes over to Israel, who will be the witness of Jahve in the world and the head of many nations. All this however is due to the merit of David,[3] which would go far to show that this prophet was not an enemy of

(1) Cf. Wellhausen 421. (2) Is. 45[1] (3) Is. 55[3] f.

the kingdom.

7. "The servant of the Lord."

Some critics are inclined to believe that, in his future hope the personal Messiah, and consequently the King, has not at all appeared. "Israel and not an individual is 'the servant of the Lord'."(1) On the other hand, it must be stated that, there are many who maintain that in these "servant of the Lord" passages he refers to an individual rather than to the bulk of Israel.(2)

8. The return from the exile.

The return from the exile represented no reestablishment of the nation or the state. It was merely a religious.

---

(1) Is. 42^{1-6}, 49^{1-6}, 50^{4-9}, 52^{13}, 53^{12}. Cf. J.E. VII 507. (2) This is still a disputed point, the literature on the subject being very large. For a discussion of problem see J.E. II 204

community. The Jews remained quiet under Persian rule without attempting to restore the kingdom.[1] Their hope, however did not die. Even though they were under Persian rule when Zerubbabel stood at the head of the community the old longing for an independent kingdom revived. The glorious pictures drawn on the canvas of imagination by the exilic prophets and the actual beginning of the restoration stand in well defined and bitter contrast.[2] There was now hope for a speedy revolution of affairs. A member of the Davidian house will be in the hand or breast of Jahve like a costly jewel, lovingly guarded and preserved, not alone to survive all catastrophes, but also to be a sign and an instrument of Jahwe's rule on earth.[3]

(1) Benzinger 316. (2) Oettli 22 (3) Haggai 2 20 ff.

9. Haggai and Zechariah.

Both Haggai and Zechariah thought they saw in Zerubbabel the Messianic ruler,[1] not alone because he was a descendant of David, but also because he was the Persian governor.[2] Zechariah received word from God that he should build a throne and place Zerubbabel thereon.[3] To him the restablishment of the priesthood in the new temple was a sign that Jahve would soon bring his servant "sprout."[4]

---

(1) H. R. Smith Old Testament History 357.
(2) Bengiger. 318. (3) Zech. 6 9ff. On this passage Smend (F.N. p. 335) says that, Wellhausen, unlike Ewald, considers it to refer only to the crowning of Zerubbabel, and not to both Zerubbabel and Joshua. Later hands put Joshua in place of Zerubbabel because priestly rule was affirmed. See also Smith O. T. H. 357 FN.[3] (4)
(4) Zech 3 8 כי הנני מביא את עבדי צמח

the obscure words in an uncertain text seem to point to someone who shall arise in the future after Zerubbabel, firmly establish the community and rule not as a representative of ~~the~~ a foreign power but as an independent ruler, uniting in himself the priesthood and the kingship.[1] This was already foretold by Jeremiah,[2] on ~~which~~ whom Zechariah seems to base his entire Messianic hope.[3]

10. Zerubbabel the Messiah?

There is no foundation for the opinion that Zerubbabel wished to play the part of the Messiah in earnest and was consequently ruined. Even if in the beginning he had been looked upon as such, ~~this~~ idea would have soon

(1) Oettli (23) interprets Zech. 6 10 ff. in this way. See footnote 3. above P. 52. (2) ~~Jer.~~ 30 21 (3) Oettli 23

lost ground when it was seen how useless would be any rebellion against the great Persian monarch. Under Persian rule they remained. The only change was one of rulers, whose Satraps oppressed the people sorely.(1)

11. Ezra and Nehemiah.

Ezra was very bitter because Israel was compelled to be subject to the heathen in the very land which God had given to their fathers.(2) On the contrary the statesman Nehemiah ~~who~~ worked for the sober and only too sad reality. There is no longer a people Israel, only a God serving community under Persian rule. That many advantages accrue from their religion and that they are held together for a better future is, of course the purpose.(1) The national goal

(1) Oettli: P. 3 (2) Ezra 9:1-9.

must not be shown to the people even from afar, that they might not demand the remaining portion of the land they had once occupied. Nehemiah at once a pious Jew and the Persian Governor could not allow them even to think of a King.[1]

12. The King of the future.

It is a matter of no little significance that, in the midst of all their bitter disappointments and severe trials, the picture of a divinely sent King did not entirely disappear. From this fact alone it can readily be seen what a strong hold the idea had taken upon the hearts and minds of the people.[2] In accordance with the prophecies of an certain authorship taught with Zechariah,[2] at the final attack of the nations the House of David will be at the head.

(1) Budde 26 f. (2) H.P. Smith O.T.H. f.n. 1 p349

of Jerusalem like Jahve's angel. Not a spirit of kingly power but one of grace and of favor will be poured out over him and a fountain to purify him from his sins will be placed there.(1) The king whom the daughter of Zion will joyfully greet shows himself master from sea to sea, but he comes into his city as a sufferer whom Jahve helps, not on a proud war horse, but on a meek mule.(2)

13. Post-exilic prophets favorable to the idea of the human kingship.

The post-exilic prophets, who rise to the highest thought, that the Messianic era will unite mankind as the worshippers of the one God,(3) seek to strengthen

(1) Zech 12. 8'0. 13'. (2) Zech 9 9f. Notes 1 & 2 are adapted from Gelli (24). Many critics now say that the coming on a mule was in the orient a sign of royal dignity. (3) Margolis P. 279 Zech 14 9 and

on the despondent Jewish community by the prediction of the speedy advent of the Messianic era.[1] And since the kernel of the Messianic idea is the completion of Jahve's rule on earth, through a human organ, a king out of David's house standing in awe before Jahve, chosen by Him and spiritually anointed to establish a rule of peace and right, which from Israel shall include all peoples[2], it must be conceded that these prophets present a favorable attitude toward the kingdom as an institution. Otherwise they could not have formed a place for the human king in their hopes and dreams for an ideal future.

Jahve shall be king over the whole earth; on that day Jahve shall be one, and His name one."

(1) Morgenstern. 278. (2) Zeitschr. 25.

14. The eternal value of the kingdom.

Israel had experienced the richly blessed rule and the mighty protection of its invisible king, Jahve, especially in the personal kingdom of David, that prophecy recognized the God-chosen characteristics, the ever-abiding value of the institution and promised eternal existence to the throne of David.(1) Thus Nathan, the prophet, denies David the right to build "God's House", saying that the Lord would prefer his descendants to perform this work, he promises that Jahve will never withdraw His favor from the Davidian line and that his throne shall endure for all time (2) Henceforth who-ever sits on David's throne is called the son of Jahve, occupying the honor place of the world;(3) the throne representative of

(1) Budde 28. (2) II Sam. 7 14ff. (3) Ps 2 6. 7 110 1

Jahweh's own rule over Israel, indeed on Jahweh's very throne itself.(1)

15. High estimate of David's rule.

Israel's high position, right rule from within and protection against outside enemies may be considered only in connection with David's rule, Oettli thinks.(2) The glory of David's kingship, completed in Solomon's brilliant reign is reflected in the expression inserted by a later hand,(3)

"One ruling over men, a righteous man,
Ruling in the fear of God;
Like the light of the morning shall he rise,
The sun of a cloudless morn,
Making the green earth brilliant after rain."(4)

Psalm 72[6] may also be said to reflect

(1) I Chron. 28[5], 29[23]. (2) P. 9. (3) H. P. Smith Samuel P 281 from whom also the translation is taken. (4) 2 S. 23[3-4].

this reign. Some hundred years later the memory of this truly brilliant rule gave cause to idealize a really discreditable kingdom. There must through Proverbs an optimistic note in regard to the kingdom which can hardly be justified by the conjectured date.[1] "The lips of the king are an oracle, in judgement his mouth transgresses not."[2] Toy rightly remarks[3] that it is "the ideal king whose character is here sketched."

(1) Oettli 10. (2) Proverbs 16[10] See also Prov 19[12], 20[8]. (3) Proverbs. I.C.C. 223.

Chapter IV
The Pentateuch and the Kingdom

Chapter IV.

The Pentateuch or Kingdom.

1. Difficulty here.

We have reserved the discussion of the Pentateuch for the final chapter because after all it probably represents the ideal. Perhaps the most difficult part of our task is before us, to establish the attitude of the Pentateuch toward the kingdom. When between verse and verse "centuries may yawn," when we are told that we have here a composite representing hundreds of years of development, it is no easy matter to place the pieces in time. Nor does it matter much, for our purpose whether we do this or not, inasmuch as we seek not so much the period in which a certain attitude arose, as we do the character of that attitude itself.

2. Kings descendants of the Patriarchs.

There is one more important testimony for the high estimate of the kingdom than the fact that the Pentateuch, which otherwise is silent in regard to the Messianic hope, makes the kings descendants of the Patriarchs.[1] Jahve promises Abraham "---- I will make nations of thee and kings shall come forth from thee;"[2] and in reference to Sarah He says, "I will bless her ---- and kings of people shall be descended from her,"[3] and finally thus He speaks to Jacob "---- a nation ---- shall arise from thee and kings shall come out of thy loins."[4][5]

---

(1) Ibid. 10. (2) ~~Smend~~ Genesis 17[6]. (3) Ibid 17[16]. (4) Ibid 35[11]. (5) In regard to the verses above cited Smend (F.N. p. 336) says, "In the friendly code the view of the king who shall arise from the Patriarchs has the view of the Messiah.

3. Moses, the founder of the political organization.

Moses was not only a war leader but a statesman and the founder of the political organization which represents no break with the past. A retrospective glance shows that the political organization which found its ultimate point of development in the kingdom was looked upon as a gracious gift from Jahve.[1]

4. High estimate of the kingdom.

The earlier account of Israel's history with which we are now dealing did not consider the kingdom as a backsliding from Jahve, as Sam.[2] would have us believe. Moral and kingdom are paralleled as of like importance.[3] As long as God is with Israel

(1) Matt. 9 2. (2) See above p. 5 (3) Deut. 33 4-5.

and the shout of a king in his midst there will be no trouble.[1] Indeed the blessings of Jacob, Bileam and Moses, each culminate in the views that the kingdom will bring to Israel great strength and power.[2]

5. The King sacrosanct.

To curse the king is considered as great a crime as to curse God himself[3] inasmuch as the king is מלאך אלהים and therefore sacrosanct.[4] In either case the punishment to be meted out was death by stoning.[5]

---

(1) Numbers 23 21. (2) Budde 26. (3) Exod. 22 27. (4) Cf. I Sam. 26 9 where it appeared to David blasphemy to lay his hand on Saul, also I S. 24 6 where David's conscience smote him for taking even a lock of Saul's garment. (5) Lev. 24 11.15 Cf also II Sam. 16 9. 19 22 I Kings 28 f. 21 10. I give these citations on the authority of Erik Mahi (93)

6. Relationship of the King to Jahve.

The King stands in very close relationship with Jahve. He is the נזיר or consecrated King.(1) Accordingly the hum-

---

and Smend (67). However I am not at all convinced that we have the right to make such a sweeping conclusion from the premises offered. In Sam. 24[11-15] no mention is made of the King. In the Naboth passage just because it says, "He hath cursed God and the King", would hardly prove that if he had cursed the King alone, he would then too have been stoned. (1). Gen. 49[26]. Deut. 33[16]. This is Smend's interpretation of the verse, with which Marti seems to agree. Driver (Deut. 33[16] also Gen. 49[26]) has the following to say: "נזיר אחיו literally either "the separate one (נזיר) of his brethren" i.e. either distinguished by wealth and influence from others or actually a prince among them. In either case a title of distinction implying superiority over others and reflecting affluence, dignity and power

an rule did not stand in the way of the divine rule, for under the kingship of man the reign of God broadened. The man was merely Jahweh's representative.

7. The "Law of the Kingdom".

The great passage in regard to the kingdom, however, we find in the so-called "Law of the Kingdom" in Deuteronomy.(1) It makes Moses tell of the pitfalls which are the inevitable accompaniment of a human kingship. Israel is not to be a world power, but a kingdom under a human hand, controlled and guided by Jahweh's law. Line by line it reproduces the features of the court of Solomon.(2)

---

which in its flourishing days, belonged in a preeminent degree to the double tribe of Joseph. (Deuteronomy I.C.C. 407) (1) Deut. 17 14-20.
(2) W. R. Smith. Old Testament in the Jewish Church. 298.

the king of the future should not have too many horses, which may lead him back to Egypt, nor too many wives, who may drag him into idolatry, nor too much money heaped up. This law evidently describes what a king of Israel must not be.

8. Not adverse to the kingdom.

But this is less a law than it is a warning.(1) Nor has it been satisfactorily proved that it is adverse to the kingdom as such. It seems merely to warn against the abuse of an institution, which God himself gives permission to establish. "When you come into the land ---- and say, 'I will set a king over me' ---- then shalt thou surely appoint him king over thee, whom Jahve, thy God, shall choose." This introduction

(1) Budde 22

to the law seems to furnish proof sufficient that its author did not consider the foundation of the kingdom as impious and as an act of high treason against the divine order.

9. Date of authorship immaterial.

Nor does it matter whether this is the work of Moses,[1] or whether it did not come into existence till the reformation of "King Josiah in 621", as Budde and others maintain;[2] whether it is an offshoot of I Samuel 8 or vice-versa. The fact still remains. It represents an attitude toward the kingdom albeit

---

(1) Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (87 f) says that because the law of kingdom is colored by reminiscences of the monarchy of Solomon, it does not deny that Moses may have made provision for the establishment of a monarchy in Israel. Cf. Ibid p. 92.

(2) Budde 21

a doubtful one.

10. The Pentateuch and the theocracy.

We turn now to a brief discussion of the Pentateuch and the theocracy. Did Moses plan the theocracy as Josephus who coined the term would have us believe? "There are innumerable differences," he says, "Between the particular customs and laws that are among mankind; some have intrusted the power of their states to monarchies, some to oligarchies and some to democracies, but our legislator had no regard for any of these forms, but he ordained our government to be what I may call by a strained expression a theocracy, (θεοκρατία) attributing the power and the authority to God.[1]

---

1) Contra Apionem ii 17 Rudolph Hellmann FN. 411

11. Wellhausen's comment.

Wellhausen says that when Josephus mentions the Mosaic code he has in mind the sacred community of his own day as it existed in 70 of the common era. The rule of Jahve is here an ideal representation which, it was attempted to realize only after the exile in the "Rule of the Holy" with outward means.(1)

13. State must come before "church".

It needed the state, a highly centralized government to bring about such a sacred constitution of the congregation as described in the Priestly Code. It was the chief task of the age of Moses to produce a state, in the absence of which the "church" could scarcely have existed.(2)

(1) Wellhausen 411. (2) Wellhausen 412. W. R.

14. Development of the state.

The state itself arose from very natural beginnings as does any state. In times of war an individual leader as indispensable; in prolonged danger, the temporary authority of an effective leader easily passes into lifelong leadership at home, as well as in the field. Such was the experience

---

Smith, P. of I. (52 f) seems to contradict this. He says, "the theocracy presents, precisely that feature in the religion of Israel which it had in common with the faiths of other nations. The national God is conceived as the divine king and often invoked by that name. The difference between the religion of Israel and of others is great. It lies in the personal difference between Jahve and other gods. Jahve could not have carried the faith with him had he come with a whole set of revolutionary ideas

of Gideon. At length the advantage of having a permanent head as leader of the army and as a restraint on perennial feuds and jealousies of the clans, which constantly threaten the solidity of the state, are recognized in the institution of the kingship, which as in the case of David, becomes hereditary because the family is rich and powerful.[1]

15. Monotheism a consequence of the alliance of religion with the monarchy.

The natural tendency of Semitic religions was toward ethical monotheism. This was a result of the alliance of religion with the monarchy.[2] The monotheism of the Hebrew prophets kept

(1) W. R. Smith, Religion of the Semites. 33 f. Cf. page 194 above for a discussion of the growth of other institutions out of the kingdom. (2) Ibid 74

touch with the ideas and institutions of the Semitic race by conceiving one true God as a king of absolute justice, the national God of Israel destined to become the God of all the earth, because of His world-wide power, as well as the fact that He could not fail to draw all nations to Him, because He was a perfect ruler.(1)

16. Jahve, king of the world.

"The Hebrew ideal of the divine kingship that must some day draw all men to do it homage offered better things than others, not in virtue of any feature that it possessed in common with the Semitic religions as a whole but ~~solely~~ through the unique conception of Jahve as a God, whose love

(1) Lo II 2 ff. W. R. Smith R. of S. Page 76

for this people was conditionally a land of absolute righteousness. In other nations individual thinkers rose to lofty conceptions of a supreme deity but in Israel, and in Israel alone, these conceptions were incorporated in the accepted worship of the national God. And so of all the gods of the nations Jahve alone was fitted to become the King of the whole earth."(1)

the emp.

168117

(1) W. R. Smith, Rel. of Sem. Page 81.