

U

UNIVERSALISM AND PARTICULARISM

IN THE PRIESTLY CODE

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO

EZEKIEL AND DEUTERO - ISAIAH.

Thesis By

Maurice N. Eisendrath

Respectfully Submitted As
Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of Rabbi.

Hebrew Union College

May 1926.

Mic. 8/78

FOREWORD

I wish herewith to express my genuine appreciation to Dr. Julian Morgenstern who, despite his manifold duties, has so kindly and generously given me of his time, and whose helpful and thought provoking suggestions are responsible for whatever of originality there may be found in this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	Page
Introduction	1
A. Definition of Terms	1
B. Statement of Problem	5
Chapter One - The Night of Nationalism	8
Moses to Aaron ^{Moses} .	
Chapter Two - Glints of Universalism	22
A. Amos	22
B. Hosea	28
C. Isaiah	32
D. Jeremiah	38
E. Deuteronomy	45
Chapter Three - The Darkest Hour	49
The Exile : Ezekiel	
Chapter Four - The Dawn of Universalism	76
A. Deutero-Isaiah	76
B. The Secondary Yahwist Strata	90
Chapter Five - The Struggle Between Darkness And Light.	98
A. General Literature of Restoration Period	98
B. The Priestly Code	105
Conclusion	134
Notes	136

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS.

A. The Bible.

Commentaries:

In Nowack's "Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament:

Genesis (Gen.) H.Gunkel, Göttingen (1922).
Exodus - Leviticus - Numeri (ELN) Bruno Baentsch
(1903)

Deuteronomium and Josua (DJ) - C.Steuernagel (1900).

In International Critical Commentary:

Genesis (ICCG)	J.Skinner (Scribner's, 1910).
Numbers (ICCN)	G.B.Gray (1903)
Isaiah, Vol. I (ICCI)	G.B.Gray (1912)
Haggai (ICCH)	H.G.Mitchell
Zachariah (ICCZ)	H.G.Mitchell (1912)
Malachi (ICCM)	J.M.P.Smith (1912)

In Cambridge Bible:

Exodus (CBE)	S.R.Driver (Cambridge, 1901).
Leviticus (CBL)	A.T.Chapman and A.W.Streane (1914)
Isaiah XL-LV (CBI)	J.Skinner (1910)
Ezekiel (CBE)	A.B.Davidson (1906)
Jonah (CBJ)	T.T.Perowne (1891)
Ruth (GBR)	G.A.Cooke (1918).

Miscellaneous Commentaries:

Isaiah XL-LV (Is).	George Adam Smith, (Expositors' Bible, Doran and Co., 1912).
Ezekiel (Ez).	C.H.Toy (Polychrome Bible, Dodd, Meade Co., 1899).
Peake's Commentary On The Bible	(Nelson and Sons, London, 1919).

B. General Works

- Carpenter, J.E. and Harford, G. Introduction To The Hexateuch, (Longmans, Green, London, 1902).
- Cheyne, T.K. Introduction To The Book of Isaiah (Introd). (A.C.Black, London, 1895).
- Budde, K. Religion of Israel To The Exile (ROITE) (Putnam's Sons, 1879).
- Buttenwieser, M. Prophets of Israel (POI) (Macmillan, 1914)
- Where Did Deutero-Isaiah Live? (Reprint, Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 38, 1919).
- Notes of Class Lectures.
- Driver, S.R. Introduction to Literature of Old Testament (Int) (Scribner's, 1922)
- Holzinger Einleitung in den Hexateuch (J.C.B. Mohr, Freiburg, 1893).
- Morgenstern, J. Biblical Theophanies (B.Th.) (Zeitschrift fur Assyrologie, Vols. XXV, XXVII - Strassburg, 1911, 1913).
- Book of Genesis (Gen.) Cincinnati, 1919
- Foundations of Israel's History (FOIH) (Reprint CCAR Yearbook, Vol. XXV).
- Moses With The Shining Face (MWSF) (H.U.C. Annual, Vol. II, 1925).
- Notes of Class Lectures

Smith, H.P.

Religion Of Israel (ROI)
(Scribner's, 1914)

Smith, R.W.

Old Testament In The
Jewish Church (OTJC)
(London, 1892).

Religion Of Semites (ROS)
(Scribner's, 1914)

C. Encyclopaedia Articles:

Hastings

Dictionary of the Bible
(HDOB) Extra Volume)

Kautzsche, E.

Religion Of Israel (HDOB)

Also Articles on "Anointing", "Priests", "Stranger", etc.,
in Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion And Ethics (H.ERE).

Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible (HDOB)

Encyclopaedia Biblica (EB)

Jewish Encyclopaedia (J.E.).

Brown, Driver, Briggs' Dictionary.

INTRODUCTION.

A. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Throughout the history of Israel, almost from its very birth as a religious group, two apparently contradictory ideas have been struggling for supremacy. In every age, the conflict between these two diverse interpretations of Judaism - the universalistic and the particularistic - has been one of the major points of contention between rival schools of Jewish thinkers. Its echo has resounded through the ages, from the period of the prophets down even to our present day, as reflected in the opposing philosophies of Jewish nationalism and Jewish universalism. Strange to say, however, the incompatibility between these two tenets is more apparent than real, for a careful analysis of their origin and growth will reveal the fact that both doctrines have played, simultaneously, a prominent part in the philosophy and writings of many of Israel's religious leaders. A correct understanding of the meaning of these terms, so frequently incorrectly and inaccurately employed, will indicate that they are not irreconcilable, nor mutually exclusive.

What, then, is understood by the words "particularism" and "universalism"? The former term might be defined as that religious outlook which "is confined to a single people or to a group of nearly related peoples." ¹ To employ an analogy

1. Kuenen - NRUR, p.5

From modern psychology, it is the same tendency, on the part of the group, which has been diagnosed as "introversion", with regard to the individual. It implies a turning of the interests and activities of the group inwards, directing them toward the group's welfare, regardless of any conscious regard for the world without. Now this general definition, as applied to Judaism, denotes that religious conception whereby Israel, as the people devoted to a particular deity, is concerned primarily and solely with the safeguarding and perpetuation of that relationship. Living apart and for itself, Israel, according to the particularistic interpretation, must "punctiliously worship its God, jealously and scrupulously living the life He had ordained for it alone,"² as His unique and particular possession, "holy" unto Him, even as He was "Holy", peculiarly sacred to them and peculiarly taboo for all other mortals.

In contradistinction to this narrow and restricted viewpoint, there arose in Israel also the doctrine of universalism. This idea might be defined as the direct antithesis of the above mentioned conception; as being analogous to the individual "extrovert", with gaze turned outward, with tendencies to assimilation and complete emancipation from the group. Such has been the interpretation placed upon this term by many, both within Judaism and without. Such a viewpoint is tantamount to the theoretical, but impractical, Christian scheme of absolute universal salvation through the individual soul, regardless of the group. In theory, it may

Be the logical definition of the term, but, in practice, universalism has been proved to be quite otherwise construed. It is that concept which, to use Kuenen's apt phrase, "is born of the nation, but which rises above it".³ It retains its particularistic or group basis, but it transcends these limitations. It does not lose its consciousness of self by a dissipation of its group values, as does the irrational extrovert. It is, on the contrary, a combination of both types of individual into that perfect personality, which develops the self only for the purpose of enriching all. It might, in fact, be likened to any artistic production born of a particular nation, but rising above it to become a universal possession. In the same way that Beethoven's music is universal though arising out of a "well-marked ethnic group", so universalism, a world embracing conception, is, none the less, not completely severed from the people who gave it birth. True universalism, therefore, is that outlook dominating, not merely separate and assimilated individuals, but even a group arisen to that ideal vision whereby it "bursts through the limits of nationality, rising above time and space"⁴ to a viewpoint or program embracing the whole of humanity. As with regard to particularism, so here, religious universalism must include the relationship of the individual or group to the Divine, but it must proceed two steps further. The Divine,

3. Kuenen - NRUR, p.9

4. Ibid, p.57

Himself, must be universal, must extend His sovereignty over all creation; and, in addition, there must be a definite relationship between the group and mankind at large. In other words, monotheism, with its absolute negation of all other deities, is the first step toward universalism. A particular group must recognize that its god is not merely superior to all others, but it must also be convinced that he is the sole divinity in the universe, the only being whose power and sphere of influence can be extended to all mankind, the only divine force that can be reached by the whole of humanity. Then, when this group arises to that stage of idealism wherein its purpose, its *raison d'etre*, is to extend this religious ideal throughout the domain of man, it has attained to a universalistic conception of religion.

In Judaism, this is reached when its God, Yahweh, is no longer solely its peculiar and particular deity, when it is no longer his peculiar and particular people alone, but when He is the "Lord of ^{the spirits of} all flesh" and Israel, the particular group cognizant of this fact, seeks to extend its knowledge of Him "to the ends of the earth". While the two doctrines have struggled against each other at various times, this harmonization, briefly sketched above, has been the dominant thought that has sustained Israel throughout the ages. A consciousness of itself as a people of God, as a definite and decided group with a world outlook and a universalistic ideal; with Yahweh "as no longer merely a national God, but now the universal God of all mankind and Israel (a separate and

particularistic group) the messenger of His truth to all the world."⁵

We might liken this phenomenon of universalism and particularism in Judaism to a mighty stream which first arose as a tiny, trickling rivulet upon the (snow-capped) summit of Sinai. As a pure particularism, it flowed through several centuries, but as it reached other lands, as other streams of thought were joined to it, as it gradually widened and broadened, another rivulet arose from its waters. The nascent monotheism and incipient universalism of the prophets sprang from this source, and gradually this tributary also swelled so that by the time of Deutero-Isaiah it had become a mighty torrent of universalism. Thence, these two surging floods have flowed on, crossing and recrossing each other's paths; and it is only when these two currents flow together and become one, that a well-rounded and complete universal ideal is attained.

B. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM.

It will be the purpose of this thesis to describe the rise of both of these streams of thought, to trace the development of each throughout the prophetic period, to observe the interplay of these currents and cross-currents of exclusive nationalism and inclusive cosmopolitanism, until they reach their fullest expression; the former in the writings of Ezekiel, the latter in the stirring appeal of Deutero-Isaiah. We shall

5. Morgenstern - FOIH, p.67f.

take note of the "painful dilemma" in which they, and all subsequent writers found themselves, the difficulty of reconciling these two doctrines: the one conceiving of Yahweh as merely the God of Israel, with Israel solely concerned with His worship; the other conceiving of Yahweh as the "One and only God of all races and lands" and of Israel's purpose to extend the knowledge of Him to all mankind.

Ever since these doctrines were clearly articulated, the problem of a reconciliation between them, both so essential to Judaism's life and purpose in the universe, has been prominent in the religious annals of this people. As we have stated above, the perfect universalism was reached only through a harmonization of the two doctrines, which was the climax and apogee of prophetic teaching; anticipated in the writings of the pre-exilic prophets, elaborated by Ezekiel, and perfected by Deutero-Isaiah. It will be our aim to evaluate the contribution of each of these men to this development; and finally, it is our desire to prove that the priestly writers, finding themselves in this same quandary and realizing that, in Judaism, both these theories were requisite, they strove for a balance between these centripetal and centrifugal forces, similar to that attained by Deutero-Isaiah; that, far from reverting completely to the particularism of the earlier and more primitive periods, they shared the exilic prophet's lofty universalistic aspirations. We shall take cognizance of the problem which confronted them: the necessity of reconciling the particularism which was then so rampant, because of the exile, and some of Ezekiel's reactions thereto, with the

perfected universalism of Deutero-^Isaiah and his followers. Finally, it is our hope to prove, by inference at least, that they too attained to a satisfactory and highly spiritual harmonization of both of these then prevalent and widely popular interpretations of Judaism.

CHAPTER ONE

THE NIGHT OF NATIONALISM.

FROM MOSES TO AMOS.

Although the struggle between these concepts of universalism and particularism was not of paramount importance in Israel's history until the time of the exile, anticipations of it can be discovered throughout the pre-exilic periods. Since Israel arose as a decidedly national, or particularistic group, the advent of the universal ideal could not have been born, like Athene from the brow of Zeus, as the product of one day or of one man, even of a religious genius, such as the unnamed prophet of the exile. Only a gradual growth, a natural and steady evolution of religious thought, can explain its development. The supreme universalism of Deutero-Isaiah was but the full-blown flower which had blossomed forth out of the tiny seeds sown by his predecessors throughout the many years of rampant nationalism that had gone before. It will be the purpose of this chapter to discuss briefly the origin and rise of this decided particularism which characterized the earlier chapters of Israel's saga and, if possible, to discover therein certain traces or hints of the universalistic ideal.

Although a "full discussion into the origin and development of Israel's monotheism (which, as we have pointed

out in the Introduction, is the first step toward universalism) should include an adequate estimate of Semitic religion, also... of the religions of that Semitic family (the Chabiri¹) to which the Hebrew immediately belonged,"² such a research into the religious origins of this ancient people would lead us too far afield. We shall confine our remarks, therefore, to the Israelitish groups per se, especially since it has been pointed out, (contrary to the opinion of Renan and others), that there is "no complete evidence or adequate proof that within the historical period any Semitic tribe worshipped one deity with a peculiar proper name of his own,"³ which is requisite, not only for a monotheism, but even for that stage just beneath it, known as "monolatry". In fact, the entire post-Mosaic age, as we shall attempt to prove in the course of this discussion, was substantially monolatrous,⁴ rather than monotheistic, even to the time of Deutero-Isaiah.

It would be more expeditious, therefore, that we take as our starting point the existence of a monolatry, in which stage is to be found the genesis of that particularism which dominated the religion of Israel for so many centuries. This doctrine has been generally attributed to the creative genius of Moses.⁵ (Note A). Whatever may have been the conditions

1. Smith - ROI, p.12

2. Montefiore - HL, p.22

3. Ibid, p. 26

4. Ibid, p. 31.

5. Ibid, p. 31

among the Chabiri nomads prior to this time, we are fairly certain that it was he who "led a tribe, or group of tribes, out from Egypt back to the wilderness, its original nomad abode; and there, acting as its tribal priest and interpreter of the oracle, he brought the tribe into contact with a desert god, thought to dwell upon some certain solitary peak in the wilderness, and in the name of this new god, and as revealed by him, he evolved⁶ for the tribe (or tribes), a body of ritual and ethical laws which, in time, became the basis of the religion of Israel. In this sense Moses is a real historical character, actually the law-giver and ultimate founder of Israel's religion."⁶ It is at this stage that we take our point of departure. Having arisen out of a vague and inchoate polydemonism, with its worship of nature and ancestral spirits, then out of a confused and characterless polytheism, with its incoherent and nameless gods,⁷ there now appears a group of people "to whom the will of a new and known god is solemnly⁸ announced and with whom a sacred covenant is concluded." They are now introduced to the worship of one particular and most potent deity, with whose name and general character they have become acquainted. They now acknowledge Yahweh, "originally⁹ borrowed by Moses from the Kenites," as an exclusive and sole deity, not of the universe, but of the tribes which have¹⁰ entered into a covenant relationship with Him. Upon this

6. Morganstern - FOIH, p.11.

7. Montefiore - HL, p.75

8. Kautzsche - HDOB, p.624f.

9. Montefiore - HL, p.51;

10. Ibid, p. 53

occasion Yahweh was solemnly proclaimed the God of Israel,
 and Israel was bound to do His will;¹¹ and it is in this
 covenant relationship entered into at this time that we find
 the germ of that particularism in which we are so vitally
 concerned. It is to be admitted that an incipient particular-
 ism might be discerned in that earlier polydemonism wherein
 the gods are believed to be intimately related to the indivi-
 duals of a certain group by bonds of blood and by actual descent
 from a common ancestry,¹² or wherein the gods have dominion
 over a particular territory inhabited by their worshippers,
 or to which haunt or beat his wanderings are confined,¹³ but
 interesting and important as these considerations are for the
 early history of the doctrine of particularism, this discussion
 must be limited to the starting point, rather arbitrarily but
 necessarily selected for the purpose of this thesis, namely,
 the introduction of Yahweh to the people of Israel.

Although Yahweh was at first merely the god of the Judah
 tribes who entered the southern portion of Palestine (Judges I),
 by the time of Deborah, He had become known to the northern
 tribes also. The summons to resist the coalition of Canaanite
 forces under Sisera was issued in His name and the victory
 secured was ascribed to His intervention (Judges V:2 f, 9, 11).
 We cannot enter into a discussion as to just how this acquaint-
 tance with Yahweh became general throughout Palestine, as to

11. Kautzsche - HDOB, p. 631b.

12. R. Smith ROS - pp. 48, 110

13. Ibid, p. 111, f.

whether He became known to the whole of Israel ~~through~~ the infiltration into the north of southern Levitical families (Note B) who brought with them the name and mode of worship of this new god; or whether, as has been observed by others,¹⁴ the name of Yahweh might have been a common term for the deity, used similarly to the appellation "Baal"; Whatever may have been the actual means by which Yahweh became the god of all the tribes, both northern and southern, cannot be positively ascertained, but disregarding this mooted problem, it suffices but to indicate that Yahweh eventually displaced the various tribal gods and became the patron deity of Palestine, the national god of Israel.

Absorbing as is the story of this development, going on *pari passu* with the steady fusion of tribes during the period of the Judges, we must pass rapidly on to the establishment of the nation and a national religious center. Under the leadership of those military heroes, known as the Judges, who arose at different intervals to drive out the encroaching enemies and to attempt a continuation of whatever confederacy the exigencies of common dangers and common adversaries had evoked - under these warrior rulers who fought in the name of Yahweh, the land of Palestine was gradually wrested from the Canaanites and possessed by the tribes of Israel. Since it was through the military power and prowess of their god that they triumphed, it was Yahweh, too, who had

14. Morgenstern - Class Notes.

come into possession of the country. Thus, He soon became its Baal, or master, for "as the tribes grew together into larger and ever fewer ethnic groups, the various tribal gods, had, of necessity, to fuse correspondingly, largely because they were outgrowths of the same fundamental conceptions. And when out of the many separate, independent tribes, one nation did at last evolve, it follows that the separate tribal gods must finally have merged completely until the conception of a national god, logically and necessarily, sprang into being."¹⁵

"To this composite deity which resulted from the fusion just described, the old God of Judah naturally contributed not only the most numerous and distinctive features, but also the name Yahweh, while the names of the other tribal gods were speed-¹⁶ily and purposely forgotten." Yahweh had become "the thorough partisan of Palestine so far as Israel's relations with other nations were concerned,"¹⁷ and by the time that Israel had completely vanquished the Canaanites from the land, through the victory of David over the Jebusites, by the time that Jerusalem had become the stronghold and religious center of His cult through the bringing up of the Ark from Kiriath-ye-arim and the building of the Temple, Yahweh was, by this time, in full possession of the land so frequently called thereafter, "the inheritance of Yahweh." (I Sam. 26:19).

15. Morgenstern - FOIH, p. 46-48.

16. Morgenstern - FOIH, p.46-48.

17. Smith - ROI, p. 61.

Although for a time a struggle ensued between Yahweh and the Baalim, a syncretization had taken place, as a result of which there were appropriated by Yahweh sacred places and shrines, especially in the north, at which the various Baals were worshipped, as a necessary means of procuring their favor and physical dispensations,"¹⁸ as the sine qua non of a continued prosperity in this new land. Through this process "Baal came to be identified, rather than merely coordinated, with Yahweh, whose worship, and in the minds of some, whose character approximated more and more closely to the worship and character of his rival"¹⁹ and in proportion as Israelites and Canaanites became one people, Baal and Yahweh became one God, for Yahweh had become the Baal of Israel, with the land of Canaan as His land.²⁰ The particularism born in the covenant consummated between Yahweh and Israel at Sinai was, by this time, full grown and complete.

Despite this belief, so well established by the time of David, the more primitive idea that Yahweh retained his ancient abode at Horeb still persisted, as can be noted in Elijah's flight to that holy mountain in search of spiritual encouragement (I Kings 19:8ff). But, aside from such vestiges of the old nomadic religious notions, Yahweh remained coterminous with His own land and so close was this association that Naamon entreated Elisha for two mules' burden of Israelitish

18. Ibid, p.65f

19. Montefiore - HL, p. 20

20. Smith - ROI, p. 73

earth that he might erect a private altar to Yahweh in Damascus, because he had resolved henceforth to offer neither burnt-offering nor sacrifice to any other god, but only to Yahweh. By this device alone did he believe it possible to worship in a foreign land this great God who had healed him, (II Kings 5:17 f). And later, we hear of David bitterly cursing those who had driven him out of the "inheritance of Yahweh," saying, 'go, serve other gods', because he believed that this expulsion from the cultivated country of Palestine was tantamount to excommunication from the presence of Yahweh (I Sam 26:19).

To be sure, the preeminence of Yahweh was somewhat endangered by the cosmopolitan tastes and beliefs of Solomon and some of his successors (especially Ahab) and ofttimes He²¹ was "forced to share His sanctuary with the local Baalim" ; still we can conclude from the above discussion that throughout this pre-prophetic period Yahweh was thought to be "the chief, or tutelary God of Israel,"²² definitely associated with the land which He had given them as an inheritance.

From this summary sketch of the centuries preceding the advent of the literary prophets, it cannot but be maintained that during these many years there was very little, if any, advance from the monolatry introduced by Moses. The dual relationship between Yahweh and Israel was similar to²³ that which existed between the Canaanites and their gods.

21. Kautzsche - HDOB, p. 625b.

22. Montefiore - HL, p. 19.

23. Ibid, p. 64.

Yahweh was Israel's God in the same respect as Marduk was the god of the Babylonians, as Chemosh was the god of Moab, or as Milcam was the god of the Ammonites. The national character of Yahweh was the outstanding feature of the religion of this period, but a slight advance over the mono-latry of Moses. And yet, despite this fact, there were - few and sporadic as they might seem - certain anticipations of the universal ideal first perfected by the Exilic prophet. "Like every great movement in history, literary prophecy had its antecedents and forerunners, among whom might be named the Rechabites, Micajah b. Jimlah, Nathan and Elijah," and, "although none of these advanced to the conception of the great literary prophets,"²⁴ still their contribution to the history of the universal ideal in Israel cannot be ignored.

It was in the break which these aforementioned spiritual leaders made with the conception of Yahweh as being merely the national or tutelary deity, (related to Israel in a blood covenant regardless of moral grounds), as being solely the patron god of Palestine, regardless of ethical considerations, it was in their challenge to these conceptions of the Divine that an advance was made. Although it has been argued by some²⁵ that the establishment of a covenant with Israel as an act of free choice on the part of Yahweh and of Israel, is the fundamental factor in the differentiation between Israel, as an ethical religion, and the other henotheistic, or

24. Battenwieser - POI, p. 160

25. Budde - ROITE, p. 60.; Kautzsche - HDOB, p. 632a.
Smith - ROI, p. 60; Kuenen - ROI - VI., p. 282.

nature religions, still it is to be noted that the code of laws which formed the basis of this covenant, (Ex.34:14,17,25,26, etc.) are all concerned with the manner of Yahweh's ritual

²⁶ worship. It is not primarily in this covenant that there is any decided advance from the early particularism. True enough, "the seed of an ethical monotheism might have been sown by Moses in the voluntary choice of a deity who had delivered Israel from Egyptian bondage," but great care must be taken lest this fact be overestimated, for it, in itself, might be but an anachronism of a much later writer. It is rather in the pronouncements of these early prophets,-

Micajah, Nathan, Elijah - that this moral and ethical note was first emphasized. These men were the first to look upon prophecy and Yahweh's revelation as being something more than mere patriotism and nationalistic ardour. When Micajah, the son of Jimlah, stood forth alone against the four hundred prophets of Yahweh (who prophesied in willing obedience to the royal will by uttering an oracle of menace and foreboding for the nation) a significant step forward is taken in the development of a universal conception of Yahweh. Micajah dared to take issue with the unhesitating unanimity of the professional prophets, who had predicted the success of the expedition against the Syrians under Ahab and Jehosophat, and to announce that Yahweh did not always cause Israel to prosper. "As Jeremiah stands alone in predicting ruin, while Hannaniah and his followers foretell smooth and pleasant

26. Morgenstern - B.Th., p. 185

things, unable, perchance, to realize how Yahweh could show Himself supreme amid the disastrous downfall of His own people, so two centuries and a half earlier, did Micajah withstand Zedekiah and the compliant four hundred before the gates of Samaria.²⁷ Sometime earlier, Gad had announced to David an impending punishment at the hands of Yahweh (II Sam 24:11f) but in the remarkable personality of Nathan we have a more notable precursor of the later ethical monotheism, for it was this prophet who, although unattached to any official position, pronounced upon this mighty monarch of Israel the judgment of Yahweh, not because of any national or ritualistic trespass, but only because of his moral turpitude (II Sam. 12:1ff). Ahijah, too, in his opposition to the bizarre changes which came about with the establishment of the monarchy, with its taxes and luxuries, its foreign and complex ritual ceremonies, in his desire to return to the simple nomadic life, (we have) made another step forward. For the will of Yahweh became again something more than mere national welfare. It was surcharged with deeply moral and religious idealism far removed from national limitations. But it is most especially in the colorful figure of Elijah that this ethical conception of Yahweh is stressed. Elijah was not merely the stalwart warrior in Yahweh's cause against the Tyrian Baal, the courageous champion of an exclusive Yahweh worship; he was, in addition, the defender of those who had been trampled beneath

27. Montefiore - HL, p.94.

the heel of injustice and moral inequity. He was the spokesman of an ethical god who denounced King Ahab and predicted the destruction of his dynasty because of the judicial murder of the peasant Naboth (I Kings 21:17 f). It was not apostasy to Baal which evoked Elijah's most furious anger against the king as it was his moral and spiritual blindness. In his personality ^{was} condensed "the achievements that represent the struggle of a generation or more of intelligent and heroic workers in behalf of the old faith and the stern simplicity, (idealized perhaps) of the nomad religion." ²⁸ In him we have concentrated and intensified the work of that succession of men who preceded him -- Gad, Nathan, ² Micajah, Ahijah, ^{later} the Rechabites) -- men whose labors were far removed from national ambitions, but whose aspirations were for the simpler and purer worship of Yahweh, which, erroneously perhaps, they associated with the desert wanderings.

In these few names we have discovered a few stars of hope just rising upon the darkened horizon, shining forth as beacons out of this night of nationalism. Although the Yahweh of Elijah and Elisha "was but little softened from the Yahweh of Samuel", ²⁹ the innovator of a new and more exalted order of prophets that spoke in the name of the national god, and who may be said to have reemphasized the exclusive and particularistic cult of Yahweh; and although

28. Peake - Article ROI , p. 86

29. Montefiore - HL , p. 94

comparatively little progress was made during the ninth century, still the active resistance displayed by the men mentioned above, to the flagrant violations of morality by persons such as Ahab and Jezebel, evinced a moral power that far transcended the limitation set by national boundaries and borders. The conflict between particularism and, at least a nascent universal morality, had begun.

To summarize the religion of Israel to the time when Amos' clarion voice rang forth amid the prosperity of Jereboam's reign, we might say, with Montefiore, that the religious "Law of Israel was monolatry -- Yahweh already possessed many ethical attributes and their possession pointed the way to the future development of an harmonious union of these qualities into a complete ethical ideal (the ethical attributes leading first to monotheism and thence to universalism) but.... the moralization of Yahweh's character was by no means completed at the close of the pre-prophetic period - He still retained many aspects of the nature gods out of whom He was derived. There was not, as yet, any thought of the religion of Yahweh being extended beyond the borders of Israel; monolatry had not yet begun to pass into monotheism." ³⁰

Although Kautzsche and others might be correct in assuming that "even as early as the period of the Judges it contained many features which raised it above the popular religions of the neighboring peoples, and which can be explained

30. Montefiore - HL , p.100-5.

by the continued influences of highly endowed spiritual personalities",³¹ still it had not as yet broken the fetters of particularism; there was as yet no world outlook nor dream of missionary effort; the night of nationalism, though illuminated by a few radiant stars of universal moral ideals, had not yet been routed by the light of dawn.

CHAPTER TWOGLINTS OF UNIVERSALISM.AMOS TO DEUTERONOMY.A. AMOS.

In the last chapter, we have noted the first portents of that conflict which was destined to continue throughout the prophetic and post-prophetic periods, that conflict between the "old pastoral and the new agricultural religion, the old Yahweh and the new Baal worship, between the incipient monotheism and the established nationalism. The latter flourished especially in the North, while the pastoral tribes, particularly in the South, continued ever the stronghold of the old religion, of the old shepherd ideas and ideals of life and virtue. This combat between Yahweh and Baal worship, which began at this time and continued until the Babylonian exile, furnishes the key to the religious history of Israel, for it was out of this conflict that Judaism, the universal religion, at last was born."¹

We have already seen the rise of a nascent monotheism in the outstanding prophets of the tenth and ninth centuries; we have noted especially the work of Elijah as being called forth by just such circumstances as were soon to motivate the great literary prophets of the eighth century. Although

1. Morgenstern - FOIH , p.66

Amos was primarily a "prophet of justice and righteousness," it was "to combat the increasing and corrupting foreign influences" that he was summoned by Yahweh; it was to protest against those practices and acts of injustice and unrighteousness which had not been inherent in the pure Yahweh worship of the desert that the shepherd of Tekoah was inspired to inveigh. But it was not in Amos' mere opposition to the cult, to the multiplicity of sacrifices, nor even to the selling of the righteous for silver and the needy for a pair of shoes (2:6 ff), but rather was it in the logical consequences of this thought that Amos' contribution to the evolution of religious thought lay. At a time when the people were congratulating themselves upon the "restoration of the boundaries of Israel from the entrance of Hamath to the waters of Arabah (II Kings 14:23 f), rejoicing in the victories at Lo-Debar and Karnaïm (Amos 6:13), at a time when these triumphs, attributed to the direct intervention of Yahweh, were fresh in their minds, and even greater manifestations of His power were anticipated in the near future, at such a time "there appeared suddenly a man who checked the joyous celebration by the earnestness of his mien, into the gay music of the revellers, with their drums and harps , he injected a discordant note, for he chanted the dirge which the mourners were accustomed to sing as they followed the corpse to the tomb. Through all the shouting of the crowd he heard the death rattle. 'The virgin Israel has fallen no

more to rise² was the burden of his song."

It was in this prediction of absolute destruction for his people, Israel, that Amos made a significant advance over his predecessors. The people had believed that Yahweh and Israel were so closely and inseparately bound together that, although from time to time he might "hide his face", the estrangement could be only temporary, that although he might be "angry for a moment", his rage could be quickly appeased by the multiplication of holocausts and burnt offerings (4:4). The bond that united Him to His people - so the populace thought - could never be broken. Strained relations might ensue, which "could be compared to the misunderstandings between husband and wife (as in Hosea 1-3), who have never heard of divorce, or at least have never thought of it. The disturbance of their peaceable relations, one with the other, might be extremely painful, but, sooner or later, it would be made up."³ No matter how much Yahweh's wrath might be kindled against His people for a time, He would not be "angry with them for long" but on the "Yom Yahweh" He would wreak vengeance on all the foes of His people, granting victory and greater glory to Israel (Joel 4:18). It was with this point of view that Amos differed so radically. Yes; Yahweh would manifest Himself on the "Yom Yahweh", but it would be "a day of darkness and not of light even

2. Quoted in Smith - ROI, p. 133, from Wellhausen.

3. Kuenen - NRUR, p. 123.

of utter darkness without a single ray of light (5:20)."

Because Amos now conceived of Yahweh as a Moral Being, He was independent of His relationship with Israel which had been established, in the first place, not because of any special merit on Israel's part, but as an example of "Yahweh's unfettered choice, as an instance of the free exercise of His sovereign will."⁴ Israel, therefore, could disappear from the face of the earth and although the "people shall wander from sea to sea and from the North even to the Sunrise, turning to and fro to seek the word of Yahweh, not being able to find it." (8:12), still, Yahweh would be unaffected; He would yet exist, nay more; be glorified and His justice vindicated, through the very destruction of His people. Thus, in this prediction of the despoliation of the entire land of Israel (Note C), which Amos speaks of as "the land of Yahweh", in his prognostication of the utter annihilation of His chosen people (3:2 ; also Note D), in this Amos rises far above the conception of a national deity.. In his pronouncement of an absolute doom, without hope of any intercession to stay Yahweh's judgment, in this message of the complete and irremedial destruction of Yahweh's people, Amos propounds a new conception, the conception of a universal and an all-powerful god.

But there are even more indications of Amos' advance in religious thought to be found in his prophecy. Not only can Yahweh exist independently of Israel, not only can He

4. Montefiore - HL , p. 124.

cast off His people because of their transgressions (2:6f; 4:1; 5:7,10,12) and their seeking of evil rather than of good (5:14), but, by implication at least, He can take unto Himself another nation, for in nowise did Israel enjoy a special monopoly on Yahweh's favor. Although He had brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt, He had also redeemed the Philistines from Caphtor and the Arameans from Kir (9:7). According to Amos' new doctrine, Yahweh, in nowise is limited any longer to a restricted area or a national domain. His power and sway extends to the other nations, his "ethical will is imposed upon other peoples,"⁵ whom He will also destroy because of their violations of His moral Law: the Syrians, because of their inordinate cruelty in warfare, (1:3-5); the Ammonites, because of their flagrant inhumanity (1:13-15); the Moabites, because of the barbarity they displayed in burning the bones of the king of Edom to lime (2:1-3). The same Yahweh who rules over Israel, who is to exact punishment upon His Chosen People for their violations of His law of justice and righteousness, is to destroy these other nations as well. Nor this alone; as an acute observer of the movements of the nations of Western Asia, Amos could not but perceive, in the renewed activity of the Assyrian army and the impending destruction of Israel, the will of Yahweh; and thus, he perceived in Assyria a nation raised up by Yahweh "to afflict you from the entrance of Hamath unto the brook of the Arabah" (6:14). Yahweh, the living and active guardian

6

of the moral order of the world was but using this instrument for the punishment of "man's inhumanity to man."

This, then, was the contribution which Amos made to the history of religious thought in Israel. "The righteous God might renounce His people, but He could not renounce Himself,"⁷ but rather would He be proved triumphant through the complete annihilation of His people. Though Amos still recognized a special relationship between Israel and Yahweh, (2:10; 3:2), which cannot be interpreted, especially because of Israel's imminent and entire destruction, as being of universal significance. Yahweh, to be sure, is the mighty and all-powerful ruler of the nations, existing independently of Israel, His justice transcending the relationship which He had established with them. But in this sense only was Amos a universalist,⁸ (Note E). For, although Amos' God was a universal one, he took but the "first step in the promotion of the God of Israel to His transcendental position as ruler of the whole world;"⁹ he did but lay the foundation later utilized by Jeremiah and perfected by Deutero-Isaiah. Amos did not as yet conceive of any relationship between Israel and the other nations; he conceived of no purpose or function for it beyond obedience to Yahweh's covenant and, since it had flouted this agreement, it was to be irreparably

6. Ibid.

7. Kuenen - NRUR, p. 124.

8. Morgenstern - Class Notes.

9. Smith - ROI, p. 138.

renounced, having no further *raison d'etre*. Still, in extending the power of Yahweh beyond the physical boundaries of Israel, he achieved a notable advance. He did not attain to a theological or absolute monotheism, but he did reach at least a "practical one, perhaps, for Yahweh, the God of Israel, is powerful enough to punish Israel for its sins (2:6-8; 4:1; 5:7, 10, 12), and to use the nations of the earth for His purpose."¹⁰

Commonplace as this advance may seem to our mature age, it was something new and startling for the contemporaries of Amos. In it there appear a few more radiant glints of light that were to pierce through the dark clouds of the early national conception of Yahweh.

B. HOSEA.

Although it must be granted that Hosea made a contribution to the general trend of religious thinking in that "to him, Yahweh is not simply the god who requires justice between man and man, but the god who seeks the love of His people, a love that will manifest itself in the doing of His will,"¹¹ a love that will evoke a worship, not merely of sacrifice, but of kindness and the 'knowledge of Yahweh', (6:6; Note F); still, in Hosea, there is but little progress of thought with regard to the doctrines of universalism and

10. Ibid, p. 140

11. Smith - ROI, p. 145.

particularism. Like Amos, he believed in the complete and irremediable destruction of Yahweh's people, (5:8-10; 13:7f; 13:13,14; and cf. Note C.); but, unlike him, he neglected to give any indication as to what would become of Yahweh after the downfall. In Amos there was the implication, at least, that He would ^{might} arbitrarily select another nation in Israel's stead, which idea cannot be deduced from Hosea's utterances. It might be gathered, however, from Hosea's idea of God as infinite Love (Note G) that he believed in a better world to come as its "necessary corollary, and that the relation between God and Israel was in the nature of an indissoluble, ethical union, based not on any mere legal contract which becomes invalid as soon one party violates the covenant, but based, like the marriage bond, as he conceived it, on love and moral obligation."¹² Still, in spite of this possible inference, his message of a complete and thoroughgoing devastation leaves little doubt that he failed to consider the universal implications of his doctrine of love, and its concomitant forgiveness. Even if Dr. Battenwieser is correct in assuming that "the union between Yahweh and Israel may be only interrupted, like the prophet's union with his erring wife," and thus the casting off of Israel as a mere means to an end, as a purificatory punishment by which Yahweh's love is to work the final salvation and redemption of the people, leading them to a fuller union with Himself,"¹³ (3:5; 2:1-3), still, even accepting this lofty

12. Battenwieser - POI, p. 241.

13. Ibid, p. 242f

spiritual conception of Yahweh and his religion as an integral part of the prophet's message, it is evident from an examination of his writings, that he has not transcended that particularism of Israel's relationship to Yahweh alone; he does not extend his gaze beyond the horizon of his own nation.

Even though this ethical bond is to be based only on "justice and righteousness, on love and fervent devotion," we are not justified in concluding therefrom that Hosea saw any farther than the reestablishment of Yahweh's people in a new and more sublime covenant (2:21-22), a passage the originality of which has been questioned by Kautzsche¹⁴ and others), without considering Israel's relation to the other nations.

Even as "Hosea's wife was taken back in the hope that through solitude and deprivation she might become chastened and purified, once more worthy of his love,"¹⁵ so, according to

Dr. Battenwieser, Israel was to be restored to Yahweh's favor, that it might eventually be of service to humanity.

But, even to press this analogy still further, it seems that Hosea was not that much of a universalist. Even as Gomer was no longer to have relations with her former lovers, so was the renewed covenant for the sake of Israel and Yahweh alone; Israel was to relinquish her alliances with foreign nations, (7:11 f; 12:2) and to remain apart. If we grant that Hosea had a purpose for Israel beyond a seemingly absolute doom, it does not appear that it included Israel's role in a universal scheme of salvation, but rather a reemphasis of the

14. Kautzsche - HDOB, p. 696.

15. Battenwieser - POI, p. 243.

reestablishment of Yahweh's peculiar and particular relation with Israel. Hosea, torn by his own personal grief and lacerated by the anticipation of that final catastrophe which was to befall his nation, was concerned primarily with Israel and her fate. Certainly, he did not advance beyond Amos in his conception of universalism, as it has been defined. It might even be added that he was not a monotheist in the strict sense of the word, for his bitterness against the Baalim (2:7; 10:1; 11:1-3) indicates that he had some belief in their real existence, while his declaration that lands other than Yahweh's are unclean (9:3-5) shows that, in his view, other divinities had power there,¹⁶ unless all this be merely due to his use of colloquialisms expressive of the people's religious delusions, a problem which cannot be discussed here. Be that as it may, it is safe to conclude that, although no absolute universalism is to be found in Hosea, still, in reiterating the message of an absolute doom through hostile invasions (5:9; 10:8), in emphasizing the doctrine of love and its concomitant repentance (**תשובה**) which later led to the doctrine of the "righteous remnant", in the "vividness with which he conceived of the relation of Yahweh to Israel as a marriage" in which no rivals were to participate,- in all this Hosea prepared the way for the thoroughgoing monotheism to follow, and made an almost imperceptible advance toward the universalism to come.

16. Smith - ROI, p. 145.

C. ISAIAH

We shall not pause to discuss the utterance of Isaiah's contemporary, Micah, for an examination of his writings will reveal the fact that, aside from his epitomization of religion in the formula "to do justice, to love mercy and to walk humbly with God," (Mic. 6:8), which epigrammatic statement bears the stamp of religious genius, (aside from this) there is little advance to be found in his work, for "the close parallel (between him and Amos) must be evident:

'Jerusalem shall be ruins and the Temple mount overgrown with brush (Mic. 3:12) - justice will be done though the heavens fall,'¹⁷ because of the flagrant violation of the moral law; (Mic. 2:1 f; 2:9; 3:1, 12, etc.). The tenure of his message is thus quite similar to his predecessors'. It is in Isaiah, now to be considered, that another marked progression in religious thinking is made.

Although H.P. Smith finds in the declaration "the whole earth is filled with Yahweh's כבוד" (Is. 6:3), a universalism beyond anything we have found yet in Israel,"¹⁸ it is not so much in this fact that Isaiah's contribution lay, as it is in his doctrine of the שאר ישרא, of the "righteous remnant" (10:21), that is to return. In this doctrine, first enunciated between the years 740 and 735 (by the application of this name to his son born during this period), another step is taken by Israel along the pathway

17. Smith - ROI, p. 178

18. Ibid, p. 150

leading to universalism. While the name in itself might have little significance, its full implication becomes more apparent in the light of Isaiah's main teaching. Like the appellation which he applied to his other son (8:1-4), this name too is purely symbolic, implying that a remnant, worthy and righteous, shall survive the destruction and shall return to Yahweh. This is a striking modification of Amos' view of complete annihilation descending upon all, irrespective of any extenuating circumstances. The doom, according to Amos, was a purely mechanical process, an inevitable consequence of Israel's sinfulness, a direct result of Yahweh's absolute justice. Surely, all the people were not such flagrant violators of Yahweh's covenant, and yet Amos seems to take no cognizance of such persons, with whose existence he must have been acquainted. Despite the possible interpretation as to the rejuvenation of the people which Dr. Battenwieser urges, Hosea, too, predicted the complete destruction of the nation; righteous as well as unrighteous were to perish together. It was Isaiah who first questioned the validity of such a justice and love. To him it seemed inconceivable that Yahweh should thus mercilessly destroy even the repentant or righteous few. Perhaps he was influenced in this respect by Hosea's doctrine of ultimate forgiveness (although it has even been suggested that the reverse is true and that the latter might have been influenced by him).¹⁹

19. Morgenstern - Class Notes.

Whatever may have been the cause of this significant change regarding the nature of the doom, its importance for the later elaboration, or the logical consequences of this doctrine in the individualism of Jeremiah and Ezekiel cannot be gainsaid. It is in this doctrine of individualism, of the righteous few who would be spared out of the destruction of the nation, that the first impetus toward the *יְהוָה יִשְׁלַח*, the servant idea of Deutero-Isaiah is to be found. To be sure, all this is anticipating, for Isaiah did not fully grasp the significance inherent in his doctrine of the saved - or better, the righteous remnant. He merely proclaimed the fact. It remained for his followers to interpret and to explain it. We might ask the question as to what Isaiah conceived as the purpose for which this remnant was saved and it might be inferred that even as Isaiah believed that Yahweh employed all the forces of history in the fulfillment of His purpose, even as He summoned Assyria as the rod of His anger (10:5), or His bee, and Egypt as His fly (7:18) to harass Israel, so it would seem logical that Yahweh could not have spared this righteous residue for nought, but rather that they be reconsecrated to Him for the furtherance of His purpose. But to do this were to read into Isaiah's teachings the views of the later prophets; for we cannot but conclude, as with regard to Hosea, that Isaiah saw nothing beyond the reestablishment - not of a chastened nation - but of a righteous remnant as Yahweh's own people, without any regard for Israel's ultimate relations with the rest of the nations.

With the exception of his doctrine of faith, which grows

out of Hosea's concept of Yahweh as infinite love, and of the holiness of Yahweh (to be discussed below), not much originality can be claimed for the remainder of Isaiah's message which, in many respects, resembles that of his predecessors. There is a more marked universalistic vision, however, to be observed in several passages among the writings of Isaiah, most of which, however, have been ascribed to post-exilic writers (11:9b;²⁰ 14:24-27;²¹ 19:19 ff;²¹ 2:2-4²²).

Since this chapter is designed as a mere survey of the prophetic period, we cannot pause to examine each of these passages individually, but even were we to grant the authenticity of certain of them, the bulk of Isaiah's message does not warrant the conclusion that he went further than an anticipation of the universalism to follow. There was, if these passages are authentic, a whisper, at least, of that resplending cry of Ezekiel's *יְהוָה יְהוָה* in the fact that other nations might recognize the power and divinity of Yahweh (Is. 18:7 ; also a questionable passage), but no definite plan for Israel's relation toward these peoples was as yet formulated. Yahweh was the Lord of Hosts, of heaven and of earth (3:3 and 1:2; 3:1). His *תְּלֵכַת* filled the entire world, (6:3); He was the universal God, to be sure, but, aside from His sparing but a righteous few, so few that they were scarcely worthy of

20. Smith - ROI, p. 161.

21. Battenwieser - POI, p. 273.

22. Montefiore - HL, p. 147
Peake - on Isaiah, pp. 438, 444.

consideration (6:13; 17:5 f); except for this he has little to add to that which was predicted by Amos. Yahweh will wreak havoc, on the "Yom Yahweh" (2:10-22) until the "cities be waste and without inhabitants, until the land be converted into a desolation" (6:11, also 54:25; 9:11; 10:4; 17:5 f, etc.).

Israel must be destroyed because of her religious delusions (1:11 f) and her unrighteous conduct (1:16 f; 10:1-4; 9:7-20).

Although it was said that little originality could be claimed for Isaiah's teachings, still he did expatiate on the ideas which he received from his forerunners. Out of Hosea's conception of Yahweh as being a God of unending love and unswerving faithfulness, he developed the lofty ideal of absolute and unquestioning faith. Yahweh, who was the sum total of all ethical qualities, Yahweh who was "holy" in the "purely ethical sense of the term,"²³ Yahweh who was Love and Faithfulness incarnate, must be the sole source of Israel's support. For this reason, when Ahab was besieged in Jerusalem and had the choice of joining with Egypt, Ephraim, Aram (30:1-5) or concluding a treaty with Assyria (28:15), at this crucial moment Isaiah, as he went forth to meet the king who was then inspecting the water supply (7:3 ff) propounded "a new and unheard of policy," for he advised Ahab to join neither Assyria nor Egypt, but to place his entire trust in Yahweh, for "if ye have no faith, ye cannot endure." (7:9; also 30:15). It is faith in a god no longer limited to Palestine which Isaiah enjoins, and yet,

23. Battenwieser - POI, p. 270 f; Smith - ROI, p. 150

has its
 (nevertheless) its particularistic implications, for it is still Yahweh, the God of Israel, who bids His people energetically to avoid any alliances with foreign nations, which implied also contacts with foreign gods and cults. Yahweh has become more than a god of justice, more than a god of faithfulness and love; he is now the ^{לֵאמֹר שִׁדְדָה}, who is absolutely holy, whose character is a concatenation of "all spiritualized ethical attributes", and upon Him alone Israel must rely. It is because of this doctrine of the pure ethical character of Yahweh and His inability to betray His undying love for His people that Isaiah was forced to ask himself the question concerning the "righteous remnant". And it was just as inevitable that he answer "the remnant shall be saved," "the small band of faithful ones among whom the divine revelation, rejected by Ahab and the mass of the people, was sealed; this small band grouping themselves about him (Isaiah) would remain under the protection of their God." ²⁴ (8:16). They would guard the word of Yahweh and mayhap perpetuate it that it might yet reach the rest of the world; ²⁴ but beyond this Isaiah did not go. Universal he was in his god concept, for his god was one whose might and power far transcended the limits of the nation. He could destroy not merely Israel, but the vast and proud realm of Assyria (10:5-19) because of its "insatiable lust for dominion, its brutal disregard for the individualities of nations, and its inordinate presumption, bordering on self-deification." ²⁵ And thus Yahweh might extend His reputation

24. Kautzsch - HDOB, 692b; Battenwieser - POI - p. 169

25. Battenwieser - POI, p. 286.

and name far beyond the boundaries of Israel; but Isaiah had not yet arisen to that height where he conceived of Israel as His agent in the "diffusion of truth or spiritual welfare to humanity,"²⁶ and of this remnant as bearing His revelation to the peoples of the earth. Another meteoric flash of light across the horizon; another watch has passed in the night, but the darkness of nationalism had not yet been dispelled.

D. JEREMIAH.

Although it would seem that in a chronological survey such as this, a presentation of the religious thought of the Deuteronomic Reformation ought to precede that of Jeremiah, it were better to reverse the process in that "he belongs in that succession of which Amos was the first member and, in a sense, completed that line." Except for his elaboration of certain doctrines, particularly that of the righteous remnant and its logical concomitant or development into an "individualism", the substance of Jeremiah's message is similar to that of the prophets already discussed. While primarily the prophet of a personal piety, of a direct and individualistic relationship to God, Jeremiah did contribute a profound conception to the general advance in religious thought, which also had its effect on the specific ideas that we have been following.

Like unto Amos he pronounced upon his obstreperous countrymen the irrevocable necessity of judgment because of their moral dereliction (6:18,19, etc.), and spiritual apostasy

26. Montefiore - HL, p. 146

(2:23, f). "Like as one breaketh a potter's vessel that cannot be made whole (19:10, cf. also 4:5-9), so will Israel be destroyed, until the carcasses of this people shall be food for the fowls of the heaven and for the beasts of the earth; and none shall frighten them away." (7:33-34). To him, the horizon was as steeped in blackness as it was for his predecessors, for there was no chance of repentance from the doom which had already befallen her sister kingdom, Israel. It was as difficult for his contemporaries to turn from their evil ways and to seek the good, as it was for an Ethiopian to change his skin or a leopard his spots. Yahweh was to renounce completely this sinful nation, even as a man who divorces his wife could not, in the light of contemporary legislation (Deut. 24:1-4) remarry her. And thus, "Israel, who has played the harlot with many peoples" cannot return to Yahweh." (3:1).

In addition to this idea of a "decretum absolutum", Jeremiah agreed with the other prophets in his conception of Yahweh as being the mighty ruler of the world who ordered the destinies of mankind, and thus he saw in the rising Chaldean armies but the instrument of Yahweh's wrath against His people, (1:15; 5:15; 6:22, etc.). From his symbolic act of passing the cup of Yahweh's wrath among the various nations, (25:15 f), can be gathered the fact that he also believed that Yahweh would chastise the other equally culpable peoples. But, beyond these ideas, Jeremiah did not make any great advance, that is, in regard to the particular problem before us.

Contrary to the opinion of Kuenen and others, who deny to Amos or Isaiah an absolute monotheism, but date its inception

to the work of Jeremiah and the Deuteronomic reformers, it seems from our study that there is no such absolute monotheism even in Jeremiah, but that it remained for Deutero-Isaiah to enunciate this doctrine, together with its fullest implication, viz: the absolute non-existence of all other deities. (NOTE H).

Thus we see that, essentially, Jeremiah's doctrines were similar to those ~~of~~ which we have already treated; yet there is one significant advance in his teaching which leads just one step further along the pathway toward universalism. Whether it arose merely out of the theory of Isaiah's "righteous remnant" and Jeremiah's further application to the individual of this harmonization between the concepts of Amos' absolute justice and Hosea's infinite love, or whether it arose out of the mere fact that a remnant did actually remain, surviving the catastrophe, we cannot tell; but Jeremiah gave a more adequate and a more clearly defined portrayal of this remnant and its function in the future, than did any of his predecessors. To be sure, the present generation was valueless, they were the "rotten figs" of no use whatsoever (24:8 f) among whom "shall be sent the sword and the famine and the pestilence till they be consumed from off the land (ibid), but disregarding these destined to destruction, Jeremiah turned his eyes toward those who were carried away into exile. He saw in them the "good figs", the ones who after being cleansed and purified by the punishment to be inflicted upon them in the exile, would return to Yahweh with their whole

heart (24:5 f). The potter will have fashioned out of the ugly clay a new and more beautiful vessel (7:15-25). Because of the faith which Jeremiah places in this remnant composed of his few followers, but more especially because of his confidence in the punitive power of the exile, he "bids the people to possess their souls in patience, for the time of the restoration, though it will come surely, will not come soon. "With remarkable sagacity, he entreats them to put aside all thoughts of rebellion or vengeance and to settle down in the lands assigned to them."²⁸ In his letter to the exiles, he advised them to build houses and to dwell in them, to plant vineyards and to seek the welfare of the city within which they are held captive (29:5 f), and then after a long time had elapsed (the seventy years mentioned in 29:10 being merely a round number for an indefinite period), Yahweh would make a new covenant with Israel which, in its very nature would be indissoluble, for it would be inscribed upon the heart of the people, from the least of them unto the greatest of them and through this covenant Israel would once more become the people of Yahweh and He would be their God" (31:31-34).

There are some who conclude from this that this new covenant would no longer be confined to a single nation, but fitted and destined for 'many nations'²⁹ and "the teaching of³⁰ it would become needless, for it would be universally known.

28. Montefiore - HL, p. 207

29. Kuenen - NRUR, p. 156

30. Montefiore - HL, p. 221

Kautzsch finds in this new covenant "nothing less than a distinct breaking with the conception of the religion of Israel as a merely national religion, indissolubly connected with particular outward forms of the cultus, and, above all, with a particular land. The new covenant could blossom forth and bear fruit wherever an Israelite looked up to his god with a grateful and trustful heart. Thus the victory is finally won (says Kautzsch) over those particularistic features, nay features bordering upon nature religion which from early times had clung to the religion of Israel." ³¹ In essence Kautzsch is right. This doctrine of Jeremiah's, of a restored remnant dedicated to Yahweh in a new covenant, by which all will, innately or instinctively, "know Yahweh," without the necessity of first being taught (31:33), this together with his emphasis on individualism and a personal interpretation of religion, (springing out of his gropings toward the later perfected doctrine of individual responsibility) these things paved the way for the teachings of Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah, but even in such highly universalistic passages as are found in Chapters ³ Three (esp. v. 17) and ⁴ Four (v.2), a particularism bequeathed to him by the past is still present, and Israel's glorification is marked throughout, (esp. 3:17). If the passage in Chapter 16:19 ³² be by Jeremiah, as Dr. Battenwieser and others so strongly urge, then there is a most ~~far-reaching~~ universalism expressed in his writings. The whole passage, 16:10-18, 21, is generally conceded to be the product of later times and while it must be granted that

31. Kautzsch - HDB, p. 697b

32. Battenwieser - POI, p. 103 f.

16:19 is not relevant to these verses, still it is possible that it too crept into the text at a later time, for it reflects much more the thought of Deutero-Isaiah with his most emphatic denial of any other deity than it does that of Jeremiah who,

although seemingly a monotheist, is not so articulate in his presentation. Dr. Battenwieser, on the other hand, with Giesebrecht, maintains that it must have belonged originally to the confession 17:5-10, 14-18³³ and concludes from his reconstruction of this entire confession that "through it the prophet affirms his own reliance on God, his firm hope of the universal conversion of mankind."³⁴ This accords fully, according to the above-mentioned writer, with the same faith which the prophet had voiced elsewhere (4:2 ; 3:17). If this be true - and we cannot here enter so deeply into the problem - then Jeremiah's universalistic vision had, indeed, become infinitely broader than that of his predecessors, and it approached the ideal of Deutero-Isaiah. But such passages in Jeremiah are the exceptions rather than the rule, and thus did not issue from a clearly orientated universalism. It might be argued that they are the logical consequences of the rest of his prophecy and their mere occasional appearances suffices to substantiate this fact. Yet, in comparison with the clearly defined and self-consistent doctrine of Deutero-Isaiah it appears to be but an anticipation, but a glimpse of what the

33. Ibid

34. Ibid, p. 115

future promised. This much we can assuredly deduce from the presence of such passages: ³⁴ universalism that sought to extend Yahweh's revelation beyond the borders of Israel was struggling to the fore. The prophet felt its power and yet he had first to overcome that deeply rooted particularism with which it came into contact. Here it is that there becomes apparent and concretely visible that conflict which later became so important to the subsequent history. Universalism was in the ascension, but to say that the victory had been finally won over those particularistic features which from earliest times had clung to the religion of Israel, Kautzsch goes a step too far; for with regard to Jeremiah's prophecies, as we have analysed them, we cannot but conclude, with Montefiore, that "owing possibly to the exigencies of the age, the storm and stress period under which he lived and wrote, we find but small space allotted to the universal hopes and predictions. They are not wanting, but neither are they prominent nor numerous. The development of a national religion into a religion nearly universal was reserved for the great prophet of the exile." ³⁵

It remained for that mighty catastrophe to elicit a new vision and a new hope.

We are now well on the way toward that universalism. We have a remnant saved because of its individual righteousness; we have that righteous remnant restored to the favor of Yahweh, a universal ruler and disposer of all the earth (though not as yet the undisputed and sole deity); but we have not as yet

35. Montefiore - HL , p. 216

found adequately and consciously expressed any program for this remnant to perform toward the other nations; we have not as yet completely transcended the particularism of the past we are still primarily concerned only with Israel as Yahweh's people and Yahweh as Israel's God.

E. DEUTERONOMY.

But a few words will be necessary with regard to the religious progress relevant to our subject achieved by the Deuteronomic Code. It was a trenchant reformation designed to eradicate all local shrines and to introduce the worship of Yahweh as the sole deity; but in actuality it was not as purely monotheistic as some aver (cf. Note H) nor did it break through the limits of particularism to any greater degree than did the prophets who preceded it. Its god was universal (6:4), "a god of gods and lord of lords (10:17), having dominion over other nations (28:49), an אֱלֹהִים who admitted of no apostasy or infidelity. But there is in Deuteronomy, seemingly, no general purpose other than the extermination of idol worship and the bowing down before false gods; for this God, Yahweh, had chosen Israel as His own to transform it into a peculiar people, holy and just, loving God and following His teaching alone. "Israel's devotion to Yahweh must, therefore, be ceremoniously indicated by difference of rite and custom from the rites and customs of other races." ³⁶ While it might be

36. Montefiore - HL, p. 189.

inferred that this pronounced particularism was but for a larger purpose because of the broad, ethical and humanitarian principles (Note I) which appears as the fundamental factor in the worship of Yahweh (Deut. 24:15, 19; 16:12, Decalogue).
 § Such a program is not set forth in the book of Deuteronomy. Although we might make just such a deduction - if we may anticipate for a moment - with regard to the Priestly writers, it must be borne in mind that they followed both the exile, and the profound contribution to religious thought made by Deutero-Isaiah, the significance of which we shall point out later; and so, without being inconsistent, it can be affirmed at this juncture that the Deuteronomic writers did, in no wise, advance to a deeper or more profound stage of religious thinking than the one at which we have already arrived. Here, too, the conflict of ideas is apparent. Priestly and prophetic ideas, particularistic stringency and universalistic liberalism were both coming into the foreground. A practical religious program seeking to embody the theoretical idealism that had been enunciated, a conciliatory attempt to combine or to bring about an alliance between priestly and prophetic theories, to introduce a binding monotheistic conception of God, through a concrete code of law and that most far reaching of all reforms, the centralization of all ritual and worship at Jerusalem. But it did not, in reality, advance beyond the concept of a "holy nation, exalted above all others (26:19)" entirely devoted to its God, blameless in its relation to Him,

no
 section

worthy of its distinction as His Chosen People, but without any thought for the world beyond, without any broad universalistic tendency or ideal, for "it did not occur to the authors of Deuteronomy that it was the duty of Yahweh's people to spread the knowledge of Him beyond the borders of Israel or that this extended recognition, whether affected by Israel or not, was the ultimate justification ~~and~~ and aim of Israel's election and privilege. "Hinted at by the eighth century prophets, this highest and only moral view of Israel's peculiar position among the nations of the world was to be taken up and worked out some eighty years after Deuteronomy, by the great prophet of the exile."³⁷

We have quoted this passage at length because it is a most striking and apt resumé¹ not merely of the work of the Deuteronomists but of the progress of religious thought throughout the pre-exilic period. "Hinted at" but not "taken up and worked out", not followed/^{out,}not perfected are the phrases that might be applied to an estimation of the progress made toward universalism during these centuries. We have seen the beginning, (though not the end, as some maintain) of "that transformation of the only god of a single nation into the only god of the entire world;" we have also observed, first, the vaguest beginning of that "doctrine by which this single god of one people became the One God of all,"³⁸ but since the prophets, one

37. Ibid - p. 91

38. Ibid - p. 156 ff.

and all "foretold judgment, one and all believed that the effects of that judgment would be adequate and lasting," they had not as yet created a new ideal of their people's function and destiny among the other peoples of the world. Certain inconsistencies in their preaching, certain hints at a future service formed the foundation upon which their successors were to build. These hopes we may liken to those first faint glimmerings which precede the dawn. The inky coverlet of night had been penetrated by their piercing needles of light. Before the day was to break forth, resplendent and bright, the darkest hour - the hour of the exile - had first to elapse. To the events that ensued during that most tragic time we now turn.

CHAPTER THREE.

THE DARKEST HOUR.

THE EXILE : EZEKIEL.

A. BEFORE THE DESTRUCTION.

It has been said that the Deuteronomic Code sounded the death knell to the true spirit of prophecy (with the exception of the sporadic attempts, here and there, to revive it), and that henceforth the tendency arose to conventionalize and to stereotype religion, to place it wholly in the hands of the priests, and that with Deuteronomy and Ezekiel began that movement which led to the triumph of ritualism and legalism in the Priestly Code. We shall endeavor to demonstrate, however, that, except for certain aspects of his work, which sprang from his personality as a descendant of the Zadokite family of priests, and especially from the exigencies of his time, the teachings of Ezekiel were not a retrogression from the lofty conceptions of the pre-exilic prophets, but rather that they marked a distinct advance over the contributions of his predecessors, that he, too, built upon the foundations which they had laid; and that, although unable because of the tragic day in which he lived, to rise above a certain decided particularism, he did, none the less, make great headway toward that towering structure of universalism to which each of his predecessors had added his share of labor and effort, and to

which the finishing and perfecting touches were added by Deutero-Isaiah.

We need not here enter into a discussion as to whether his prophecies in Chapters 1-24 are but a "vaticinium post eventum" and that consequently the whole of his work represents one piece of unified writing prepared for careful and thoughtful study rather than for oral delivery,¹ or whether, on the other hand, they are his separate utterances delivered at the various times² upon which he himself has dated them, (20:1;8:1); for, in either event, our interpretation of Ezekiel's message would not be substantially effected, since it is with the ideas evoked by the actual destruction of the land of Judah that we are primarily concerned. It is following the unhappy turn of events in 586 that Ezekiel rises above the conceptions of his predecessors. Up to that time, his utterances (or his supposed utterances, from Dr. Battenwieser's point of view) are quite similar to those of the prophets that had gone before. Whether his fulminations were directed against the kingdom before its destruction, or represented as such merely as an object lesson to his fellow-sufferers in the exile, matters little for our purpose, for in either event, before the land was actually destroyed, he was (or represented himself to be) the prophet of doom, the denouncer; and it was only afterwards that he became the consoler and organizer. To him also, destruction was irrevocably decreed,

1. Battenwieser - Class Notes.

2. Toy - Ezekiel, p. 90; Davidson, Ez. p. XXIII.

(13:13; 9:10, etc.) because of Israel's perversion of justice and deeds of violence (22:6 ff), but more especially because of its worship of images and false gods (20:28; 8:10 ff), and its profanation of the Sabbath (20:11-13). Except for his emphasis on the people's shortcomings with regard to the cult and his failure to idealize the desert period (representing in his writings Israel as having been obstreperous from its very birth in Egypt 16:26 ff), except for these differences his early message does not differ radically from the pre-exilic prophets. Even the stress placed by him on cult and ritual transgressions is almost invariably accompanied by ethical malpractices (cf. esp. 18:5 ff, where the moral demands far outnumber the ceremonial, also 22:7 ff). Although his was a conception of Yahweh as being far more transcendental than that of the previous prophets, though He was a deity that could only be approached through the proper mediators and ritualistic observances, still, in the main, these ideas were more the result of Ezekiel's practical program of reform, exigent to meet the situation which confronted him, than they were a retrogression on his part. Certainly, he conceived of Yahweh as dwelling in the very midst of His people (45:35) and of His spirit poured forth upon them (37:14), which divine spirit became the "bond of union and communion between them and their God." (Note J). Although the means by which the people might approach their God differed from the innate communings of Jeremiah, still Yahweh was, to Ezekiel also, a

near, rather than a far-off god.

In addition to this, Yahweh was, even as in the writings of his predecessors, the all-powerful and omniscient sovereign of the world (1:15 ff)³ deciding not merely the destinies of Israel (20:5 ff) but of the other nations; Ammon (25:3); Moab (v8); Edom (v.12); Philistia (v.15); Tyre (26:2 ff) and even far-off Egypt (29:2 ff); in fact, he is the omnipotent ruler of the universe. Though Ezekiel does not posit the absolute non-existence of all other deities, but seems throughout all his prophecies to be vitally concerned with their apparent reality, still he does regard Yahweh as the god par excellence, majestic and august. Thus it can be seen that, with few exceptions, the burden of Ezekiel's message was quite similar to that of Jeremiah.

To be sure, there were, even then, faint hints of some of the doctrines upon which he later elaborated and by which he was to become quite distinct from his predecessors, but they were not as yet fully crystallized, nor adequately articulated. Despite the fact that he had prognosticated a thorough destruction, he too, like Isaiah before him, felt that some would "escape the sword among the nations when ye shall be scattered among the countries," (6:8; also 5:3), a remnant would be spared out of the siege. Although Jeremiah had seen in Isaiah's doctrine of the righteous remnant which Yahweh, in His justice and love, would rescue, the possibility of extending this

3. Toy - Ezekiel, p. 95 f.

principle even to the individual, it was Ezekiel who really applied it to the single personality and thus he was assured that only the soul that had sinned would die (18:4), that were such righteous men as Noah, Daniel, and Job then alive they alone would save themselves by their righteousness (14:13 ff). This expansion of Isaiah's conception of the righteous remnant into a more well-rounded individualism than even Jeremiah had reached, stood Ezekiel in good stead when once the doom had fallen, and it was then that he saw within it even further implications. But even in these earlier chapters can be seen his insistence that a remnant of righteous persons would be spared. In addition to this, he also already saw in the exile, perhaps because, through his own deportation he saw more clearly the actual situation, or because he had already perceived the deeper significance of his doctrine of individual responsibility in the idea that the wicked who "turn from their sins and execute justice and righteousness, shall not die, but live" (18:21); for whatever reason it may have been he discerned, in the exile, as did Jeremiah before him, only a chastening influence following which Yahweh "would gather them from the nations (even from Sodom and Samaria, [16:53 f]) and assemble them from the lands whither I have scattered them, then I will take away their heart of stone and give them a heart of flesh that they shall be My people and I will be their God" (11:17-21; also 20:33 -44). Ezekiel, at this time, also had faint glimmerings of that time when through the reestablishment of Israel to a greater glory than

it had ever before known "all the trees of the field (the nations of the world) shall be taught that I, Yahweh, abase the high tree and exalt the low tree" (17:22-24); We shall not discuss just now the significance of this passage, nor of the anticipations of the *לבו ינוב* idea to be found in these earlier chapters (esp. ch. 20), for it was only in the latter part of the book that they were fully set forth as his definite doctrines and ideas; but it can be seen that already Ezekiel had made some progress over his predecessors, though his message is quite similar to that of Jeremiah. The doom must come. Even were such well-known intercessors as Noah, Daniel, and Job alive, they would "save neither son nor daughter..... but themselves alone (14:20). But already Ezekiel had greater assurance that the destruction could not be final, but would lead to a restoration and an everlasting covenant with Yahweh, (16:60 f); already he seems to possess, as we hope to prove, a more clearly rounded and definite conception of universalism than did any of the inspired preachers who preceded him.

B: DURING THE EXILE.

But it was with the last deportation in 586, when the flower of the inhabitants of Judah were carried away into Babylon, that the turning point in Ezekiel's teachings came. In our summary review of the pre-exilic prophets we did not pause to examine the social and political conditions of their day (important as this be for a complete and thorough comprehension of their individual messages) because we were primarily concerned

with the religious progression, or retrogression, with regard to the ideas of universalism and particularism. It is necessary, however, in order to understand the teachings of Ezekiel, to cast our eyes, fleeting as the glimpse must be, over the scene that confronted this prophet in the years immediately following the destruction of the Temple in 586. Although we know, from other records, that the capture of the country and the deportation of some of its inhabitants did not leave the country depopulated; still, among those poorer classes who remained behind in a land that had been war-ridden for so many years, and also among those who were carried far away from their homeland, both the material and the spiritual outlook must have been at an exceedingly low ebb. Although the prophets' message had been fulfilled, which fact might have won over the people to the truth of their entire teaching, the actual result of that final blow was quite the antithesis of such expectations. We have already seen how hopeless the prophets were of weaning their contemporaries away from their many religious delusions. The people were too deeply rooted in their superstitious beliefs and primitive notions ever to appreciate the "prophets' conception of God and religion which presupposed a larger measure of ethical capacity than the majority possessed."⁴ They were spiritually deaf, dumb, and blind and not "even an event of such significance as the fall of Jerusalem, establishing as it did the truth of Jeremiah's (and for that matter, also of the other prophets') predictions of the moral supremacy

4. Montefiore - HL , p. 224.

of the God in whose name he had uttered them, was able to precipitate an⁴ ethical transformation." If, as we have pointed out, the prophets had not yet advanced to an absolute and unmitigated monotheism, what might we have expected of their idolatrous contemporaries? Surely, if they had risen above henotheism, it could not have been farther than a nascent monolatry, which yet conceived of Yahweh as dwelling in their midst, and, especially since the Deuteronomic Reformation, in the sanctuary at Jerusalem. But even this was most probably far beyond their understanding, as might be seen by the failure of Deuteronomy and the persistence of primitive Canaanitish survivals. Thus, most likely the apprehension of the prophets had come to pass (Amos 8:11 f; Is. 28:19; Jer. 14:18). The people were completely paralyzed by the thunderous bolt that had crashed down upon them. Stunned by the severity of the blow, they were steeped in darkness, wandering from sea to sea, unable to find their god, whom they identified with their land, now laid waste. Even had they retained their faith in Him, they could not worship Him properly on foreign soil, (Note K), for, much as religion had developed by this time, surely this idea of the universality of Yahweh had not yet penetrated the masses. Although they may have become somewhat reconciled to the prophets, since their words had been fulfilled, although they were on seemingly more friendly terms with their seers (as evidenced by Jeremiah's letters, for example), still it is highly questionable whether they as yet comprehended the profundity of their message, so ill-understood even in our present day. Certain new ideas may have occurred to them, as

is apparent from their concern regarding retributive justice and their dissatisfaction with the old standards (Ez. 18:1 ff), still they had as yet no understanding of the universal nature of their god. Although many ^N forced by the exigencies of their time to seek some mode of worship even on foreign soil, rather than desert Yahweh altogether (cf. Note K), still a great number must have "bowed to the ground in Mourning, void of knowledge (of Yahweh)" (Jer. 14:18). For, to the vast majority, even the observance of Sabbath and circumcision, now the only possible distinguishing marks of Israel as a people different from the nations among whom they dwelt, even these rites could not suffice. To them the cult was still of primary importance. Heretofore, if defeated in battle because of Yahweh's wrath, they had but to placate Him by increasing their oblations and renewing their zeal in bringing sacrifices, but now in this "unclean land" even this was denied them. Besides this inability to worship Yahweh properly from their point of view, there was little use of so doing even were the opportunity available. An impotent deity He had proved Himself to be, for He had been defeated by some power stronger and mightier than He. Especially was this fact recognized by Israel's surrounding neighbors and their taunts and sneers were even more difficult to bear than their grief and terror over the loss of their nation (25:5; 26:2; 34:29). These peoples, since the early times, but especially since Israel had adopted a policy of aloofness and separation (about the time of Isaiah), had despised Israel for its vaunted

boastings as to the supremacy of Yahweh and the sufficiency of reliance on Him alone and now, in mocking accents, they derided those who had survived the carnage: "Aha," they said, "when my sanctuary was profaned" (25:5; 26:2); scornfully did they proclaim Yahweh's impotence before the gods of their conquerors and now, at last, they ironically remarked, Israel had become "like the nations roundabout" (25:8), in nowise better than they. In consideration of all this, it was small wonder that these despairing people should see no alternative but to "become like the nations, serving wood and stone" (20:32). Thus, for these two reasons: the inability on foreign soil to translate their devotion and belief in Him into those acts and visible ceremonials which they believed were requisite and the apparent futility of maintaining an allegiance to such a powerless and impotent deity, these two elements made it a period of much skepticism and confronted the prophet Ezekiel with the problem of revitalizing their waning faith in Yahweh.

And finally, as Montefiore points out, even had they retained complete faith in the power and justice of Yahweh, and that the exile was the "legitimate result of present and personal iniquity," their hope was gone, for it was now too late to repent. "The vital sap was gone from Israel."⁵ Their bones were dry, their hope was lost, they were ruined. (Ezek. 37:11). A national resurrection which, with their old idea of tribal solidarity and tribal responsibility, was the only thing to which they could aspire, and this restoration

5. Ibid, p. 228

was quite beyond their mental purview. For these reasons, outlined above, it was a rather dark and gloomy situation which Ezekiel faced in the years following that great national disaster: "helpless despair;" faith in their God destroyed, "rebellious murmur," and idolatrous apostasy With this lugubrious picture before our mind, let us turn to the actual work of the prophet.

Realizing the reactions of his contemporaries, their religious delusions and their present despair as watchmen to the House of Israel (33:7), he set himself the task of restoring their faith in Yahweh, and imbuing them with new trust in the future. To do this he had first of all to preach a message of optimism, of faith, of hope. Facing the actual desolation of his people, he realized more than his predecessors ever could have appreciated, that he must do much more than merely upbraid the populace for their shortcomings, either past or present. It was imperative that he fill them with faith in a definite and concrete and tangible future. The doom could not be the terminus ad quem of his prophecies. He must have envisaged for his dejected contemporaries a glorious vision of the restored nation. If Ezekiel was only the prophet of unrestrained particularism, and we shall endeavor to refute this commonly held point of view, then it was because he was compelled to be just that. As an ideal teacher, as the perfect pedagogue, he had to place himself on a level with his people, he had to begin with their own popular conceptions,

to start with the foundation of their own beliefs. Though it was a dangerous procedure to build upon such shifting sands, it was his only alternative. The apathy, or rather the opposition which had greeted his predecessors, was adequate proof of that. It was futile to attempt to impart anything without first considering the apperceptive mass of his hearers' minds. If this be remembered, then we will understand better the work and inspiration of this true descendant of that galaxy of religious genius who preceded him.

Had Yahweh proved Himself impotent in the eyes of His own nation and of the nations round about ? Then He would vindicate His reputation by proving in the sight of all the world that He was yet a powerful and mighty ruler. The prophet was already convinced of the universal dominion of Yahweh, (supra p.52), but it was to a deluded mass that he addressed his words and this was one means of assuring them that Yahweh had not failed them; that He had not deserted His people, but above all, that He was not an impotent deity. "For the sake of His Name," in order to reestablish His former reputation, now profaned and despised, (36:20), He would take His people from the "nations and gather them from all countries and bring them into their own land." (36:24). We have already found anticipations of this idea in Ezekiel's earlier chapters (20:4, ff, etc.), but with what greater stress and emphasis does he enunciate it here, now that Israel is actually destroyed, an object of scorn and derision in the eyes of the nations roundabout (25:8). Over and over again, in this chapter, does

he reiterate this doctrine of למען שמו (v11, v17, etc.),
 "Israel, dispersed and scattered among the nations
 whither they went... caused My Name to be profaned, in that
 men said, 'these are the people of Yahweh, and are come out of
His land' and then I took pity on My sacred Name which
 the House of Israel caused to be profaned..... therefore,
 say to the House of Israel, 'Thus says the Lord Yahweh. Not
 for your sake do I act, O House of Israel but for My
 sacred Name which ye have made profane. I shall make sacred
 My great Name,' " by restoring Israel and by renewing His covenant
 with them (36:16-32; 37:21 ff, etc.).

The prophet does not condone the sins of the people nor
 has Yahweh overlooked them. Little as they merit redemp-
 tion, much as the people realize that their redemption is
 remote, that their bones are dry and their hope is gone, the
 prophet assured them - and to his contemporaries his argument
 must have been extremely cogent - that Yahweh must restore
 His people. Not for their sake, sinful, wretched generation
 that they were, with but few desirous truly to repent; not
 for their sakes, but in order to ~~exonerate~~ His reputation
 which had been so sneeringly impugned; it is in order that
 Israel and the nations shall know that I am Yahweh - great,
 powerful, universal God (28:24-26; 37:13; 35:15; 34:27, etc.).

In this way alone, it seems to us, could the prophet
 reestablish the people's faith and reinsure their allegiance
 to Yahweh, which was the first step requisite for the rest
 of his teachings. In this way did he convince his hearers
 that, despite all appearances, Yahweh would arise to make good

His claim to supremacy. Nor did the prophet doubt his own words. Firmly convinced was he, though for other reasons, perhaps, that Israel would be restored, for he had elaborated Jeremiah's incipient individualism into a clearly defined statement of the doctrine. But Ezekiel did not stop with the mere assurance of a restoration. He was too practical and far-sighted for that. Once restored to Yahweh's favor as evidenced by a return to their own land, which was the only proof positive that would dispel all the doubts, in both their own and the other peoples' minds (34:27-29), what means then could guarantee their future allegiance to Him? In order to maintain this new loyalty, Ezekiel formulated a positive program for the people. It is in this program (chapters 40-48) that Ezekiel's particularism is most clearly portrayed, for therein we find that Israel's restoration is for the purpose of reestablishing that peculiar relationship between Yahweh and Israel which had been emphasized and reemphasized from the very dawn of its history as a nation. Ezekiel seizes almost every means at his command to insure the permanency of this union between the people of Yahweh and the God of Israel. Again he keeps in mind the views of the people, for he is the practical teacher, the efficient pedagogue. Although the prophets, beginning with Isaiah, had used the term **קדוש** with a new and highly ethical interpretation and implication, Ezekiel, employing the term throughout his writings, reverts, however, to its old and physical connotation. Israel becomes **קדוש ליהוה**, and Yahweh becomes **קדוש לישראל**.

he assumes the rôle of ~~שׂוֹמֵר~~ ^{שׂוֹמֵר} and Israel is the ~~שׂוֹמֵר~~ ^{שׂוֹמֵר} ~~Israel~~, uniquely and peculiarly related to its God, Yahweh, by a physical and tangible bond, by a mysterious tabu which separated them from the rest of the world. This idea was easily comprehended by the people among whom the primitive conceptions of physical cleanliness and uncleanness, of sacred and profane, of tabu, were still deeply imbedded. Thus, ^{and} thus alone could the prophet have appealed to a people who had failed completely to understand the supreme idealism of his predecessors. And, being of a priestly family, he realized all the more the value of the ritual in the lives of the people. To be sure, he might have argued with the other prophets that the cult did but blind the people to the moral demands of religion, and was therefore but a stumbling block. But he recognized, on the contrary, that if he could in any way impress his generation with the actual ethical demands of Yahweh which, as we shall eventually see was far from ignored by Ezekiel, he could do so only by compromising on this point. To all the nations of antiquity the worship of God had no greater significance than the cult. "To whatever literature of ancient times we turn we see that religion was identified with ritual and sacrifices and that in these the whole religious life centered ... a view which, notwithstanding the teachings of the prophets, is also found in the Talmud." ⁶ (Mish Taanith IV). The prophets, like Ibsen's Brand, had demanded "all or nothing," and as we have already observed, they secured the latter. Ezekiel, confronted by the actual danger of apostasy and assimilation, knew that in the people's mind sacrifices were

the "medium by which man might enter into, or renew his communion with the deity,"⁶ and realizing that to reiterate the prophets' denunciation of the cult would be disastrous, he instituted an elaborate ritualistic system, as a practical means of securing and maintaining the peoples' allegiance to Yahweh. In no other way could he lift the people from that lower level to the higher ethical principles to which, we are certain, it was also his purpose to exalt them.

As the people were convinced that it was a false worship of Yahweh, as well as an idolatrous worship of other gods, that had brought about their dispersion, Ezekiel, "from a priestly point of view, and with a love for temple ceremonial, not shared by Amos or Isaiah, sketched a plan by which in the Israel of the Golden Age, every semblance of idolatry might be avoided and Yahweh might dwell once more within His chosen home."⁷ Thus, the last nine chapters of his book are devoted entirely to the external organization of the temple and land, with its elaborate ritual and purificatory processes.

In these same chapters there occurs that pronounced particularism which has blinded many to the universalistic elements which we feel are also to be discovered in Ezekiel's writings. But, from this plan for the restored nation, it is quite obvious that he stressed far more than did any of his predecessors, the unique and peculiar relationship

6. Battenwieser - POI, p. 314 f.

7. Montefiore - HL, p. 255

between Yahweh and Israel; that he sought to safeguard this sacred covenant by every means possible, by the minutiae of an elaborate cult and ritual. It is evident also that his chief aim was the preservation of Yahweh's sanctity and his highest aspiration, apparently, the restoration and exaltation of Israel to even greater glory than it had known before. An examination of these chapters reveals also an extreme exclusivism even to the extent of ousting the foreign servants, the menial ministrants of the Temple, and the supplanting of them by the Levites (44:6). From his people's ranks, now no longer a mere nation, but a religious entity with certain beliefs and distinct practices (viz.: the belief in Yahweh as the sole deity, in His Omnipotence, the practice of circumcision, the Sabbath, etc.), he excludes from this "Congregation of Israel" (קהל ישראל) all the uncircumcised, denying them the right to enter the sanctuary of Yahweh (44:9) and what is by far more harsh and cruel, in the light of those times, he dooms them to an inferior position in Sheol (31:18; 32:17 ff).⁸ His pronouncements against the other nations because of their hostility to Yahweh's elect are most virulent, and his vision of the new Jerusalem and the rebuilt Temple as the center of the earth (38:12) in which Yahweh was henceforth to dwell (43:7 ff; 48:35) are markedly chauvinistic. Here Yahweh was to rule over His people (34:2 ff; 37:22). At first he had had the idea of an earthly

8. Toy - Ezekiel, p. 162, Note (18)

monarch, descended from David (17:22-24; 34-23), but with his growing opposition to (the) royalty, he found them culpable for the sins of his people (34:9) and looked to Yahweh as the supreme and sole ruler of Israel. The temporal sovereign would be but a prince among them (34:24) whose chief function seemed to collect taxes for the Temple services, and of guaranteeing the regular performance of the cultus and of providing the proper offerings for this purpose (45:13 ff). All these are particularistic elements that are incontrovertible; but, did he merely retrogress to a primitive separatism, or did he too have glimpses of the prophetic ideas of universalism even amid this maze of meticulous detail; did he seek to harmonize the growing idealism of the prophets before him with that particularism which was the necessary product of the time in which he dwelt?

In our opinion, those who affirm only Ezekiel's particularism lay altogether too much stress on the last nine chapters of his writing and are either wholly oblivious to much that is contained in the major portion of his work, or they regard it as a mere appendage hardly worthy of mention. Ezekiel, however, was undoubtedly too great a figure to be used to illustrate but this single tendency. There are some who, with Duhm, summarize his teachings as contributing not a "single new idea of religious or ethical value" and that in Ezekiel's new Jerusalem there is no longer anything that has to do with prophetic religion, but we already breathe

the air of Judaism and the Talmud." ⁹ To contravert this opinion, one has but to examine his writings, outside of his legislation for the future state, and one will find that, although he built upon foundations already laid for him, still he did advance beyond the concept of universalism held by his predecessors, and thus he was their true spiritual descendant.

What, then, was the purpose of all this legislation, of all these external enactments, and of this glorious future state? In the first place, in regard to the individuals, did it mean that henceforth every individual would merely concern himself with Temple ceremonial and have no other duties in life but those of worship and ritual purity? Was their whole life to be merged in the service of the Temple? Only if we arbitrarily separate these last nine chapters from the rest of the book can we maintain such a point of view. What are those statutes of life, the doing of which would be the mark of that new heart and that new spirit which repentance and God's grace would win for Israel at last? They include, on the one hand, the avoidance of idolatry, but otherwise they are exclusively ethical. What must I do to be saved? Ezekiel answers: "Serve Yahweh only; be just, be pitiful; be chaste! 'Oppress no one, restore the pledge, commit no pillage, give bread to the hungry, clothe the naked, execute true judgment between man and man, (14:6 ff)..... he is right,' saith

9. Duhm - *Theologie der Propheten*, pp. 252 - 263.
Quoted in Montefiore - *HL*, p. 240

Yahweh"; while even in the midst of his particularistic legislation (40-48) he requires of the prince that above all he must rule in absolute justice (45:9-12)¹⁰" Except for his previous and pragmatic emphasis of the cult, his program does not differ from the old prophetic preachments - to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly before God. His legalism predominates, it is true, but only because he had realized through his close contact with the people, that the prophetic program of "seek good and not evil" had not sufficed. Righteousness and justice were not enough. Ezekiel worked with and through the individuals, for it was through his extension of this doctrine, foreshadowed in Jeremiah, that he perceived the seed from which would blossom forth an Israel, rejuvenated and restored. It was this idea, this faith in the individual, rather than those doctrines adopted for purely expedient purposes that gave Ezekiel such confidence in the possibilities of the future and it was this emancipation of the individual soul from the old collective or tribal responsibilities which was perhaps his greatest contribution to the religious thought and life of his times. He turned the gaze of the individual from the past sins, which he felt that he had inherited from his forefathers and for which he was held responsible. He lifted from his shoulder also the burden of what he considered his own irremedial transgressions, that he might see with him the vision of the dried up bones

10. Montefiore - HL, p. 256

once more revived and reborn. In his own mind this must have been the paramount idea; and although to the people he had to appeal through his doctrine of *law yms* and his compromise on ritual and rite, still we must agree with one of his commentators that it was "in this profound concept, reached through such reflection as the downfall of the State, leaving now no place for religion, except in the soul, or in the sentiments, expressed by the men around him," it was in this hope which he held out to his contemporaries, this hope that he extended to the individual that if he ~~did~~ but repent

of his evil ways, he would be forgiven and his nation restored, (33:11 ff); it was in this concept that his greatest contribution lay and that he found the true *raison d'être*

for the restoration.¹¹ "In these faithful few Ezekiel saw the genesis of a new commonwealth in which Israel's true ideal would be reached."¹² But, in order to attain to this ideal, he had first to give these individuals a concrete and (to them) comprehensible means of attaining their redemption through Yahweh. The ritual was the means but their understanding of his ethical demands was his hoped for end (18:7; 24:6, etc.) This, then, was his purpose with regard to the individual.

And with regard to the nation? Here, too, his aim was but an extension of this principle. Out of his concept of individual repentance and of forgiveness, grew a similar

11. Davidson - Ezekiel, LI

12. Smith - ROI , p. 205

application of it to the State. Yahweh was to restore His people for the sake of His reputation, to be sure, but also for a deeper and more spiritual reason. "Like a shepherd seeks out his flock when the sheep are dispersed," (34:11), so Yahweh, because of His great love for Israel ever since its very birth (16:6 ff) would seek out His flock and deliver them from all the places whither they had been scattered. Not merely for the sake of His Name, but for a larger purpose would Yahweh do all this. He would redeem Israel; He would go to such extremes as to destroy the nations round about, even wreaking vengeance upon all the hosts gathered together under Gog (Chapts. 38-39) for a loftier reason than the mere reestablishment of His reputation. This great and final victory by Yahweh, achieved even after the nation will have been restored and which, as Toy points out, does not appear as very far off, but that it seems to be an event prophesied for the near future, even as being synchronous with the restoration to Palestine, that it might serve as the main means of leading Israel to a true knowledge of Yahweh.¹³ And all of this is not for Israel's sake, not merely for the sake of Yahweh's Name, but rather that "they shall know that I am Yahweh." (38:23; 39:7, etc.).

Now, at first glance, this phrase seems to imply the same as does the idea of *mo ym*, the mere acknowledgment on the part of the other nations of Yahweh's power

13. Toy - Ezekiel, p. 176, Note (18)

or even supremacy over the other gods, still its constant use in relation to Israel as well as to the other peoples, and also its occurrence in a rather different phrasing, such as: למען דעת הגוים אותי בהקדשיך בעיניהם which Toy translates as follows: "in order that the nations shall learn what I am when, through thee, I manifest Myself to them as worthy of reverence"(38:16). This verse seems to imply a deeper and broader connotation. We have already observed what the idea of "knowing God" or "knowledge of Yahweh" really connotes (cf. Note F), and it is not unlikely that this is what Ezekiel's aspiration actually was. As Davidson points out, "the words mean more than that those addressed shall learn that it is Yahweh who inflicts the judgment or confers the blessing upon them; they mean that they shall learn the nature of Him who is dealing with them."¹⁴ And to know the nature of a god is to know his requirements and demands. The nation knowing of Him as the greatest of the gods, as would be demonstrated by His renewed manifestations, recognizing Him as the all-powerful and even sole deity ... since this too would be proved to the nations who doubted His supremacy,- to do all this were ipso facto to acknowledge Him as their god also and to seek His way. Otherwise, the constant use of the phrase "and they shall know that I am Yahweh" would mean very little, especially since the same words are applied to Israel, who acknowledged Him but did not worship Him. Israel, through its redemption, was to

14. Davidson - Ezekiel, p. XXVIII

become thoroughly convinced that Yahweh is God, but surely this would not suffice; this would not satisfy Yahweh. Learning that He is God and God alone, it became incumbent upon Israel to worship Him, and hence the chapters 40-48, for this is what Yahweh required. Can it not be deduced therefrom that the same is true of Ezekiel's attitude toward the other nations? To be sure, to effect this grand, final triumph of Yahweh, much cruel and brutal destruction would first have to ensue. But even as Israel had to be destroyed, even as other nations, as viewed by the other prophets also, had to be ravaged for not acknowledging or truly revering Yahweh, so in Ezekiel, Yahweh would have to prove by His might, and here again he speaks in the only language comprehended by his hearers, His right to be worshipped by all. And although Ezekiel might have gone still further by showing just how the nations, now acknowledging Yahweh's supremacy and seeking to worship Him, might secure the necessary knowledge, he does not follow out his own theory to its logical conclusion. By implication, we might say that this people consecrated to Yahweh, with His spirit upon them, were to become the exponents of His will to the world. But to do so would be to take much for granted. Israel had not yet become the active agent of God, His minister to mankind, but Israel most assuredly seems to be Yahweh's passive instrument, His DIVAS SIX through which His reputation would eventually reach all peoples, and through whom His worship would be extended to all nations.

An apt summary of this general plan is to be found in Davidson's

Introduction to Ezekiel: "He who knows Himself as God alone has become historically the God of Israel, has begun His revelation to the world thus, and will thus carry it to an end, till He is known to all the earth. Therefore, He cannot destroy Israel, for this would undo the first step of His great purpose, already taken, and efface from the minds of the nations the knowledge which they have of Him, which they have received by His redemption of His people in their sight... The prophets' ideal is a large one and might comprehend more than he fills into it. It is that God's revelation of Himself is historical, that He becomes the God of one people, with whose destinies His Name is linked, that His rule of this people in their history, its progress and final issues, the way He leads them and that into which He at last fashions them is His revelation of Himself to the eyes of mankind."¹⁵

To this very conclusion our studies also have led us. In Ezekiel there is a most pronounced particularism, a most rigid and rigorous ritualism, but which we have felt were due primarily to his practical program and necessary compromise with the limited mental and spiritual capacity of his contemporaries. But he did not rest content with this alone. A universal ideal was still struggling to the fore; and although a full and adequate expression of the doctrine is not to be found as yet in his writings, still the dilemma which has ever since confronted Israel's teachers, faced him also.

15. Ibid - p XLI f

He conceived, on the one hand, of Israel as the "עַמּוּל", as His perpetually peculiar and particular people, His unique property, but His property only that He might use them in the furtherance of His own pursuits, which included the reestablishment of His reputation and the acknowledgment of His power by all mankind. Nor this alone, for mere acknowledgment did not suffice for any god. He had also to be served and worshipped by all who now look upon Him as the great and Almighty God. Nations would through His unprecedented manifestation come to know Him, and knowing Him, they would seek to understand His way, His requirements and demands. So powerful a deity would have to be revered by all. Thus, Ezekiel has grasped both ideas and approached a harmonization of them by conceiving of Israel as Yahweh's peculiar people, His holy nation for whose benefit He manifests His supreme power, but only that through His deeds in behalf of His nation, they may become a "correction and a sign" or a symbol of warning and admonition (5:10) to all the peoples of the earth, that they too might seek Him. Whether all mankind would then enjoy the same relationship is seemingly not considered nor adequately answered by Ezekiel. Only this much is certain: he was struggling with the problem. He attempted a solution in the conception of Israel as Yahweh's elect, His chosen instrument, trained and instructed in His way, through whom might be extended to all peoples the "knowledge" of Him, in the fullest implications of this term.

The flame kindled by Isaiah's doctrine of faith and

its concomitant, the "righteous remnant", by Jeremiah's nascent individualism and future covenant, illuminated Ezekiel's path and led him on through the dense night of the exile. The darkest hour was passing. The moment of dawn was nigh.

CHAPTER FOUR.

THE DAWN OF UNIVERSALISM.

A. DEUTERO-ISAIAH.

It was about the middle of the 6th century when streaks of light began to appear over the darkened horizon in Israel. In the rise of Cyrus, his revolt against Media (549 B.C.) and his conquest of Lydia (546), the downfall of Babylon was imminent and the redemption of Israel seemed nigh. After making himself master of Sardis and the kingdom of Croesus, Cyrus, with his victorious armies, turned toward Babylon, which country had allied itself with Lydia, Egypt and Sparta (547). Little resistance could be offered to this mighty conqueror by the weak and vacillating Nabonnedos, so in the year 538 Cyrus entered in triumph the capitol of Babylonia where he was enthusiastically proclaimed the monarch of that land.

With this "great and bloodless victory achieved,"¹ new hope was born to the exile. Light seemed to be breaking forth all about them. Yahweh's deliverance, promised by the prophets after their purgation in exile, seemed at hand. Even before the fall of Babylon, therefore, the "early successes of the Persians, foreshadowing the fall of Babylonia, heralded Israel's restoration and was thus a prelude to the golden age." Glowing anticipations and rash national promises must have characterized the thought and perhaps some of the writings of this time. (Is. 21:1-10; 13:2-14:1-23) (Note I).

1. Montefiore - HL, p. 261

But the religious genius of Israel was not limited to visions such as these. In one master mind, at any rate, the approach of Cyrus gave the impulse to a "wider doctrine and a grander theodicy." In the preachments of Deutero-Isaiah also this new hope is kindled, these glowing enthusiasms and fervent anticipations are to be found. He too sees in Cyrus the redeemer of his people; he sees in his conquest (whether impending or accomplished need not be considered here) the end of the exile of his people. But his contribution, his religious genius lay in the fact that he saw much farther and deeper than this. He saw in the restoration to follow that broad and universal extension of Yahweh's worship to all the nations of the earth. He gave definite form and concrete expression to that ideal to which the prophets preceding him had but aspired.

The starting point of our discussion of Deutero-Isaiah's writings ought to be his god conception, for it is from his absolute and perfect monotheism that much of his inspiration flows. To be sure, it cannot be definitely ascertained whether he believed that because Yahweh would perform all this, He must be necessarily the cause of all other things, or, on the other hand, that because Yahweh is the cause of all things, He must also achieve this signal victory. There are allusions to both ideas in his writings, indicative of the prophet's profound processes of thought. By whatever logic or inspiration it came to him, however, it seems that the former idea is the more prominent. Because Yahweh is the sole ruler of

the universe, the Creator of all that exists, the One who fore-knows and fore-ordains all the events of history, - because He is a god, Absolute and One, it is He that has arisen to redeem His people. Thus, the proper point of departure is the prophet's monotheism. He is the first of the prophets to deny, categorically and emphatically, the existence of all other deities save Yahweh. (Note H). Again and again, he repeats the formula: "I am the Lord^g, -there is none else." (45:18;21; 46:9; 44:6,8, etc.). Even as the phrase "That they may know that I am Yahweh" became the shibboleth of Ezekiel's utterances, ~~so~~ does this negation of all other divinities assume like proportions in Deutero-Isaiah. Yahweh is the first and the last (44:6) before Him there was no god formed and none shall come after Him (43:10). For this reason, the prophet's most bitter invective is directed against those who allege the existence of other gods, thus differing from the earlier prophets who had merely denounced the worship of other deities as a sinful transgression of the mandate "ye shall have no other gods beside me." Bitingly and ironically does he ridicule the manufactured articles which they call gods, regarding the "whole process as theoretically and intrinsically absurd." The fashioning of a log of wood, part of which has been used for fuel, into an idol to be worshipped is, to this prophet, not merely a transgression of Yahweh's statutes, but the height of folly and self-delusion (44:9-20). In this wise, does Deutero-Isaiah advance beyond his

predecessors' terminology even of "non entity" (אֵלִים, אֱלֹהִים), for idol worship is to him nought but a reductio ad absurdum of the whole concept of deity. Therefore he calls Israel as witnesses to prove that these things which the people term gods are but as nought and their work as vanity (41:22-24). Here we have not merely the affirmation of Yahweh as the sole god of the universe, but also the most direct and convincing negation of the other gods, both of which are necessary to assume an absolute, unconditioned monotheism.

Since Yahweh is the sole divinity, He must also be the creator of the universe and of all life therein. Some divine power must have fashioned the world, and since Yahweh alone is divine, then who else could it have been, if not Yahweh? "Lift up your eyes on high and see who has created the heavens and stretched them out, who but Yahweh the creator of all things," the אֱלֹהִים (44:24). Since there are no other gods, since He is the Lord (, יְהוָה 42:5) then He alone could have "created the heavens and stretched them out, who expanded the earth and brought forth the produce thereof.... who gave soul to humankind and spirit to those that walk thereon" (42:5; 40:12, 26), and, "who" (in contrast to the Persian dualism which must have been pressing its way westward at this time), "forms light and creates darkness, who makes peace, (welfare, and right), and creates evil" (45:7), "to whom the nations are but as a drop in the bucket and considered as grain in the balance" (40:15). He is the sole deity to whom none can be likened, (40:18, 25), the supreme ruler of the universe, who "bringeth

princes to nought and who maketh the judges of the earth as nothingness." (40:23). Since He is the creator of all these things, He is also able to preordain all that will come to pass (44:7 ; 48:3) and in this His superiority really lay. (41:21-3). His ability to prognosticate the events of history as proved by Israel's (~~also 40:12, 26~~), past (43:9 ff); and also by the present prediction that Israel is soon to be restored through the instrumentality of Persia's conquest of Babylonia (48:14), by means of "His bird of prey summoned from the East" (46:11). Since He is the omniscient and omnipotent ruler of the universe, all things must necessarily come to pass in accordance with His will. This fact is implied in the omniscience and omnipotence. A divine teleology is the inescapable corollary to these doctrines which are so fundamental to his conception of Yahweh. To him, all the scenes of history, - past, present, and future - represent but the gradual unfolding of Yahweh's great drama of life. Nothing occurs except it be in accord with this purpose, all of which is expressed in the term **ṭṭs** (Note M). Since everything is in accordance with Yahweh's purpose, then everything must be proved eventually to be just or right (**ṭṭs**), for some ultimate good. The prophet's message now is clarified. Yahweh, the universal God, has chosen Israel (41:8; 43:4; 46:3), He has delivered them from Egypt; He had exiled them to a foreign land (42:24; 47:6), but now He is about to restore them. All this is but for a definite and preconceived

purpose. Not for their sakes, blind (42:19) and uncomprehending (42:25), sinful and recalcitrant people as they are, but for His own sake Yahweh will defer His anger and refrain from cutting them off (48:9,11). Although, at first, in his enthusiasm to comfort his despairing brethren, Deutero-Isaiah speaks of Israel as meriting this redemption, as having been completely purged by a double portion of punishment (40:2), still the general tenure of his message is that they have "burdened Yahweh with their sins and wearied Him with their transgressions," and yet, in spite of all their iniquities, for His own sake He will blot out their transgressions and remember their sins no more (43:24 f). Though Israel still goes astray, Yahweh will not forget His eternal covenant with Israel, for it is not as easy for Yahweh to reject Israel as for a man to give his wife a bill of divorcement (50:1). Yahweh made this covenant with Israel, Yahweh summoned Israel to His service at its very birth (49:1) for a certain purpose, and now, despite its faithlessness, in order that His divine plan may be fulfilled, Yahweh will pour forth upon them His spirit which, like "water poured forth upon thirsty land or streams upon dry ground will cause them to spring up as willows beside the water brooks" (44:3 f)

What, then, is this purpose for which Yahweh has chosen Israel, for which He is to restore His people despite its manifest shortcomings? Even were no definite and clearly articulate statement of this to be found in Deutero-Isaiah's

writings, the nature of Yahweh's doings might easily be deduced. A god who directs the destinies of mankind at large toward some future preconceived goal could not have selected one particular group whimsically or idly. It could not have been a caprice on His part, but He must have chosen Israel only to become the means, the instrument by which He might fulfill this purpose with mankind. The mere correlation of these two ideas of Yahweh's universal purpose and His choice of Israel, would suffice to prove this fact. But such reasoning is quite superfluous, for the writings of this prophet abound in passages which clearly and directly answer our query as to the nature of this divine purpose.

In one respect Deutero-Isaiah's reply resembles that given by Ezekiel, for he accepts at first the latter's doctrine of *נחם* *לעמ*. Because of the calamities which befell Israel, first with regard to Egypt and now with regard to Babylonia, Yahweh's name has been blasphemed (52:4-5; cf. Ezek. 32:21), and therefore he must contend with Babylon for His name's sake (48:9), in order that all flesh shall know that "I, the Lord, am He who saved thee, thy Redeemer, the Mighty One of Jacob" (49:24). Here we have the same idea which characterized Ezekiel's writings, that Yahweh, because of this act of grace, unmerited by His sinful and spiritually blinded people (43:22; 42:19,22) but necessitated by the exigencies of the times, will restore the exiles to their lands, will convert the devastated country once more into a rich and

fertile country, too narrow even for all its inhabitants (49:19) in order that Yahweh will glorify Himself through Israel (44:23)

Even in this doctrine of *יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל*, Deutero-Isaiah advances beyond his predecessor, for not merely does he imply that the result of such a display of Yahweh's might will be the acknowledgment of Him by the other nations; (49:24-26), but he specifically tells us that, following the restoration, nations will be gathered together and people assembled, desirous of "subscribing with their hand unto the Lord and summing themselves by the name of Israel" (44:5; 43:7), so great will Yahweh's reputation have become.

Thus far, Israel has become for Deutero-Isaiah even as for Ezekiel, the *אֵלֶּיךָ*, the instrument by which Yahweh will extend His reign over the various and diverse peoples of the earth. But Deutero-Isaiah developed even this idea to its logical conclusion. For if Yahweh has chosen Israel in accordance with His general plan of the universe, if He had "created this people for My purpose" (43:21), then they need not be merely the unconscious instrument, the passive tool in the hands of Yahweh, but they might also become His active agent, His conscious messengers, (44:26) the striving servant of Yahweh, His witnesses (43:10) summoned "to tell of My glory." (Ibid) and to declare to the ends of the earth that Yahweh hath redeemed His servant Jacob (48:20).

This, then, is the great contribution made by Deutero-Isaiah to the history of religious thought in Israel; this,

the finishing touch requisite for a perfect universalistic structure. Now there is considered not merely Yahweh's relation to Israel and mankind, but for the first time we have an accurate and clearly expressed relationship between Israel and humanity. Israel has been chosen by Yahweh in accordance with His cosmic purpose, but having become blinded by the religious fallacies of their day, it was necessary to punish and to purge them. Undeserving as they are even now, yet Yahweh in His infinite love cannot forsake them for long; His anger was but for a moment (54:7), but with great mercy and everlasting kindness (v 7-8) He has taken pity on His people and thus, as an act of pure grace, He shall gather them from all corners of the earth unto Himself once more, vowing (as He did with regard to the waters of Noah), never again to reject them, never again to break His eternal covenant with them (v 10), and thus they will come to recognize Yahweh's love and undiminished forbearance. Israel's allegiance to Him will be increased and they will become dedicated once more to their god, as His fit and consecrated servant (Note N).

And in this wise will Israel become the teacher of humanity, both by example and by precept. Not vicariously, as Christian theologians would have it, but rather as the living exemplar of Yahweh's ways, testifying by its history to the purificatory effects of suffering, through which the nations also will be purged and purified. Israel's suffering will not substantially effect Yahweh, which would be the

sine qua non of the doctrine of vicarious suffering and atonement, but it is the nations that are to be transformed by taking heed of the example offered by Israel's much merited punishment, for in Deutero-Isaiah, "suffering is considered chiefly from the good that accrues through it to others..... as leading to the restoration of Israel and the regeneration of mankind"² Israel, burned in the furnace of affliction, severely punished by an "exacting judgment" (53:8) will serve as a sign and warning to, as well as a teacher of, humanity.

Aside from this passive role as exemplar through suffering, even greater is the servant's task as teacher by precept. Like the ^{prophets} priests of old, Yahweh's spirit is poured out upon them (42:1; 44:3) thus consecrating them to His service, endowing them with divine power and insight, permeating them with a complete and perfect knowledge, a knowledge especially of Yahweh and His ways (Note G; cf. also Note F).

Up to this time, except for a number of similar passages which we have noted in some of the prophetic writings, only individuals were conceived of as being endowed with this ^{חכמה}, but now it descends upon the collective individual, the personified servant, Israel. Chosen by Yahweh, Israel, through its sufferings and through Yahweh's manifestations in its behalf, will gain a perfect knowledge of His way. That this is ^{II} Isaiah's conception of Israel's function as the "servant of Yahweh" (42:1-4; 49:1-6, etc.), can be seen from

2. Battenwieser - Job, p. 83 f.

the prophet's clear and unambiguous presentation of the servant's task. He is to bring **משפט** (42:1) to the nations; he will not fail nor falter, relax nor grow weary until he has faithfully (v. 2) discharged his function of

לֹא יִכָּחֵה וְלֹא יִרָוץ עַד יֵשִׁים בְּאוֹר מִשְׁפָּט וְלִתְהַרְתּוּ אֲיִים יִיחָלוּ:

which verse has been most accurately translated by Prof.

Buttenwieser: "'until He has set forth religious truth on earth and until even the far distant isles await His revelation." (v.4)

The use of **משפט** together with **תורה** gives us the clue to its exact meaning in Deutero-Isaiah. Here it does not convey the idea of justice in the legal sense, but rather as the Arabian equivalent **دين** which also has the connotation of "religion" or "religious truth." But as **תורה**, in its original usage, means not merely law, or a specific codification of law, but rather teaching and especially religious teaching (cf. *infra*, p.125ff), the purpose and function of the servant is clearly defined. Israel is not merely destined to become an example to the nations which might learn from the despised servant the error of their ways, the consequences of their sins, and the redemption which might likewise be theirs (53:1-12), but the servant, though at first the rejected of men, with marred visage and deformed figure, as the prophet so vividly describes him, is yet to become the teacher of Yahweh's religious truths to the nations. Through this instruction in Yahweh's ways will it fulfill the task of bringing all mankind into the same covenant relationship

with Yahweh as it itself enjoys. Thus the term ברית עם is employed by Deutero-Isaiah with this connotation; not that Israel is to be merely a covenant people (which would be ברית עם) but, (as the expression צור לגוים used synonymously implies) a conscious agent of Yahweh in effecting this universal covenant with all mankind, to bring light to the nations; that divine light, that clear vision and perfect knowledge of Yahweh, that insight into and understanding of His ways, ^{which} as will enable all mankind to comprehend His תורה in the full implication of this term: to worship and to proclaim Him as their universal God.

To leave Deutero-Isaiah at this highest plane of true universalism, without saying a word or two of his particularism were to gloss over and to ignore an important element in his teaching. Universalism, as we understand it, does not imply an entire renunciation of particularism, nor a complete merging of all groups into one uniform whole, but, to recall the definition which we posited at the outset, it is rather the harmonization of that separatism as a part of a universal whole. It is the development and retention of group identity for the benefit of mankind at large. And so Deutero-Isaiah, in his fervid universalism, did not lose sight of Israel as a separate entity or nation. Yahweh, the creator of heaven and earth, was for him, none the less, as much the God of Israel as He was for Amos and Isaiah. His particularism, in certain passages, (42:22 ff; 45:14 ff. etc) is ⁶⁵so marked as in those of some of the other prophets; but it must be borne in mind that his true

universalism lies, not in the negation of this doctrine so inherently a part of the very soul of Israel, but in the harmonization of it with a broad humanitarian ideal.

Similar to the former denunciations directed by his predecessors against the enemies of Israel, are the tirades of Deutero-Isaiah, such as "all thy antagonists shall be put to shame and made to blush; yea, all thy enemies shall become like nought and made to vanish" (41:11; 49:26). Yahweh's and Israel's causes are one. Israel need never fear, for even at the price of giving Ethiopia and Seba as ransom, He will ever uphold and redeem them (43:1,2,13), that they might, on the one hand, become a "light to the nations," but also that Yahweh might lead them back to their own country (40:3) and there restore Zion to all its pristine glory. (49:19; 51:11). In his enthusiasm for his own nation and people, Deutero-Isaiah sometime permits his chauvinism to dominate his thought, conceiving only at times, to be sure ^{of} -/Israel as enjoying a primacy among the nations "before whom kings shall arise, princes also shall worship (49:7); yea, "kings shall be thy foster fathers and queens thy nursing mothers; they shall prostrate themselves before thee and lick the dust at thy feet" (49:23) "even the produce of Egypt and the merchandise of Ethiopia shall accrue to Israel because the nations will seek God, who hides himself in their midst (45:1-15; also 54:3; 55:5). All this might be explained as being but the natural homage rendered to Yahweh through Israel because of the manifestation of His power and the desire on the part of the nations to demonstrate their

reverence for Him. It seems, however, that the prophet is to be taken a little more literally, that in his ardent zeal to comfort the stricken populace and to assure it of its speedy restoration, his nationalism becomes quite understandably inconsistent with his more profound doctrine of universalism. Nor does such a viewpoint conceiving of a special relationship between such a glorious and exalted deity and a particular group militate against the ideal which he has enunciated. Rather is this that perfect universalism, that only satisfactory solution to the dilemma of a chosen people with a universal message toward which centuries of religious thought had been groping. Rather is this that balance and harmony between these two doctrines so vital to the life of Israel: a "particularism born of the nation", to be sure, "but rising above it"; a particularism transcending all national boundaries and tearing asunder all group barriers, rising to the very heights of a true, a logical, a profound universalism wherein Zion, restored and "glorious in the eyes of Yahweh"; Zion, the center of the whole vast universe, exists that only from it shall radiate to all corners of the earth (49:5-6) the teaching and knowledge of Yahweh, by which process He, though still primarily the God of Israel, will in like manner become the Lord of all flesh, to whom every knee will bend in homage and by whom all men shall swear. (45:23).

The long night would then be ended. Israel, bearing the light of Yahweh, would flood the world with His divine radiance. The last dark cloud would tremble and depart,

completely dispelled by the glowing idealism of the servant of Yahweh. The day of universalism will have dawned.

B. THE SECONDARY YAHWIST STRATA.

For the sake of completeness, we must add a word or two regarding the treatment which our problem received at the hand of those redactors known as J² writers. Although some of their work must have been completed by this late date, still much of the material that has been ascribed to this school of authors could not have preceded the exile and seems to reflect the broad universalism of Deutero-Isaiah. We cannot enter into an analysis of the time from which these passages issue, but suffice it to say that many of the thoughts contained therein ^{not} could have originated until comparatively late. An instance of this, as Dr. Morgenstern has pointed out, is to be found in the theory of universalism reflected in Genesis 18:17 ff, wherein Yahweh is pictured as the Judge of the whole earth, in an absolute and disinterested sense, rather than in the relative sense that His primary interests are in, and for, Israel, as found in Amos, for example. Again, Abraham's broad sympathy and solicitude for the non-Israelitish people of Sodom approximates the prophetic thought of the exilic and post-exilic periods, as is first found in the writings of Deutero-Isaiah, Jonah, and Ruth, rather than in the pre-exilic literature. ³ Still further evidence is to be discovered in

3. Morgenstern - MWSF, p. 23 f.

the idea of למשל (Num. 32:9-14; 30-34; and 14:11-25), whereby Moses expostulates with Yahweh that He dare not destroy Israel, lest Egypt say that He was a false God, impotent and incapable of fulfilling His promise, having deceived Israel in redeeming it from bondage only to slay it in the wilderness. For the sake of His reputation, therefore, it was imperative that He forgive His people despite their manifold transgressions, and that He manifest His power in the sight of the nations. From this idea also, which plays such a prominent part in this code, (even as, because of the actual taunts of the nations, it did in the work of Ezekiel), we can deduce the late or post-exilic origin of these passages. We might well expect to find, therefore, in the writings of these J² writers, very many of the ideas which dominated the early post-exilic period.

An examination of their actual work seems to confirm this hypothesis. Beginning with the conception of a universal god, an impartial judge of all the earth (Gen. 18:17) whose כבוד fills the entire world (Num. 14:21) and who, by divine fiat, פ (בבריאת [Gen. 2:4], found as כבר fifteen times in Deutero-Isaiah) created the heaven and the earth, these writers give a panoramic view of mankind's early history that is universal in its outlook and all inclusive in its origin. At the genesis of humankind all are subject to Yahweh's dictum and demands, as exemplified in the injunctions issued to the first human beings. But because of the corruption that ensued, because mankind strayed from Yahweh's way (Gen. 6:1-7), Yahweh repented that He had created him and determined to

destroy all His work, "both man and beast and creeping thing and fowl of the air, for it repenteth me that I made them." (v.7). In accordance, however, with His divine justice and because of the doctrine of the individual responsibility and requital which had by this time developed, the one man, just and innocent in his generation, Yahweh would spare, in order that he might become the progenitor of a new and better race. This, too, is in accordance with the idea, noted in Deutero-Isaiah, that the world was created, not to be a waste and desolation, but that it might be inhabited by mankind (Is, 45:18). In the story of the Tower of Babel, composite as it may be, we can discern the same universal conception, for it also bespeaks an original unity and harmony on earth, with mankind composing one family and speaking one language. In some way - and the writers ingeniously drew on the Babel story to account for the change - this state of affairs was altered and mankind, seemingly because of its sinfulness, had become dispersed throughout the various lands, speaking diverse languages and dwelling apart from each other, often in hatred, and even enmity. Was this, then, the end of Yahweh's plan with mankind? Was such a state of affairs compatible with the conception of Yahweh as a righteous and just God who had created a harmonious and beautiful world? It would seem as if Yahweh always had been represented as destroying wickedness only in order that a new and better generation might rise in its stead (Num.14:12), that the end He had in the view was the existence "on this earth created in order to be inhabited" of a people living

in the same relationship as had existed at the outset. This would seem to be the logical deduction, especially in the light of all prophetic teaching up to this time. Even in Amos, if Yahweh had to reject Israel entirely, He might choose another people to fulfill His purpose. But always Yahweh had this end in view, whether Israel was completely destroyed or not, - the destruction of wickedness and of sinful peoples was only in order that justice and right might yet prevail. But there had been developing at this time, the idea of Israel as the agent or instrument by which this transformation might be effected, and it seems, by inference at least, that the J² writers concurred in this belief. We have seen that their idea must have been that Yahweh was desirous of restoring the pristine days of universal concord and harmony, but as yet we have no indication as to how this purpose was to be fulfilled; as yet the writers' eyes are turned entirely toward mankind and the universe at large, which has fallen from its high estate to one of degradation and disgrace. Suddenly, however, the picture changes and the vision of the narrator is narrowed from the broad vistas of a vast universe to the limited view of but a tiny portion thereof. Without any words of transition, without any prefatory remarks, we are plunged headlong into an entirely new scene and story. The writer resumed his story of world history, not with an account of humanity's vicissitudes following its dispersion, but with the narrative of a single individual - Abraham. Disregarding his birth and early years, ~~they~~ commence this story, in medias

res, with the command issued by Yahweh to Abraham that he leave his fatherland, go whither Yahweh will lead him, in order that he might become a great nation, that Yahweh might bless him and make his name great; but, above all, - and this is a most important point - in order that "in him, (or "through him") all the nations of the earth might be blessed." (Gen. 12:1-3)

It is needless for us to expatiate on ~~the~~ fact that Abraham and, for that matter the other patriarchs also, are but the eponymous heroes representing the experiences of certain tribes, or even of Israel as a whole, ⁴ for in our day this principle has been so well established by Biblical science and is too widely accepted to admit of refutation. With this point in mind, we are now justified in making several interesting deductions with regard to the J² writers. Human history, according to their account, began with a universal harmony among the families of the earth, the restoration of which estate, in the light of all other prophetic writing, is seemingly the goal and purpose of the universal scheme of things. Now, in this sudden transition to the history of Abraham, (the symbol of Israel), we have a clue to the manner in which this regeneration of mankind was to be effected. Abraham, or his descendant Israel, was enjoined to be a blessing by becoming the agency through which all the nations of the earth were to be blessed. Not to the present or past can it refer, for Israel, or Abraham, was anything but a blessing to the people

4. Morgenstern - Gen. p. 18.
Ewald - HI, V.I, p. 40

with whom they came into contact, (e.g., a plague descended upon the Philistines; Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed; etc.), but it is rather to the ideal Israel of the future that this passage refers. It is exactly parallel to Deutero-Isaiah's viewpoint expressed in his assurance that even as Abraham, who was but one, was summoned to Yahweh's service, blessed and prospered, so Israel, who was many, would fare likewise. (Is. 51:2). The purpose of the J² writers is now clear to us. It is the same general notion as characterized the message of Deutero-Isaiah; a pronounced and perfected universalism wherein Israel is to be not merely the passive instrument by which Yahweh will establish His reputation among the nations, but, in addition to this, they are destined to become His active agents through whom humanity will be blessed by a restoration to its former state of harmony and union with its God from whom it had been estranged. It was a failure to observe His ways that had created this hiatus; it was the fact that Noah alone had walked in His path that had rescued this one righteous man. Is it not logical to assume, therefore, that mankind too would enjoy the same protection and favor of Yahweh which was Noah's, which at the outset had been its own possession also, only if it too (like Noah) and the future Israel) became cognizant of His demands, only if it gained a full "knowledge" of Him? that "knowledge" of Yahweh which was subsequently revealed to Israel at Sinai, and for which purpose Israel had been redeemed from bondage: that it might bring this body of information to the rest of mankind?

This was the meaning of the command issued to Abraham in the words "Be thou a blessing that through thee all the nations of the earth might be blessed."⁵ We might, if time permitted, continue with the analysis of the other characters presented by this code as substantiating the conclusions at which we have arrived. The trials and privations endured by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Israel), before they could become Yahweh's perfect instrument,⁵ the romantic legend of Joseph with its demonstration throughout of Yahweh's divine providence in life, - these stories also bear testimony to the deductions we have already made. The very apex of the J² writers' philosophy is reached in the concluding utterance of Joseph, those words which are spoken just as the curtain descends, not merely on the drama of his life, but on the whole epic of the Genesis narratives; "Ye devised evil against Me, but Yahweh in order to preserve a numerous people, caused it to turn out for good." (50:20). Here again we have reiterated the general theme emphasized by this code; once more we have reflected Deutero-Isaiah's dominant doctrine of Divine Providence.⁶ From the very beginning this has been manifested: Yahweh had created a universe that was very good, that was good because it was in accord with His divine purpose (as we have already pointed out with regard to the word *ḥayy*, Note M); He guided His righteous one, Noah, on a rudderless ark; He selected Abraham

5. Ibid, p. 21 f.

6. Ibid, p. 24 f; 324 f.

to be a blessing to all nations; He protected Jacob in various exigencies; He delivered Israel from Egypt for His Name's sake and for the fulfillment of His divine plan. No matter how wicked mankind might become, no matter how much evil they might devise against His righteous servants, good would prevail at last. Yahweh would cause it to turn out in accordance with His purpose: "to preserve a numerous people"; the restoration of mankind to Him might be effected through His chosen servant, Abraham, the prototype of Israel.

Seemingly, the writers of this secondary Yahwist strata subsequently lost sight of their main theme after the revelation of Yahweh's will at Sinai, in the wanderings of Israel through the wilderness, with its rather particularistic interests, for Israel is still specially related to Yahweh (Ex. 33:16). We have seen, however, that the central motif of their code was the same broad and "harmonized" universalism which we found in Deutero-Isaiah. The radiant sun, which arose with him, was yet shining, resplendent and bright.

CHAPTER FIVE.

THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN LIGHT AND DARKNESS.

THE PERIOD OF THE PRIESTS.

A. GENERAL LITERATURE OF THE PERIOD.

Before proceeding to a discussion of the Priestly Code proper, it is necessary to consider the diverse trends of thought which characterized the period of the Restoration. Here too there is that same play ~~and counterplay~~ of universalism and particularism which dominated the Babylonian exile. Some of the literature which is to be herein considered is possibly of later origin than the writings of the priestly school, but we can consider them, none the less, for they are all expressive of tendencies of thought which existed side by side at this time. On the one hand, since the time of Ezekiel, there had been a ^{long-range} reaction toward a pronounced particularism which was ^{perhaps fostered somewhat by} due to the failure of Deutero-Isaiah's ^{fulfillment} prophecies to come to fruition upon the people's return to Palestine, and the need which many of their leaders felt of infusing them with a greater group consciousness that they might rebuild the Temple speedily (Hag. 1:4) and worship Yahweh solely. The course of events, following the Return, were far removed from the expectations of the people and, just as it was at the time of the exile, so now Yahweh's power and worth

were not beyond question. It was to combat these views and once again, even as in the days of Ezekiel, to maintain Israel's allegiance to Yahweh that these writers of the post-exilic period were compelled to revert to a stringent particularism. "The longed for Golden Age still delayed its coming... the hopes centered in Zerubbabel, (identified with the long anticipated Messiah - Zc. 6:9-15), were dissipated and shattered Israel was apparently as far from exaltation to influence and power as she had ever been Yahweh apparently had no interest in His people or in the vindication of justice and righteousness. Was the service of Yahweh worth while? Did it yield tangible and satisfactory returns to its adherents?"¹(3:14).

To meet these skeptical queries, to kindle the waning flames of faith with arguments that the people might understand "the responsibility for delay had to be transferred from the shoulders of Yahweh to those of Israel herself. The sins of Israel rendered it inconceivable that the blessings of Yahweh should rest upon her as she now was the neglect of the worship of Yahweh (by sacrifice and offering, indicative of a lack of faith in Him), was the unpardonable offense (Mal.1:7,8,12,f)¹" They had profaned Yahweh's covenant by promiscuous inter-marriage with foreign wives (2:10-16), which dangerous tendency toward assimilation the religious reformers of this period had to restrain. For reasons such as these, the

1. J.M.P.Smith - ICCM, p. 11 f, 61.

consciousness of group loyalty, of faith in Yahweh, of particularism, had to be intensified once more. Thus, in the writings of this period in general, in Malachi more especially, (the date of which has been a disputed point, but which is expressive of the thought of this period and time), this tendency is stressed. Contact with foreign peoples cannot but mean "the contamination of Jewish life at its source by the introduction of heathen rites and beliefs Israel, as the people of the holy God, must keep herself holy (2:11), contact with unholy people or things must be scrupulously avoided"² (2:11; 1:14). Israel must remain apart from these idolatrous nations, and return with renewed enthusiasm to Yahweh, by strict adherence to the law of Moses (Mal. 3:22). Then only will Zion be an delightful land envied by all peoples (3:12) and called prosperous by all nations (3:12).

This same thought, so prominent in the work of Malachi, is also to be found in the writers of this period, e.g., in Haggai, where Zerubbabel, the chosen of Yahweh, is to become "as a signet" (Hag. 2:23), and to the reestablished kingdom greater even than the one before (2:9) will come all the nations to pay tribute and homage to Israel (2:7), reconsecrated and most "holy" to Yahweh (2:14); in Zechariah also, (although certain passages to be treated later breathe a profound universalism) Jerusalem is chosen again (2:16), primarily because of Yahweh's special love for Israel, the

2. Ibid, p. 13; esp. p.48 f.

"apple of His eye" (2:12) because He is "jealous" for Jerusalem. (1:14; 8:2). Although in Zechariah, as in Ezekiel, all this is seemingly for the purpose "that many nations shall join themselves to Yahweh" (2:15), still the burden of his prophecy is with the restoration of Israel, especially protected "by a wall of fire round about her," that Yahweh may dwell upon His holy land (2:16), the sacred shrine of the whole earth. (8:3). But this particularism, stressed by Haggai and Malachi, and rather faintly adumbrated in Zechariah, reached its fullest expression in Ezra's insistence that "this unique and intimate relation of 'holiness' must be safeguarded by every means possible, not only by ethical living, as enjoined by the earlier prophets, but also by a more constant and intense and punctilious worship and ritualism and, if necessary, even by such extreme measures as the compulsory divorce of non-Jewish wives." (Ezra 10:10 ff).³ Although a more detailed analysis of the writings of this period could be made, the above account, though rather hurried, will be sufficient in the light of our discussion of the earlier particularism to indicate the reaction to Deutero-Isaiah's universalism and the decided tendency on the part of many to reemphasize a stringent and separatistic policy that might cope with the wavering faith of Israel during those disappointing years following the return to Palestine.

But universalism was not dead. Even as this ray of

3. Morgenstern - FOIH, p. 14.

light had arisen out of the darkened years of exile, so at this time also many stars of hope illumined Israel's horizon. As a reaction and protest against this narrow exclusiveness, with its bitter antagonism to intermarriage (Ezra 9,10; and Neh. 10:29, ff), and all contact with foreigners (Neh 2:20; Deut. 23:3, etc), the Books of Ruth and Jonah were produced: the former to point out that an alien of race and faith could be the criterion of the highest virtue (Ruth 2:11; 4:15; 3:4 f), and could be most faithful to her adopted religion and god, (1:16); the latter, "to reveal, in its true colors, the unloving exclusiveness which too often characterized the Jews, and to rebuke the grudging narrow-mindedness that would deny all favor from the God of Israel, to the gentile world."⁴

In the first instance the romantic account of the Moabite maiden, Ruth, and her marriage to Boaz, from which union there was descended David, the "shoot of Jesse" (Ruth 4:17); in the latter case the punishment meted out to Jonah (Jonah 1:5 ff), because of his refusal to be the instrument, the messenger of Yahweh to the heathen nation (1:1-4); by these concrete stories it was hoped that the people would comprehend that religious universalism which was being eclipsed by a reawakened particularism, and furthermore, that they would understand that Yahweh's care and mercy extended over all mankind, (Jonah 4:2,11)⁵

4. Perowne - CB4 p. 52f

5. Ibid, p. 91

with Israel (Jonah) as the bearer of His revelation.

In addition to these narratives which served as indictments against the rampant separatism, there were other utterances which reflected the universalism of Deutero-Isaiah. To discuss the much disputed date of the various passages in Isaiah 56-66 would not be germane to this thesis, but those passages which are relevant to our theme, must have originated within the limits of this period. That writer, or group of writers known as Deutero-Isaiah gave voice to similar conceptions as those enunciated by the author of Isaiah 40-55. There is, to be sure, a vestige of that particularism requisite for the survival of Israel as a group. Zion, the center of a new creation, (Is. 65:18 f) is to be reborn, (66:7-9); the wealth of the nations will flow into it (v.12); its enemies will be destroyed (v.14); and Jerusalem, in which Yahweh takes great delight, rededicated and reunited to Him, will be called ~~הפצה~~ ^{הפצה} and ~~בשלה~~ ^{בשלה}. This restoration, however, ^{will be} ~~was~~ only in order that "its salvation might be known to the ends of the earth, that all people would recognize Israel as the ^{עם קדוש} ~~עם קדוש~~ and the ^{אלהי יהוה} ~~אלהי יהוה~~." But not this alone was Yahweh's purpose in rehabilitating Palestine. Not only were "all nations and tongues to see Yahweh's glory" (66:18 f), which doctrine is to be found also in Haggai (2:7) and Malachi (2:2; 1:5), but following the idea of the ^{עבוד יהוה} ~~עבוד יהוה~~ as conceived by Deutero-Isaiah, the survivors will go "to the isles afar off that have not heard of My fame nor seen My glory and they shall

declare My glory among the heathens (66:19), (as "priests of Yahweh" (61:5 ff): the significance of this term will be discussed below). In order that "My house shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples" (56:7), "strangers and even eunuchs who join themselves to Yahweh's covenant and keep the Sabbath shall be welcome to worship Yahweh and to offer sacrifices (56:4 ff). All this will lead to the final triumph of Yahweh throughout the universe," that righteousness and praise shall spring forth before all nations." (61:9ff).

In addition to this exalted and supreme universalism of Tritro-Isaiah, there are still other echoes which resounded throughout the years discussed now. The passage, already considered in another connection, (cf. Note J) in Isaiah 11:1-10, and also one in Micah 4:2 are most likely products of this period⁶ and they too attain to the same broad vision where "the earth will be filled with the knowledge of Yahweh as the waters cover the sea" (Is. 11:9) when "out of Zion shall go the *Torah* and the word of Yahweh from Jerusalem" (Mic. 4:2). And finally, even in Zechariah, in whom is discernible a practical particularism, this same universal note is sounded. According to him also, Israel is to enjoy Yahweh's special dispensations, but the other nations are to participate in the blessings that accrue to His Chosen People recognizing their gods (אֱלֹהִים) in Yahweh, the God of Israel. To Zechariah, loyalty to truth and simple justice is a most

6. Cheyne - Introd. p. 9-14.

important consideration (3:10; 8:19), while the end and aim, the primary purpose of Israel's election is that eventually "ten men of all the languages of the nations shall take hold of the spirit of him that is a Jew, saying, 'we will go with you, for we have heard that Yahweh is with you.'" (Ze.8:23). Yahweh, the God of all will be universally acknowledged and sought by all mankind. (8:20;6:15).

B. THE PRIESTLY CODE.

It can be seen from the foregoing discussion that the conflict between the ideas of universalism and particularism had now reached its apex. The profound harmonization of these two doctrines attained by Deutero-Isaiah and a few of his followers was not so easily grasped by the people. To choose one or the other seemed their only alternative, leading either to a narrow and restricted separatism or a shallow and decadent universalism. It was with this perplexing problem that the priestly writers found themselves confronted. Nor was it merely a philosophical or theoretical question, for the situation became more acute and concrete because of the actual external events that ensued during the restoration period. Almost immediately upon the return from exile a breach was created between those who had remained behind in Palestine, (עמי הארץ) and those who had endured the years of privation in Babylonia (בני גולה). The latter, due to the emphasis which the prophets had placed upon the chastening effects of the exile, already had come to look upon themselves

as the "righteous remnant" (Is. 7:3), as the "suffering servant" of Yahweh" (Is. 52:13-53:12) through whom Israel, and eventually the whole of mankind, would be redeemed. Among the former there were many (who took the words of Deutero-Isaiah even more literally and) who sought to bring his universalistic dreams into immediate realization by luxuriating in as many associations as were possible with the foreigners or semi-heathens about them. Many had intermarried and "idolatrous tendencies were possibly prevalent among them,"⁷ but above all, they had not passed through the purgation of the exile, nor had they felt that esprit de corps, that group loyalty which, of necessity, would develop among a band of exiles in a foreign country. Consequently, these two groups were dominated by these two different tendencies. There were some in either group, to be sure, who were at variance with the others, for it is not to be thought that there was a homogeneity or conformity of opinion in either party. But there did exist these two decided factions (Neh. 10:28 ff), the one seeking fervidly to put "the universalistic aspirations of the prophets into practice" even to the point of promiscuous intermarriage and its tendency to amalgamation; the other jealously guarding the religious purity which it believed it possessed as a result of the exile, and lest it be sullied by too close an alliance with these others who so freely associated with the "half pagan, half converted foreigners."⁸ Both doctrines had been misinterpreted and

7. Montefiore - HL, p. 293

8. Ibid, p. 291 ff; Morgenstern - FOIH, p. 176

misapplied. Particularism had become a proud and narrow exclusivism, which looked with such contempt upon the "people of the land" that it led subsequently (whether earlier or later, we need not discuss) to the Samaritan schism; Ez. 4:1 ff; Is. 65:1-7, 11-12; Neh. 10:28 ff; 13:28 ff)⁹; while universalism had become a blind and purposeless assimilative process which, with "its large influx of elements from a lower religious plane", could not but have led to a religious retrogression.¹⁰

The priestly writers faced a crisis in the history of Israel. Not merely a theoretical problem occupied their attention, but a most concretely critical situation confronted them; a solution was exigent. A practical compromise was most imperative. Neither universalism nor particularism as theoretical ideals would suffice, nor would Deutero-Isaiah's philosophical harmonization, lofty and exalted as it was, offer a solution to their problem. What they required was not merely a physical wall, but spiritual and psychological barriers embodied in a tangible, a concrete, a practical program of reform that would embody both these ideals, protecting Israel from too many foreign accretions, yet expressive of a universal ideal. Not merely a petty exclusiveness, but a particularism which would vouchsafe and safeguard Israel's allegiance to Yahweh. And, on the other hand, not merely a frenzied

9. Josephus - Antiquities XI, 712.
H. ERÉ - Art. Samaritans, p. 161 f.

10. Ibid, p. 303

assimilation, but a universalism that would reemphasize Israel's group consciousness, but only that as a people it might continue its service to mankind. How, then, did they solve this "painful dilemma"?

On the one hand, they met this situation in very much the same manner as did Ezekiel (supra, p.59ff). Much of the foregoing discussion contained in this thesis has been wholly in anticipation of the writings of the Priestly School, and hence it is not necessary to reproduce here an analysis of those details which have been treated more fully above. Suffice it to say that these writers, faced with an exigency very much the same as that which confronted Ezekiel, were compelled to deal with it in a similar manner. Like Ezekiel, they realized that the imageless worship of Yahweh could not be preserved by their spiritually superficial contemporaries, unless it were protected by a rigid ritualism. Like Ezekiel, they knew that to retain the ethical and universal principles of this Yahweh worship, they would have to compromise with the people's point of view by including in their code many of the formal and particularistic elements. Like Ezekiel, they would have to protect Israel as a group from the foreign accretions and influences that were everywhere about them, they would have to meet their skepticism and waning faith by offering to them religious ideas and practices which they could understand, the neglect of which was responsible for the failure of Yahweh to fulfill His long-awaited promises. The result of this was the decided particularism so characteristic

of the Priestly, and more especially, the Holiness Code, (Note O). Since every work on the Priestly Code stresses this aspect of their work to the almost total exclusion of any other factor, it is not necessary to dwell at length upon this subject,, for our concern is primarily with their harmonization of this element-which we must admit plays the more prominent part in their writings - with the universalism that was also extant in their days. A few words, however, on their particularistic bias, which resulted from their much-needed compromise with the religious delusions of their generation, will not be amiss.

In the first place, they too conceived of Israel as a "holy" people specially related to Yahweh. And in order that Yahweh might continue to dwell among His Chosen People, every precaution had to be taken lest they be "profaned", in the physical connotation of the term, the only sense in which it would have any vital and practical application for their day. While it is true that other motives, more ulterior than this, may have actuated the priests, still this seems to be the dominant one, especially when viewed in the light of their idealism, which a further study of this code will reveal. In order to maintain this sanctity, the most stringent laws were enacted, regulating almost every act and incident in a man's life. There are a multiplicity of ways in which one might become polluted, and an equal number of means by which one can be cleansed (Lev. Chaps. 9, 12, 13-14, etc.). The most minute infraction of a ritual observance, unless expiated,

is to be severely punished, but this too can be accounted for in the light of the priestly writers' compromise. All life had to be devoted to Yahweh and lived according to His demands. The slightest deviation from this course would lead the way to greater and ever greater transgressions, for it must be borne in mind that "the details of ceremonial observance grew with a nation's growth, and are the result of traditions reverently and jealously guarded by those who felt that in the rules which directed their intercourse with the higher powers, nothing was lightly to be introduced or set aside."¹¹ For this reason, and as a compromise with such a point of view, which, regardless of their own notions, they were compelled to consider, the priestly writers had to include in their code even several primitive and most ancient survivals and superstitions, such as the ceremony of removal of defilement by the dead by means of the ashes of a red heifer (Num. 19) and of the "Sotah" (Num. 5:11-31), customs which had prevailed from far distant antiquity. For similar reasons sacrifice played a prominent role in their program, as it was by this means that the people, in their naivete', might really be placed "en rapport" with the Divine so as to enjoy the advantages accruing from a supernatural source;¹² The idea, for example, of atonement, of propitiation, as gained through sacrifice, was so deeply rooted in the social heritage of

11. Chapman and Streane - CBL , p. XXIX, f.

12. Ibid.

these peoples and the belief in its efficacy in the effacing¹³ of past estrangement and the securing of future favors, was so firmly entrenched in their minds that the priests could not afford to ignore its potency. Elaborate rites, specified sacrifices, frequent offerings are therefore enjoined by them. In this way, even as by the use of such a minor detail as "tassels" (Num. 15:37-41), by great means and small, Israel is constantly reminded of its covenant with Yahweh and the necessity of remaining loyal and faithful to Him alone. In this purpose, in the concluding chapters of Exodus, great pains are taken meticulously to describe the Dwelling of Yahweh, together with all its numerous appurtenances. Every thread and plank must be divinely prescribed by Yahweh and thus rendered holy and inviolable. All this might be considered in greater detail, together with its various ramifications, but the above will suffice merely to substantiate the particularistic interpretation of the priestly writers. The aim of their entire legislation might be subsumed under the epigrammatic statement, "Be thou holy, even as I, Yahweh, am holy", (Lev. 19:2), the purpose of the punctillious care with which there were drawn up the plans for the Tabernacle, and its various appendages, could be crystallized in the formula found on the mitre of the High Priest קדוש ליהוה (Ex. 28:36). Their aim and purpose was most assuredly the creation of a people holy to Yahweh (20:8-9)^{Lev}, His special and unique property,

dwelling in His own (Lev. 25:23) favored land (26:4), different and distinct, set apart and separate from the other nations of the earth, protected in every way possible from heathen influence (Lev. 17:3-7), with their every act, (even pagan superstitious survivals, which could not be uprooted and were therefore incorporated into the worship of Yahweh), so regulated as to remind them of their covenant relationship with Yahweh. And this Yahweh, as in Ezekiel's later chapters, though transcendent in some respects, is to be enthroned in the midst of His "holy people" (Ex. 25:8; 29:45) ruled over by Him as their divine king, and His priests as His special servitors, no mention being made of temporal monarchs, civil judiciary, or earthly potentates, outside of the Priests and Levites. Such a Supreme Being also had to be protected from any contaminating influences, which was provided by "successive rings of defense or grades of sacredness."¹⁴ First, by His special abode within the "holy of holies", separated by a veil from the "holy place", then by the courts, both inner and outer, then by the dwellings of the priests, of Levites, and finally of the Israelites themselves (Num. 2), who, although bordering on the profane world about them, were protected from pollution by the rigorous demands of this code.

Here is a separatism which is, in very truth, far reaching; an exclusive doctrine that could not easily be surpassed; a particularism that approaches, if it does not

14. Chapman and Streane - CBL XLVVIII.

attain to, the very extreme of this policy.

But did the priestly writers stop here? Was this their ultimate aim and purpose? Were they only concerned in "dry genealogies, exact dates, precise measurements" and dull details, all of which must be admitted as a constituent and important element in their code? In reply, we might first point to the well-recognized ethical note which is adequate refutation of the unjust and inaccurate criticisms of the Priestly Code which are so frequently made and which have found their way into the writings of many distinguished scholars. "To the authors of the priestly legislation," writes Reuss, "the interest of the altar and its ministers are the chief matters of moment - not religion and morality. Purity of skin and of dishes is more important than purity of heart."¹⁵ A glance at almost any portion of this code will reveal the arbitrary nature of such an accusation, for side by side with minute ordinances, designed to safeguard individuals from ritual pollution, are ethical commands that embrace all social conditions and relations. On the one hand are detailed descriptions of holy vessels, robes, furniture and sacrifices; of holy days and festivals, while, on the other, there are to be found most humanitarian considerations of the poor (Lev. 25:35-38), the aged (19:32-34) and the slave (19:20-22). In the very same chapter in which is contained the very keynote of the particularistic theme (19:2), there is sounded

15. Quoted in Montefiore - HL, p. 323.

also that might universalistic chord: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (19:18), which devotion in verse 34 is extended even to the "Stranger" (19:34). Virtue and vice, far from being ignored, were antecedent to ritual and sacrifice, especially in the minds of the later priestly editors whom we are soon to consider, for it is in the priestly *Grundschrift* that the ethical considerations are most apparent. (Gen. 6:9; 17:1). But it is not in their ethical program, laudable as this is, that the primary purpose of the Priestly School is to be discovered. Important as these moral considerations may be, they would not necessarily transcend the narrow limits of their particularism. Except for their liberal and lenient attitude toward the "stranger" (to be further treated below), most of these broad ethical principles might apply only to their own separate and specific group, and the query as to the presence of any ultimate goal other than the formation of a "holy people" would have to be answered in the negative. Ethical requirements are not enough to warrant the assumption that they possessed a broader vision than the people for whom they legislated and with whom they compromised. The presence of moral injunctions is not enough to conclude that they did not lose sight of their original purpose, viz: to harmonize the universalism which was also a part of the religious thought of their day with the particularism which was so requisite for the future of ^apotent, unattenuated Judaism. But, as we have already observed, particularism was not enough, and by

itself could not but dispel completely the vision and dream of a universal service to humanity. Did the Priestly writers wholly ignore this aspect of the dilemma? Were they only concerned in Israel and Yahweh, or did they, even as their spiritual progenitors, consider "the relation of Israel and Israel's God to the peoples of the outer world?"

That the Priestly writers shared this universal outlook, at least with regard to their god conception and the universe about them, can be seen from a mere cursory glance at the early narrative portions of their code. In the opening chapter of their account (Gen. 1:1-2:3) "the great idea of God, first proclaimed in all its breadth and fullness by the second Isaiah during the Exile, is embodied in a detailed account of the genesis of the universe, which lays hold of the imagination as no abstract statement of the principle could ever do."¹⁶ It is that grand conception of a great cosmic being who has control and power over the entire universe, One so mighty and potent that He creates all things that exist by His mere word or fiat, (**אמר**), by the mere effortless expression of His thought or purpose. And the result of each succeeding creative act is summarized in that recurrent refrain that affirms each of its parts as being "good" and, as a whole, as being "very good". If Yahweh, so commanding and sublime a Being, "has called forth this creation and has found it pleasing (**טוב**)

16. Skinner - ICCG, p. 6f.

in His sight, then it must have met with His inmost desire and wish, it must have been in accordance with His divine purpose.¹⁷ Omnipotent as such a Deity, perforce, was, only that which was good in His eyes would be countenanced, even as the subsequent events - the flood and the dispersion of mankind - soon proved. And the end and aim of this vast scheme of creation, the crowning feature of Yahweh's desire, was that it should be populated by man and woman, that it should be the abode of mankind. In striking contrast to the older account of creation (Gen. 2:4 b ff), where Yahweh's purpose is not so clearly defined and where the creation of woman, for example, occurs to Him as an afterthought and as a result of much experimentation, the conception of the first chapter of Genesis is in full agreement with the teaching of Deutero-Isaiah. Here too the purpose of Yahweh in His creative act is that the world is "not to be a waste and desolation, but a place to be inhabited by mankind." (Is. 45:18). Nor is this all. Yahweh's purpose does not end with the mere formation of man. There is a sense of noblesse oblige which devolves upon Him as a result of this act of grace. Yahweh has created mankind not merely in order that His universe be populated, not merely that man might be "fruitful and multiply" and that he continue in his original state of concord and unity, but also, by implication at least, that he should be devoted to His Maker and (as we shall see below), obedient

17. Morgenstern - Gen. p. 38.

18

to His decrees (Gen. 1:29 and later 9:10). This, then, is the Priestly god conception. A universal god, a god of the spirits of all flesh (Num. 16:22; 27:16), a creator of the universe and all its elements; of both light and darkness (Gen. 1:3-4, as in Is. 45:7, supra, p. 79), of the stars (Gen. 1:14-18), so often associated (~~Gen. 1:14-18~~) in primitive theology with other gods, and finally, of all living things. He is the sole deity (cf. Is. 40:26, etc) who, as in Deutero-Isaiah "created the heavens and stretched them forth, who is Yahweh, the Creator of all things." (Is. 44:24); and all this being in accordance with His divine purpose that it might be "good" in His sight (or in the language of Deutero-Isaiah - טוֹב , "good" or "right"). The scene which is so good and pleasant to Yahweh is not the little sequestered Garden of Eden (as in Gen. 2:8 ff), but the sight of the world which He had fashioned and the humanity He had called forth to inhabit it, a humanity living in peace and harmony, even with the beasts of the field. It is the glowing picture of a golden age, a perfect world order with mankind at its head.

This state of affairs continued for many generations (Genesis 5) wherein man was blessed with longevity as a reward for his godly living, but for some reason, the details of which the Priestly writers suppress, the "earth" became corrupt and filled with violence, for all flesh had corrupted their way upon the earth." (6:11 f). Since such a descent

from the pristine beginnings of man was displeasing to Yahweh it was necessary that, in His Omnipotence, He "destroy them with the earth," (v.13), by means of a mighty flood (v.17). But the one righteous man, the one man "who walked with Yahweh" (v.9), him He would spare, for, in the first place, He was a just God and, in addition, His great purpose, as indicated above, was that the earth be inhabited by His worshippers. Therefore Noah was saved by Yahweh to become the progenitor of a new and even better race on earth (8:17 ; Note P).

After the waters of the flood were assuaged and Noah's ark had been safely guided by Yahweh's providence, there is repeated the command which, in its frequent iteration, substantiated Yahweh's primary and fundamental purpose - "be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth." (9:1). Once more mankind, Yahweh's crowning achievement, is to rove as the lord of creation throughout the world that He had formed (v. 2 f). But this time Yahweh is more explicit in His demands laid upon man in return for His divine dispensations. Specific injunctions are given to Noah and through him to the new humanity that is to arise. Mankind is not to forget its Creator, but is to reverence Him by obedience to His divinely revealed will. Two thundering demands (not given to Noah in the other codes) are given forth by Yahweh out of the silent calm that followed the chaotic storm; "flesh, with the life therein, namely, with the blood, ye shall not eat," at the cost of forfeiting your lives, and "whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." (v.5 f). Yahweh's

law is incumbent upon every man to obey, it is binding upon every mortal. In the "image of Yahweh" (1:27) had mankind been created; they had distorted this divine inheritance by their corruption and violence, but now once again Yahweh, through a divine revelation bestowed on the whole human race, exhorts them to be fruitful and multiply, to fill the earth with a God-fearing and obedient generation worthy of their being made in the image of Yahweh (vv 6 f).

This is man's part in the covenant, while Yahweh, on His part, promises to protect him and never again to destroy him. As a token of that covenant which Yahweh established with all mankind, (represented by Noah), He sets His bow in the clouds as a reminder of that perpetual covenant consummated between Him and "all flesh that is upon earth" (vv 12-17).

The first of the four great world periods¹⁹ is ended, with a

בְּרִית (as in Is. 42:6; 49:8; supra, p. 87) with a covenant between Yahweh and "all flesh that is upon earth," in which Yahweh in the future is to protect mankind from any such catastrophe, and in return man is enjoined to worship Him by observing His commands. Yahweh's purpose is clear. The goal set for the future humanity is apparent, Mankind must return to that glorious golden period of human brotherhood and oneness (Gen. 10), of peace and harmony, which at the beginning was so "very good" in Yahweh's sight. Again, the question must be asked. How was this transformation to

19. Skinner -, ICCG, p. XL

be achieved? How was the Golden Age, destroyed by the cosmic proportions of this great flood, to be regained? How was mankind, now dispersed and scattered because of their sinfulness, divided in their lands and speaking every one after his own tongue" (10:5) to, be restored to that unity and harmony that had prevailed at the beginning?

The Priestly answer to these queries and the means by which they give expression to their reply is so similar to that given by the J² writers considered above, that a hasty resume of the latter's point of view will suffice. Like the Yahwist writers, the authors of this code also turn their gaze suddenly from the broad vistas of their world view to a particular individual, the progenitor of a particular people. In a rapid and swift^{ly} flowing genealogical table, "revealing a profound consciousness of the unity of all mankind" (Gen. 10), the descendants of Noah are quickly dispensed with, except for the direct ancestors of the Abramitic family. In staccato like sentences he disposed of the various branches into which the human family had been divided, and discarding all these as non-essential to his purpose, with hardly a word of transition, he rivets his glance upon Abraham and his descendants. (11:27-32). Although there is, in the Priestly account of Abraham, no such express statement as "in thee shall all the nations be blessed", which occurs in the Yahwist narrative, still there is enough material to warrant similar conclusions as those arrived at above (supra, p. 94ff). Yahweh is represented now as no longer concerned primarily with the

whole of mankind, but rather with a particular group, with Israel, (with Abraham as its prototype or symbol), with whom He concludes a special covenant. Again, the inference could be made, even if there were no further evidence, that Yahweh has selected Israel not as a whim or a caprice, but as a part of His purpose with mankind. Yahweh has chosen Israel, has singled it out from among all peoples that it might become peculiarly related to Him in a covenant relationship. But again the principle of noblesse oblige applies. Israel, thus specially favored, is also especially obligated to Yahweh. Yahweh will multiply Abraham (Israel) exceedingly, will make of him a great nation and will give to him a large and bountiful land (v 8) while He will be a god unto him and his seed after him, in the fullest sense of the word (17:4,5,7). Abraham (Israel) on his part, however, must also keep Yahweh's covenant (v 9), must walk before Him and be upright (v 1). This much, at least, is apparent from the passage just considered. Israel is to be especially related to Yahweh and in return for this dispensation is to walk in Yahweh's path as an example, a sign of the state to which mankind at large is to attain by walking before Yahweh in uprightness. As a token of this covenant, Abraham and all his male relatives and slaves are to be circumcised as "a sign of a covenant betwixt me and you" (vv 10 ff). Israel is thus differentiated by a tangible symbol from the rest of the peoples. But even as all things happen in accordance with Yahweh's purpose to bring about a restoration of the Golden Age, so Israel must

have been thus selected and distinguished only as a part of this divine plan. This would seem a most logical deduction even were there no further evidence, but there is more adequate proof of this proposition to be found in the remainder of the Priestly Code.

The following narratives in Genesis do not yield much for our purpose. Except for such differences as P's suppression of discords in the patriarchal household, in order to present a unified and harmonious Israel from the first, and the "sweeping aside of old cult legends which traced the origin of existing ritual usages to historic incidents in the lives of the fathers", in order that "every practice to which a religious value is attached might be referred to a direct command of Yahweh",²⁰ except for such differences, P utilizes the narratives of JE. It passes quickly over the intervening history in order that it might reach that period for which all the past has been a preparation, the period of Moses, of the *מִן הַטּוֹרָה*, of the revelation of His true name (Ex. 6:2) and thus His Essence also, of the giving of His Ten Commandments, of the legislation for the Tabernacle, after its heavenly antitype, and of the establishment of the Israelitish Theocracy, with its fully established Mosaic ritual, seemingly the final purpose of all that has gone before.²¹ To be sure, the other patriarchs are treated by the Priestly Writer, but

20. Skinner - ICCG, pp IX and XII.

21. Ibid.

with practically the same end in view as was that of the J² writers, to provide a connecting link between the past progenitors and the Mosaic (Aaronic or Priestly) family), together with such important considerations as the transmission of Yahweh's promise through the various patriarchs (28:3; 48:4; 35:11) and the pledge of the possession of the land of Canaan by Abraham's descendants through the purchase of the Cave of Machpelah²² (Gen. 23) and the burial of the patriarchs therein. (25:9; 49:30; 50:13, f). But all this, as was said above, is incidental to that which follows and which seems to be the chief interest of the Priestly School, namely, "to present a systematic view of the origin and the establishment of the great theocratic institutions of Israel, so carefully and punctilliously worked out even to such a detail as the transference of the rod that worked such wonders, from the hand of Moses (Ex. 4:17, 20b; 14:6a; 17:5, f) to that of Aaron the priest (7:9, etc.)

At first glance, therefore, this universal outlook which is contained in the historic framework to the legislation that follows, is but to lead back to that particularism which was our starting point, that particularism in which Israel is peculiarly related to Yahweh and in which Yahweh takes up His abode among His Chosen People. Seemingly, the Priestly Writers have lost sight of their universalism in a maze of minute descriptions and meticulate legislation, in a particularism which blinded them to the broader horizons beyond their

22. Ibid, p. 339.

own people and land. That this is possible and that they were not conscious of the logical consequences of their universal background cannot be denied. But it seems to the present writer that with such a grasp of the sublimity of Deutero-Isaiah's conception of Yahweh and His ultimate purpose with mankind, which they did possess, it seems most plausible that they shared also his view with regard to the reason for Israel's selection. That they enunciated as clearly defined a doctrine as his *יהוה לבד* cannot be asserted, but that with their idea of Yahweh's divine providence so adequately articulated, together with His choice of Israel to walk with Him and to be upright, to be an example and a sign, a proof of Yahweh's favor and potency (Ex. 8:15; 11:9-10 RP), to be a people observing His ways in every act of their life, it seems as if the mere correlation of Yahweh's providence and His selection of Israel leads to the same conclusion at which we arrived with regard to Deutero-Isaiah; they also had some idea of Israel as Yahweh's active agent or servant.

And it is in the figure of Israel as a priestly people that we find support for this hypothesis. Even if the passage "and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (Ex. 19:6) (Note Q) be by other than Priestly Writers, the sentiment behind it is Priestly. If it originated earlier, it must have been the shibboleth of their school also. The entire purpose of their legislation was to transform Israel into just such a nation peculiarly "holy" unto Yahweh, a nation set apart and so safeguarded from

ritual uncleanness as to be priestly in character. But the function of the priest was not merely to live apart from "profaned" men, jealously guarding his ritual cleanliness. He was the intermediary between Yahweh and the ordinary, unordained man. And the general purpose of the Priestly Writers, with their carefully planned Tabernacle and dwellings round about it, indicates that Israel, as a people of priests, ~~was~~ to play just such a role toward the nations round about. Nearest to Yahweh dwell the Priests, then the Levites, the Israelites, and finally the nations. A gradation in which each group seems to be the intermediary between the one below and the one above, leading finally to Yahweh. But we need not seek substantiation in such a fantastic scheme of things. We need but hark back to the priest of old and to examine for a moment his primary functions.

The priest, from earliest times, as intermediary between God and man was necessarily the interpreter of the Divine Will which, in the primitive period and even much later, was ascertained through the manipulation of the Urim and Thummin, or sacred lot, a custom commonly practiced by the Arabs ~~and other~~ Semitic groups. The ephod, too, played some part in his operations, though its exact purpose is not clearly understood. "The very name which he bore - 'cohen' - designated him as the man whose answer unlocked the secrets of the unknown, as a soothsayer or wizard."²³ Frequently, he is known as the כֹּהֵן כֹּהֵן (from ירה "to shoot" and hence, later, "to teach"), the priest that interprets or teaches

23. Kautzsch - HDOB; art. "Priests" VIV, pp. 67 ff.

according to the oracle. Consequently, his teaching or the revelation which he received from God became known as **תורה**. These "teachings" contained the requirements by which the deity was to be worshipped, the distinctions between "clean" and "unclean" and the pronouncements of legal decisions.²⁴

Contrary to the opinion of some, it was not solely the priest's prerogative to offer sacrifices, for "the competency of every Israelite to offer sacrifices to Yahweh was recognized"

(offerings were made by Saul, I Sam. 14:34 f; David, II Sam. 6:17f; Elijah, I Kings 18; Gideon, Judges 6:24-26, etc.), but it was the primary and unique function of the priests to serve as the "indispensable media in 'seeking' or consulting Yahweh."²⁵

He gave forth Yahweh's ordinances (**דברים** as in II Kings 17:25-28) and teachings. These ordinances or statutes the priests were in charge of and it was their duty to "teach" them.²⁶ Thus the earliest sanctuaries of Yahweh were more than places at which sacrifices were offered and vows discharged. "To the Tent of Meeting, which was the Mosaic sanctuary, whether originally associated with the ark or not, tradition asserts that everyone who sought Yahweh made his way. It was before the Tent of Meeting that Moses is probably conceived of as sitting to judge the people when they came to inquire of Yahweh (Ex. 18:15; ~~32-7~~). Thus justice and the equitable settlement of disputes between man and man became associated with religion."²⁷

24. Kuenen - NRUR, pp. 87 ff.

25. Ibid, p. 82

26. Ibid, p. 86 f.

27. Montefiore - HL, p. 65

(cf. also Num. 27:5^f and 27:21). Moses was then a "cohen moreh", or oracular priest such as we have described, and although the function of Aaron and his successors became somewhat more complex and ritualistic, still this primary function of the priests continued on into post-exilic times (Note R). In Malachi there is a splendid picture of such an ideal priest and his functions; true revelation proceeds from his mouth and unrighteousness is not found upon his lips; with Yahweh he walked peacefully and uprightly, causing many to return from their sinful ways. The priests' lips have charge of (or preserve) "knowledge" (most likely an ellipsis for *דעת*) and *תורה* is sought from his mouth. In short, he is the messenger of Yahweh Tsabaoth, (Mal. 2:6-7). While the priests, in actuality, did not attain to such an exalted conception, (cf. Hosea 4:1-9; Am. 7:14; Ez. 7:26), still this was the ideal and it was because the priests of his day were so far removed from it that Malachi so bitterly rebuked them, not only because of their ritual neglect, but because they paid no heed to Yahweh's ways and have not been impartial in judgment (v.9). It was the priest's function, at least in the ideal, to impart to the people the "knowledge of Yahweh" (cf. Notes F and S); he was Yahweh's interpreter, the "bearer and appointed upholder of His right."²⁸

Was this the ideal of the Priestly Writers? There is no explicit statement to this effect to be found in their

writings and seemingly they are primarily concerned in the priests' ritual tasks and ceremonial duties, the necessity of which we have already noted. And yet, in the light of the idealism which pervades the introduction to their legislation and the moral character of so many of their enactments, in the light of their conception of Yahweh as "the god in whose name justice was administered, and of whom it could be said that He was not known where the laws of honour and good faith were violated,"²⁹ in the light of all this is it not likely that, in the ideal at least, they were in perfect agreement with the lofty prophetic conception of the priesthood and its function, so aptly and adequately summarized by Malachi as the "trusted interpreter of the deity"³⁰?

If this be true - and there is little reason to question such a deduction - then Israel as the priest people must be conceived as fulfilling a similar function (Note T). Even as the priest was anointed with the sacred oil, symbolic of Yahweh's spirit which rested upon him and endowed him with special insight and the clear understanding of Yahweh's ways, (cf. Note J), is it not possible that these writers likewise conceived of ~~the ideal~~ Israel of the future as being similarly consecrated? Many of the precautions which they prescribed seem to lead to just such a supposition: the safeguarding of the community against any impurity, the atoning sacrifice

29. Ibid.

30. Ibid, p. 104

and ceremony for the entire congregation on the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16), the presence of Yahweh within the midst of their assembly, but more especially the idea of the sanctification of the entire Congregation of Yahweh." (Lev. 19:2; 20:7-9), all this and many more details seem to warrant the assumption that Israel was, in every respect, to become not only a holy nation, a particularistic group, but, in addition, a kingdom of priests with all its universalistic implications: a people possessed of the "knowledge of Yahweh", which knowledge was their treasured and unique possession as a group, from Sinai; a people from whom alone the nations might inquire of His way and to whom they, as priests, might impart His "teaching." (Is. 42:1-2).

This is in consonance with the broader view which we know that the Priestly Writers held, in addition to their narrow particularism. It is in consonance, especially with their marked liberalism with regard to the "stranger" (Lev. 19:34). Such strangers, learning of the greatness of Yahweh, especially through Israel's deliverance from Egypt (Ex. 7:3), through the glory that accrued to Yahweh "through Pharaoh" (Ex. 11:9-10) and the benefits which they have since received, these strangers will desire to join this religious community (religious since the days of Ezekiel when certain dogmas became the *sine qua non* for membership in the *קהל ישראל*) (cf. Note K). They will inquire of Israel as to the requirements of such admission and the manner of Yahweh's worship.

And provided that he does "that which Yahweh commands", he will be accepted. He will be permitted to partake even of the Passover sacrifice, the annual reminder of the whole covenant relation between Yahweh and Israel, provided that he too enters fully into the special covenant between Israel and Yahweh by submitting to the rite of circumcision (Ex. 12:43 ff), and participates also in Israel's sacrifices, the only means by which one of that day could enter into relation with a new god. In fact, "he shall become as one born in the land." The frequent iteration of the phrase "one law for the home born and for the stranger (Lev. 19:34; 24:2; Num. 15:15; 9:14), together with this instance of a liberal "open door" policy, indicates that in a practical way the writers of this school sought to extend the knowledge and worship of Yahweh. Not promiscuously^{or} heedlessly, as did many of the assimilationists mentioned above, for they were categorically opposed to intermarriage (cf. Gen. 26:34 f; 28:1; 27:46) in view of the exigencies of their day, but gradually and rationally to take into the Congregation of Israel those who sought such membership. Through Israel, then, as the priest people, as the peculiar possession of Yahweh, His religion was to be extended to all who sought Him and in this way it seems that the Priestly Code provides the means by which mankind will return to Yahweh, its original estate. In practice these writers resemble Ezekiel, except that they are much more lenient and liberal to the stranger; in theory they approximate, at least,

the universalism of Deutero-Isaiah, except for their more practical and expedient methods of achieving his end. A compromise has been reached that includes the better and more necessary elements of both particularism and universalism.

To summarise the contribution of the Priestly Code, we might say that its writers conceive of Israel as a well regulated and carefully safeguarded theocracy, a priest people chosen by Yahweh to minister unto mankind, to interpret His will and to bring His **תורה** and **משפט**, His revelation to the other peoples. (as in Is. 42:1-2). Israel was the special favorite of Yahweh, to be sure, the very salt of the earth, His first-born (Israel being the first-born son of a series of first-borns - Gen. 10:1a; 11:10-27; 21:1; 25:26b), but only because ^{as} an upright people, walking with Him (17:1) could they better fulfill His purpose. Yahweh had redeemed Israel from Egypt (Ex. 7:4-5); He had guided it through the waters of the Red Sea (14:4,17); had lead and sustained (17:1) it in the wilderness (16:12,32); and had given it the land of Canaan as an inheritance (Ex. 6:7; Gen. 17:8) primarily for the sake of His Name, that the knowledge of His power and His fame might spread abroad. In addition, He had entered into a covenant with Israel (Gen. 17:7,8) that they might be to Him for a people and He to them for a god (Ex. 6:7), that He might reveal to them His law in order that they might be duly consecrated unto Him as His priest people,

possessed of the full knowledge of Him, which knowledge alone, when possessed by the whole of mankind, could bring about the restoration of that pristine age of happiness and universal concord. Therefore Israel's most fundamental institutions are seemingly prescribed for humanity at large (Note T). It had been so at the beginning. Yahweh's will had been revealed to all mankind. But they had strayed from His path and now Israel had been chosen to bring man back to that uprightness and godlikeness which alone was pleasing to Yahweh (Gen. 6:9). Israel was to be converted into a holy nation and protected by every precaution from foreign and heathen influence, that it might become like Yahweh "godlike" (19:2; Lev.). Every act of its life was to be an "imitatio dei", to be patterned after a divine "ideal", even to the minutest detail, in order that it - and mankind at large - might once again be truly made in the "image of Yahweh" (Gen. 1:26). This, and this alone, could have been the purpose for which a great universal god could have selected a particular people: that creation might again become one unified whole, that mankind, descended from a common ancestry, all of the same kin but now dispersed and disparate, might again become one, godlike creation, holy even as Yahweh their God was holy.

The grand scheme of the Priestly Writers is now unfolded in all its depth and sublimity. Mankind, dispossessed of its primeval revelation and knowledge because of its sinfulness, is to regain its former most valued possession through Yahweh's chosen ministers, tried and tested, in the stories

of the Patriarchs and the wilderness wanderings; trained and consecrated through the priestly legislation, respected and sought out for instruction because of Yahweh's special manifestations to them; Israel, Yahweh's holy nation and the kingdom of priests, destined to fill the world with a knowledge of Him, even as the waters cover the sea. To repeat: although the priests were perhaps too rigorous in their ritual demands, designed to meet the critical situation which confronted them, although they may have become lost in the labyrinth of their legislative enactments, formulated to bring back their people to a recognition and constant reminder of Yahweh, their only God (Ex. 28:29, but especially Num. 10:10), still they did break through the limits of national interest and transcended this well recognized and pronounced particularism, reaching as perfect a compromise as was possible in their day; the practical particularism of Ezekiel, reconciled to the vision and universal aspiration of Deutero-Isaiah.

CONCLUSION

It is our hope that the conclusions arrived at in the previous chapter, together with the arguments adduced to establish their validity, will meet with the approval of those whose background and scholarship render them better able to judge. For the rest of this thesis no originality is claimed, for we have merely attempted to trace the rise and development of the two doctrines of particularism and universalism, to show the gradual progression of early Israel's religious history out of a narrow nationalism toward the broad universal ideal. We have become acquainted with a problem that is all-absorbing and which has dominated the subsequent history of Judaism. Many ramifications have suggested themselves, which might have been developed more fully and in greater detail, but which have been omitted in order that the main theme might not be obscured by too many digressions and that we might retain an interest and an impetus to pursue further study in this field, for we have but superficially scratched the surface, leaving much more to be discovered in the rich and fertile soil beneath. This much, however, we have achieved: From the earliest beginnings of Israel as a nation, through its various victories and vicissitudes - the monarchy, the dispersion, the exile, and the restoration, - almost from its very source, we have followed the course of these two streams, now

flowing apart, now commingling their waters into a mighty and powerful torrent. But we have not continued on through the succeeding stages of Israel's history which, together with the many extraneous problems already presented, would furnish interesting and abundant material for further research. For, if the story of the people of Israel provides any unbroken thread, any single motif, or even dramatic conflict within itself, it is the struggle of these two ideas for supremacy, and the repeated attempts to reconcile them into that loftiest conception of universalism with Israel as God's instrument, or servant, destined to bring about that "state of human perfection and bliss which is the final goal of all history and the fullest revelation of His glory."

NOTES.Note A.

The historicity of Moses has at various times been called into question, but most scholars are agreed that the general outline of the Moses traditions is historic. "His descent from the tribe of Levi," writes Kautzsche, "his name Moshe, his flight to Sinai on account of some homicide, his marriage with a Midianite priest's daughter, Zipporah his deliverance of a group of Israelitish serfs his brother Aaron and sister Miriam the prolonged sojourn at Kadesh and his death on the east side of the Jordan: (these facts) are beyond suspicion and their invention is either inconceivable or at least extremely improbable."¹

Accepting this as true, the general conclusions with regard to the part he played in the introduction of a particular deity, Yahweh by name, is also beyond question. "Since the time of Stade," says H.P. Smith, "the Kenite hypothesis has found great favor among scholars, in general."² and it is this hypothesis which warrants the conclusions arrived at by Dr. Morgenstern, as quoted above. The descent of Moses from the tribe of Levi; and its association in tradition with Simeon, Judah (29:33-34) and the fact that Judah was so closely associated with the Kenites who accompanied (under the leadership of Hobab) the Israelites (Judg. 1:16) and again the relationship between Judah and Simeon (Judg. 1:3; Gen. 49:5 f); all this leads to the conclusion arrived at above, that Moses led this group of tribes - Judah, Simeon, Levi - rather than the Ephraim-Manasseh group, based on the purely fictitious story of Joseph (cf. Morgenstern - Biblical Theophanies, pp. 171 ff; Budde - Religion of Israel Before the Exile, etc.).

Note B.

The fact that Deborah issues her call in the name of Yahweh has raised the issue as to just how, if this god was introduced only to the Judah tribes, His name had permeated this far north. The fact that Heber and Jael, the Kenites, are mentioned (cf. Note A) seems to indicate that the Judah tribes were already in the land but were not summoned because they were completely cut off from the North by strong Canaanite settlements round about Jerusalem, and

1. Kautzsche - HDOB @ Art. "Israel".

2. Smith - R9I, p. 53

also the lack of esprit d'corps between North and South, but the fact that by the time of Eli, not over a century later, the tribal priests of Ephraim were of the Levitical family, seems to indicate that some members of the tribe of Levi had migrated northward, carrying with them the name and reputation of Yahweh. The other alternative, offered by Dr. Morgenstern, as to the common appellation "Yahweh", is also quite plausible.

Note C.

Dr. Battenwieser, in his "Prophets of Israel", sets forth abundant and seemingly incontrovertible proof that the prophets, from Amos to Jeremiah, predicted a complete and absolute doom to befall their entire nation. Because of the hopeless corruption of their contemporaries and the insuperable distance between them and the prophetic view of religion, there was no possible hope of repentance, which alone could have spared them. The above-mentioned scholar, however, denies that they were pessimists in the sense that they did not see beyond this destruction, but in each one of them, including even Amos, he discovers some future hope of a regenerate Israel which would bring the knowledge of Yahweh to the peoples of the earth. To quote his apt and well-remembered phrase, "They were but sowing the seed, the harvest of which would be reaped in some future age."³ From this point of view we have departed somewhat, especially with regard to Amos and Hosea, but we present his view also for the sake of completeness, and also as an instance of one of those many problems which time and space prevents us from discussing more fully.

Note D.

The verse in Amos 3:2 is to be translated as Dr. Battenwieser has indicated: "Hear this word which Yahweh hath pronounced against you, O Israelites, against the whole race which I led forth from Egypt. Verily, I have taken more care of you than of any other race of the earth, hence I will visit all your sins upon you."

The usual translation, "you only have I known" would be antithetical and inconsistent with Amos' conception of a universal god who has not only delivered Israel from Egypt,

3. Battenwieser - Chaps. III, IV, V, VI, (esp. pp. 177-8, (301 f and with regard to the entire land being prey to destruction, see pp. 225-237).

but also other nations who were similarly the victims of injustice and oppression and to Whom the Israelites are in no wise better than the despised Negro races (9:7). But translating קָדַשׁ as being intensive rather than restrictive and יְיָ as denoting "God's providential care" (as in Hosea 13:5; Ps. 1:6) with כִּי used as the כִּי of comparison, the meaning becomes clear. Yahweh, Who has dominion over all peoples, has especially favored Israel in the past, and therefore did expect even greater obedience from them, but now, because of their shortcomings, He must more severely requite them for their sins. Israel is still Yahweh's chosen one and specially favored, but He is not limited to this particular nation.⁴

Note E.

The interesting problem as to the origin of Amos' universalism cannot be discussed herein. The question, however, as to whether it blossomed forth out of the innate genius of the prophet or whether it was his personal and exalted reaction to the conditions of his day, especially to the Assyrian concept of world unification achieved through conquest under a world God Ashur is a vital one, but not wholly relevant to our theme, for, by whatever means it arose, Amos' idea far surpassed that of any that had gone before in his profound doctrine of the supremacy of Yahweh, to be achieved through justice and righteousness.

Note F.

The term "knowing Yahweh", while used in the Bible with several different connotations, is yet expressive of one fundamental idea. It is employed, especially in Ezekiel, to mean mere cognition, the acknowledgment of Yahweh's supremacy and power (Ez. 20:38; 21:5; also Ex. 29:46, etc.). But frequently the term also implies a knowledge not merely of His existence and special manifestations (Is. 45:3; Ez. 33:29, etc), but also of His several attributes (Deut. 7:9) Because of His great power, in later Biblical passages, to recognize Him is also to admit His supremacy over all other gods (Ex. 14:18; Ez. 38:23) and hence to seek His protection also. In order to attain this, however, a knowledge of the means by which He might be propitiated or His favor secured, must be gained, and thus to "know Yahweh" comes to mean a comprehension of His way, or of His requirements

4. Battenwieser - POI, p. 307; N.1.

for worship. At first, and even later in Ezekiel and in the Priestly Code, this may have included only those sacrificial rites and special ritualistic observances by which a people sought its God. But in prophetic times the term included all those demands which Yahweh made of His people, especially the demands of righteousness and moral living. A striking proof of this fact is to be found in Jeremiah (22:16), where the practicing of justice and righteousness, the judging of the cause of the poor, is considered and construed as comprising a knowledge of Yahweh. Again, in another chapter, (9:22), Jeremiah expresses the same thought, - that to know Yahweh is to know that He is One who "doth work love, justice, and righteousness in the world." From such passages, and from many others that could be gathered from the other prophets where to know Yahweh is to also know, or practice, righteousness and to observe Yahweh's revelation, (especially Hosea 4:1; 6; where knowledge of Yahweh is related solely to truth and mercy and abiding by Yahweh's law. cf. Hosea 6:6; Micah 3:1; Is. 51:7; also important passage Is. 11:2 ff). From the foregoing discussion it can be easily maintained that knowing Yahweh implied the "knowledge of God in its highest sense, including obedience,"⁵ and the realization "that God controls the universe in accordance with the moral law and that to know God means to live in accordance with the moral law."⁶

Note G.

In refutation of those who assert that Chapter III is not an integral part of Hosea's work, Dr. Battenwieser remarks: "There is no particle of ground for discarding Chapter III, but every reason to consider it genuine interpolations, particularly such lengthy and material ones as would be Chapter III and Chapter II:16-25 never fit in harmoniously with the work of the original author, but invariably betray themselves through some more or less striking discrepancy."⁷

Note H.

A detailed and thorough discussion of the question as to just what point the conception of absolute monotheism arose in Israel we cannot enter into, but a few words in substantiation of the point of view presented in this thesis are necessary. With Kuenen, we feel justified in maintaining

5. Definition in Brown, Driver, Briggs' Dict.

6. Battenwieser - POI, p. 145, N.2.

7. Battenwieser - POI, pp241-243.

that the "sole existence of Yahweh, with the converse doctrine of the absolute non-existence of 'the other gods' is not expressly taught before Deuteronomy and Jeremiah."⁸ Isaiah's conception of Yahweh as a universal god whose רִצּוֹ filled the whole world was along step in that direction, but it seems that "to Isaiah, as well as to Hosea, the images and the gods they represented are identical,"⁹ and hence their reality is not denied by him, for his invective against the worship of them is so frequent as to preclude this fact. But we must disagree even with Kuenen's judgment and extend the rise of an absolute unquestioned monotheism beyond the time even of Deuteronomy. In Deuteronomy, to be sure, there is the idea of Yahweh as One, but it seems that this oneness refers to Israel alone. He is the sole god for Israel, but He is the "God of gods and Lord of lords" (10:17), who assigns the hosts of the heavens for other peoples to serve (4:19 D²) who is jealous for the sole worship of His people lest they take unto themselves other gods whose reality is seemingly not questioned (5:7-9). True enough, the phrase does occur "He is God in heaven and there is none else", but this too belongs to the later secondary strata,¹⁰ and is in contradiction to the tenure of the rest of Deuteronomy, and even portions of D², such as 28:64) with its frequent invectives against "other gods" and Israel's apostasy to them. In Jeremiah, if 16:19 be genuine (cf. Supra, p. 42 f), then we have a rather forceful denial of the validity and worth of other gods, who are nought but vanities. In 2:11 also, he refers to other gods as הֵלֵל וְעֵלִים while in 2:5 he again uses the term הֵלֵל, which might imply that they are things of vanity, of no profit for Israel, but the absolute non-existence of which he does not assert, whereas his continued accusation against Israel is their idolatrous walking after other gods (7:9; 3:6-12). Just what Jeremiah meant by the term הֵלֵל is difficult to determine, for he may have implied simply that there was no profit or help in them, that they were lying delusions and then, on the other hand, he may by this term have affirmed their absolute non-existence and referred to "other gods" simply in the language of his contemporaries, as it seems the Priestly Writers, despite their lofty monotheism and universal god conception, also did (Num. 33:4). Into this we cannot go more deeply but it is apparent that there is evidence for both points of view, that the struggle between the old conception and the new has seemingly not yet ended within his time, and hence it is not erroneous to state that the emphatic, categorical, absolute denial of the existence of other gods did not occur until the advent of Deutero-Isaiah.

8. Kuenen - NRUR, p. 340 f.

9. Montefiore - HL, p. 137

10. Carpenter - Harford - IH, p. 520

Note I.

The treatment of the גֵר, or sojourner dwelling in the midst of Israel, by various writers is an interesting one, but one which cannot be dealt with fully here. We have noted already Ezekiel's violent objection to "foreigners" participating in Temple rites. In Deuteronomy, greater stress is placed upon the privileges and protection which a גֵר ought to enjoy, although a D² passage excludes from the "קהל" an Ammonite and a Moabite even to the tenth generation, (Deut. 23:4). Frequent exhortations are made to treat him kindly (Deut. 10:19; 26:12) and to protect him from injustice (1:16; 24:17) but it was not until the time of the Priestly School, when, born out of the new proximity to the strangers in the exile and also out of the added emphasis placed on Israel as a "holy people", that upon the stranger also devolved the duty of remaining "clean" and "undefiled". It was then that there was stressed the doctrine of "one law for the homeborn and the stranger that sojourneth among you" (Ex. 12:49; Lev. 24:22; Num. 15:16). Such ideas are found in Deuteronomy also (Deut. 16:10 f; 16:13 f; 5:14, etc.), but it is P that most of the duties, - civil (Lev. 24:22), moral (18:26), or ceremonial (Ex. 12:19; Lev. 16:29) enjoined upon the Israelites were also demanded of him. Privileges also were extended to him (Ex. 20:10); he was, in truth, like one born in the land for only thus could Israel, the holy people be adequately protected and, (as is pointed out in Chapter 5), it was in this way, through the extension of the forms of Judaism to the "stranger" that its universal ideal could be achieved.¹¹

Note J.

The idea of Yahweh's spirit being poured forth upon Israel, once more restored to Yahweh, has deeper implications than the mere expression in itself indicates. The person possessed of Yahweh's spirit is in many respects differentiated from the rest of mankind. This idea dates back to earliest times, when one who was anointed with holy oil, was supposedly endowed, through this process, with Yahweh's spirit. The material means used - the oil - was the medium or symbol by which the anointed man came into possession of the רוח יהוה carrying with it the "symbolic transfer of qualities associated with the divine essence."¹² Thus, after Samuel anoints Saul, he becomes gifted with clairvoyant power and is recognized as the איש אלהים (I Sam. 10:1 ff).

11. HDOB - Art. "Ger", p. 156 f.

12. HDOB - Art. "Anointing", p. 556.

David, through anointment, is granted his kingliness, possessed of greater power and strength (16:13) indicating "an actual transfer of divine powers to the person anointed."

Later, even though the ceremony was not actually performed, certain persons were regarded as Yahweh's anointed ones, possessing "His spirit" (I Kings 19:16). This spirit grants even special craftsmanship (Ex. 31:8), the ability to interpret dreams (Gen 41:38) and extraordinary powers (II Kings 2:15). In the later writings, however, the possession of Yahweh's spirit endowed one with higher spiritual powers. As the idea of Yahweh became more spiritualized, so one possessing His spirit has gained more exalted attributes. This idea of the spirit of Yahweh is well summarized in the post-exilic passage¹³ in Isaiah 11:1 ff., where there is delineated the Davidic king who is to reign over the restored kingdom. The spirit of Yahweh which he possesses gives him wisdom and understanding (v.2) and the clear and comprehensive "knowledge of Yahweh" (Note F). It enables him to be sure in judgment (v.3) with a sense of righteousness toward the poor and the downtrodden. By a mere word he punishes evil-doers. He has insight into the essence of things and is a stalwart and unerring champion of justice (vv.3-5). Thus Yahweh's spirit resting on a person gives him possession of that perfect knowledge of His way which the prophets had enjoined (Note F). And, in addition, it gives him the will and facility to enforce his way upon men (vv.4,5). Thus, when Ezekiel speaks of the spirit of Yahweh being poured forth upon an entire people (37:14), he has, in all likelihood, this idea in mind, but if it had not quite reached this stage as yet, it is surely implied in Deutero-Isaiah's picture of Yahweh's servant consecrated unto him and with His spirit resting upon him, for it is just such things of which the servant is possessed and which the servant is to achieve (44:3; 42:1-4). It must also, in view of the priest's function as teacher and judge, as intermediary between Yahweh and man in a moral as well as a ritual sense (infra p.125ff; Note R) be included ~~also~~ in the idea of the priest as Yahweh's anointed. And if the inference be permitted, it is most likely true that even as in other cases¹⁴ the material unguent is omitted but the person is set apart and regarded as possessed of Yahweh's spirit, so in regard to Israel, "set apart for a particular religious work or use, as marked by some typical or symbolic rite,"¹⁴ Israel, in the Priestly Code, is consecrated and dedicated to Yahweh as a holy people possessed of His spirit, fulfilling the function of His anointed ones. (Is. 11:1-5).

13. Gray - ICCG, p. 215, 223; Cheyne - Introd., pp. 59-62.

14. Definition of 'Consecration' in H.ERE Vol. IV., p. 58.

Note K.

While there did exist such skepticism as described above, certain acts of worship were intensified by the Exile. It was the Sabbath and the rite of circumcision, which could be observed by the individual even outside of Palestine, (the Sabbath sacrifice not having been commanded until the P Code) which were given fresh emphasis by the Exile and which constituted the main acts of worship during the dispersion. Both the Sabbath and circumcision had fallen somewhat into desuetude in the hectic years that preceded the destruction, but now both institutions were stressed as a means to distinguish the Israelite from his heathen neighbors. Abstinence from work is to be most rigorously enforced and violation of this injunction is to be punished by death (Num. 15:32-36) (4) and even in such a sacred enterprise as the erection of the Tabernacle, it must be observed (Ex. 31:12-17). But it was to be not merely a rest day, negative in character, but a day of worship (Ez. 46:3) and later (P) a day on which additional offerings were to be required (Num. 28:10). Similarly, circumcision for which there is no specific legislation in the earlier codes "in P becomes a prescription of first magnitude, being placed above the Mosaic ritual, and second in dignity only to the Sabbath,..... as a sign of the national covenant with Yahweh." 15 Israel in Exile did not cease to be a religious group, but now without any nation or land it became just that, a *קהל* or "Church", a Congregation to which one belonged not merely through residence in the land of Yahweh, but by the observance of certain specific and particular rights and by the belief in Him and His unique attributes.

772
by birth
also

Note L.

These passages in Is. 21:1-10; 13:2- Ch. 14:1-23 are attributed by Montefiore to this period preceding the destruction of Babylon, but Battenwieser regards it as a vaticinium post eventum. 16 At any rate, the thought reflects the particularistic reactions and national aspirations growing out of the Exile.

Note M.

That the word *פֶּתֶחַ* is to be translated as that which is in accordance with Yahweh's purpose is discernible throughout Deutero-Isaiah's prophecies, but in the verse 43:9 (cf. 41:26) where the analogy to a law court is drawn

15. Skinner - ICCG, p. 297

16. Battenwieser - POI, p. 288, n.1; Montefiore - HL, p. 263

and the judgement pronounced is **נִסָּח**, used in relation to **קִדְשִׁי**, we have even more adequate proof. Thus **קִדְשִׁי** comes to mean that which is true, or right, or in accordance with Yahweh's purpose, which is ever true and right. For this reason the parallel between **נִסָּח** (Gen. 1) and **קִדְשִׁי** has been thought justifiable (Supra, p. 117).

Note N.

The **נִסָּח** is herein regarded as the future Israel, transformed and restored to Yahweh. The fact that there are passages which clearly refer to an Israel within an Israel (49:6; 50:10), need not concern us here. Most probably the prophet conceived of a small minority becoming converted to Yahweh, first; through them, Israel, as a whole would arise regenerated and purged, but in the last analysis it was to be Israel, Yahweh's Chosen People that was to become the "servant of God" and the "light to the nations." That the servant is not to be regarded as a single individual is now too well accepted a theory among Biblical scholars to be discussed herein.¹⁷

Note O

Although we have studied the Priestly Code "in dissection", according to its various strata, our treatment will be to regard it as a whole. It is to be granted that there are inconsistencies and even contradictions in these diverse strata, such as the anointing only of the High Priest in Ex. 27 and Lev. 8 and of the ordinary priests also, in Ex. 28:41; 30:30. There are variants in relation to the Dwelling, its size and equipment, the calendar, its duties and ritual requirements, but the majority of these divergences do not effect materially our main theme. Since it is likely that the Holiness Code originated quite late (probably even after the Return) the fundamental and general ideas of these writers are much the same. Some may have been rigid ritualists, others liberal universalists, while still others may have represented both views; and it is to these latter redactors, most likely, that we owe this Code and its compromise, including both elements. Hence, for the purpose of clarity and of presenting a unified view of their final work, we have refrained from treating it according to its many strata, but rather as a unit welded into a harmonious whole out of its variety of component parts.

17. Bittenwieser - Class Notes.
 Skinner - CBI (XL-LXVI), pp. 233 ff.
 Smith - ROI, p. 257

Note P.

It is to be noted also that even with regard to a detailed description of the ark, the Priestly Writers illustrate their penchant for representing all things, even down to the minutest considerations, as originating with Yahweh and as being a part of the divine scheme of things, here with regard to the ark, and mankind in general; later with regard to the Tabernacle and cult, and Israel, in particular. But the principle that all things must be according to a divine pattern applies in both instances.

Note Q.

The verses 19:5-6, which are erroneously attributed to the Elohist Code by many commentators,¹⁸ the lateness of its origin cannot be gainsaid in view of the idea of a "holy people" expressed therein, which idea, as we have seen, was first expressed by Ezekiel, but which was elaborated by the Priestly Writers. The expression *עם סגולה* is also late (being found elsewhere only in Deut. 26:18; Malachi 3:17; I Chr. 29:3). The entire passage is seemingly composite. Whether 3b belongs to the Deuteronomic redactors or P is to be questioned, but the entire passage 3b-6 must be very late, either Priestly or, as in Baentsch, RD¹⁹. In any event, the thought is Priestly: the conception of a holy people is its theme throughout (Lev. 19:2; 20:7 f), while the ritual safeguards, the plan of organization, the conception of Israel as the *קהל יהוה*, all this indicates that it was just such a *ממלכת כהנים* which the Priestly Writers aimed to create. Even if the verse is not actually by P, the idea contained therein is most assuredly shared by him.

Note R.

Further evidence of the oracular or teaching function of the priest existing in later times is to be found in such passages as Jer. 14:18; Is. 28:19; Micah 3:6 f,²⁰ Ez. 44:24) and by the care with which the Priestly Writers legislate for the ephod, and the Urim and Thummin as part of the priest's vesture (Ex. 28:28 ff), and the use to which it is put in seeking judgments (Num. 27:21). They do thus continue to be, at least in the ideal, that "positive force for instruction (Ez. 44:24; Deut. 33:10) and reproof in righteousness"²¹ which Malachi described as their major function.

18. Chart in Holzinger - Einleitung

19. Baentsch - ELN, p. 172.

20. Battenwieser - POI, p. 113 f.

21. J.M.P. Smith - ICCM, p. 38

Note S.

In support of the inferences made with regard to Israel as the "priest people" with much the same purpose to perform as had the servant, we might quote Carpenter-Harford: "Though (P is) specific with regard to its (Israel's) role among the nations, still its calling as a dedicated people is repeatedly mentioned."²² The significance of this dedication or consecration is discussed above (Note J), but it is of further significance that the same terms of consecration (though no actual anointing is performed), which, as we have seen, is not absolutely essential) is used with regard to the entire community (Lev. 20:8), as is with regard to the priest (Lev. 21:23; 22:9), Yahweh has *קדש*, not "made holy", but "set apart", or "regards as consecrated", Israel as a Congregation as well as the priest, and thus the great bulk of the "Priestly legislation is not merely for the priests, but primarily for the members of the Congregation."²³

The idea "servant of Yahweh" itself is quite clearly stated in one passage (Lev. 25:55) which in itself would offer no proof, but the analogy between the priest people and the servant, between prophet and ideal priest is so marked that the verse is not without significance. Thus, the practical program of the priests, in the light of this added evidence, seems to have been the "training of a holy nation who, by undivided allegiance to their God should sanctify His Name", out of which "grew the larger and fuller conception of a conversion of the heathen nation to the true religion."²⁴

Note T.

We have seen (Note K) the importance which the Sabbath and circumcision assumed in the exilic and post-exilic periods. Now, in regard to both these most fundamental institutions in Israel, which were looked upon as distinguishing features of Yahweh's people, a broader view is taken. The reason for the Sabbath is altered. It is not only ordained for humanitarian considerations, but rather because Yahweh rested thereon (Gen. 2:2-3; Ex. 20:11; 31:17) and its observance is incumbent even upon the "stranger" (v.10). But further, it was first hallowed, long before Israel came into consideration and is thus ordained for all mankind. Circumcision, too, is to be

22. Carpenter-Harford - I&H, p. 234

23. HDOB - Art. "Priests" - Vol. Iv. p. 82

24. Montefiore - HL, p. 125.

extended to those who seek to join Israel's ranks, while even the Passover, also a most distinctive feature of Yahweh's worship and reminiscent of Israel's deliverance and election (Ex. 12:14-20) can be shared by the stranger provided that he submitted to the rite of circumcision. (Ex. 12:44,48). Thus, if these basic institutions are also ordained seemingly for the nations as well as Israel, then it is apparent that through Israel the peoples are to learn the true worship of Yahweh in other respects, as well. Yahweh through Israel, reveals His will to mankind, that not only Israel will "keep His Sabbaths", in imitation of its God, and observe His way in general, but that humanity at large will once more walk in Yahweh's path as in the days of creation.