9501-1

SOME ASPECTS OF BIBLICAL MESSIANISM

on the basis of studies
in contemporary Aramean Religion

a thesis submitted in
partial requirement
for graduation

Hillel A. Fine
Hebrew Union College

Referee:
Dr. Julius Lewy.

SOME ASPECTS OF BIBLICAL MESSIANISM

With special thanks to Dr. Hildegard Lewy for the use of her unpublished study, Nabû-na'id, the king of Babylon and Prophet of the Arameans; and his immortalization in Iranian, Israelite, and Arabic Legend, upon which work this thesis is based.

CHAPTER I

The Purpose of Doom

Any modern approach to the prophetic writings must recognise that the prophets achieved distinction as ethical and religious teachers rather than as seers, gifted with supernatural ability to foretell the future. Yet any attempt to rationalise the prophetic message completely must meet with failure. The critical investigations of pre-exilic biblical literature have sometimes tended to oversimplify the phenomenon of prophecy. It has been assumed, all to glibly, that the prophets proclaimed, as a simple doctrine of retribution, that the necessary consequence of wrong doing was punishment and destruction. It was only in describing the inevitable results of sinful action that the prophets were believed to be interested in prediction.[1]

On the basis of such a rationalized interpretation of prophecy, contradicted though it is by the mysticism explicit throughout the prophetic writings,[2] the message of the prophets was often misinterpreted. Since, it was argued, in a simple, ethical system, the wages of sin is destruction, it would be impossible for the early prophets, so overwhelmed by the consciousness of their people's shortcomings, to foretell anything but the impending doom. The guilt of Israel was conceived to have reached such proportions, that Jahwe had no alternative but to renounce his covenant with his people, and to destroy them. This action would be irretrievable. The hopes, therefore, which many critical scholars are willing to concede to the pre-exilic prophets are, at the best, vague and irrational. They delete, as spurious, a great number of more optimistic phrases. A number of criteria are found for the deletion of many of these passages. But the most significant has been the difficulty of reconciling them with this rationalized pattern of the prophet's thought.

More recently, however, a group of investigators have re-examined the sources, and have been more willing to concede that it is not necessary to expunge all the hopeful

---

1. See, for example, Volz (p. 7), Hackmann (pp. 143f.), W. R. Smith (pp.315f.), etc.

2. E.g., Is. 6; Jer. 1:4-10: Amos 7:1-9; 8:1-3; etc.

predictions of the pre-exilic prophets.[1] Assuming, with justification, that the eschatological element, now almost universally recognized as a feature of the prophetic writings,[2] is deserving of more weight, in an interpretation of the prophet's message, than it customarily receives, they have seen, in the hopeful aspects of prophecy, a necessary feature of this eschatology. On the basis, especially, of Egyptian parallels, they have assumed that the variations in prophetic texts between predictions of doom and predictions of salvation are the natural expression of Israelite prophecy and not always a result of textual revision.[3]

Nevertheless, the evidence afforded by Egyptian parallels is not entirely convincing. The oracles quoted by Gressmann, Sellin and Dürr [4] have all been recognized as examples of post eventum prophecies; and although they still reveal the tendency for a prophecy of salvation to be preceded by forecasts of destruction, their eschatological basis is, consequently, by no means self-evident. The cyclical pattern which they read into history may be merely the result of the particular events which called them forth. Moreover, their limited scope, and their concern only with the future of Egyptian society constitute an equally significant difference from Israelite prophecy, and a deviation from the presumed eschatological pattern for universal history.[5]

---

1. Particularly Gressmann, H. (Der Ursprung der israelitisch-judischen Eschatologie; Der Messias); Sellin, D.E. (Die israelitisch-jüdische Heilandserwartung; Der alttestamentliche Prophetismus); Dürr, L. (Ursprung und Aufbau der israelitisch-jüdischen Heilandserwartung).

2. Thus the concept of the Jôm Jahwe, and the many prophetic ideas associated with Jahwe's judgement, which cannot be derived from the ethical, rational postulates of prophecy: the high mountains (Is. 2:2; Ezek. 40:2); the fiery wall (Zech. 2:9); the precious stones and jewels (Is. 54:11ff.); etc. See Gressmann, Sellin, and Dürr, op. cit.

3. For the best analysis of the history of this criticism, especially with regard to Isaiah, see Fullerton, K., "Viewpoints in the Discussion of Isaiah's Hopes," JBL, vol 41, pp. 1-101.

4. Thus the Leiden Papyrus, the Westcar Papyrus, the Prophecies of the Lamb and the Potter, etc. Both Sellin and Dürr make this limitation very clear. See especially Dürr, pp. 2-7, for a discussion of these oracles.

5. This last criticism is mentioned by Cripps, p. 54.

A much more evident parallel to prophetic eschatology, however, is revealed in a recent study of Aramean religion by Hildegard Lewy.[1] In her description of the religion of Nabû-na'id are found many of the essential features of biblical messianism. Her emphasis of the dependence of Nabû-na'id upon Aramean traditions and of his admiration for the First Aramean Dynasty [2] is equally significant in view of the Aramean origins which the Israelite tradition willingly acknowledges.[3]

The basis of Aramean messianism lies in the belief that the process by which one empire succeeds another, symbolizing on earth the successive reigns of the great heavenly deities, will finally be halted, and the supreme beneficent deity will finally establish his rule for ever. In the religion of Nabû-na'id, the ultimate ruler of the entire world is conceived to be the moon-god, Sîn,[4] whose kingdom will be re-established as soon as the prescribed terms of office of all the gods who must reign before him have expired. The mild rule of Sîn was expected to usher in a golden age "in which violence and evil would disappear, and mankind live in peace until the end of days." [5]

It was in the expectation of such a messianic future that Nabû-na'id placed his reign not in the "palû" of Sîn, but in that of the immediate predecessor of the moon-god, the goddess Ištar.[6] The struggles of his reign were convincing evidence that the messianic future had not yet become an actuality. Its advent depended upon the expiration of the "reigns" of his predecessors, and upon human readiness to receive the "golden age." For despite the precise periods of time which were allotted to each deity, the realization of the messianic future was not

---

1. Lewy, H., Nabû-na'id, the King of Babylon and Prophet of the Arameans; and his Immortalization in Iranian, Israelite, and Arabic Legend.

2. Lewy, p. 42

3. Note the association of the patriarchs with the Aramean cities of the Tigris-Euphrates region, and the form of the ancient confession of faith: ארמי אבד אבי (Deut. 26:5).

4. Lewy, p. 53 5. Ibid. 6. Ibid. p. 158

conceived to be an automatic process, but would depend, to some extent, upon the readiness of men to accept the rule of Sîn and to practise his religion.[1]

Thus, in the Aramean religion, the concept existed that the "golden age" identified with the kingdom of the beneficent world-god through his ruler on earth, would be preceded by eras of strife and confusion. Moreover, the idea had already received its ethicization, in its emphasis upon the part which humanity must play in bringing about the messianic goals. That such a conception of history influenced the literary prophets, particularly in their portrayal of the Jôm Jahwe, can, we believe, be demonstrated by an analysis of their writings. The Jôm Jahwe, both in popular and in prophetic thought, was not merely the period of Jahwe's vengeance, whether exercised upon Israel's neighbors alone, or extending even to his own people. This, indeed, was the necessary preliminary. But the essential character of the Day is that it was to represent the final triumph of Jahwe among the gods. That this was the basis of the popular view, denounced by Amos for its crudeness, needs no demonstration. But we shall attempt to show that basically, even for Amos and his great successors, this fundamental character of the Jôm Jahwe persisted. It was the ultimate purpose, to serve which the destruction was a preliminary. Out of the destruction, a new era of contentment was to arise.

The messianic references, often denied on <u>a priori</u> grounds to the early prophets, are, therefore, a necessary complement to their message of doom. The more dismal aspects of their message received more emphasis from them. That this was inevitable from the nature of their task, as they conceived it, we shall likewise attempt to show. But the chaos of the Day of Jahwe was not an end in itself. It was but one part of that form of preaching, firmly rooted in popular eschatology, which looked ultimately for a more perfect society under the acknowledged empire of Jahwe. Without some reference to this eschatological framework, the concepts of the prophets cannot be fully comprehended. The prophets brought significant changes to the popular belief. But nowhere did they abandon its essential ideal.

---

1. Ibid., p. 157

A. The Island of Salvation

The early literary prophets delivered their message against the background of this well known eschatology, elevating it by their ethical and religious insights, but by no means challenging its basic postulates. The entire purpose of Amos' ministry was, as has been generally recognized,[1] to substitute his own concept of the Jôm Jahwe for the more optimistic version of his contemporaries (5:18). He pictured his audience as "yearning" for the coming of this day of judgment, which would be their vindication over their enemies. But in reality, Amos warned, the day would bring only misfortune to his people. When it came, Israel would find itself fleeing from one disaster to another more terrible than the first.

Yet Amos did not invent this more severe interpretation of Jahwe's vengeance. Others among his contemporaries were convinced that Israel must suffer, even as the rest of the nations, when the general upheaval was inaugurated. They differed from the prophet only in not taking the idea seriously enough to guide their lives by it or to imagine that it would materialize in the immediate future. Optimistically, they "put far away the evil day" (6:3; cf. 9:10b), and remained unconcerned with the ultimate course of history.[2] At any rate, Amos' emphasis of the doom which would overtake Israel on the Day of Jahwe was by no means unheard of before he preached his message, nor did he himself originate his unshatterable belief that the vengeance which Jahwe would exact from Israel's neighbors would just

---

1. Thus W.R. Smith, pp. 397f.; H.P. Smith, p.216; Marti, pp. 180-186 Harper, pp. 131f.; Cripps, pp. 193b.; etc.

2. Cf. Gressman, p. 76. Sellin (Proph., p. 118) believes that Amos 3:12 can similarly be best understood if Amos' audience were already acquainted with the concept of a remnant, and if the prophet is assuring them that this remnant will be completely negligible (Cf. his interpretation of Amos 6:6 [p. 119]). For the reasons which will be developed in this chapter, we cannot follow Dürr (pp.36ff.) and Sellin (passim) in making the prophets the originators of the idea that Israel, like the other nations, would suffer in the upheaval of the Jôm Jahwe. The various early poems of Jahwe's victories which Dürr quotes to prove that the popular expectations of salvation were not supposed to be preceded by destruction are in no way eschatological or messianic, and are therefore, irrelevent for our purposes.

as surely overwhelm and destroy his own compatriots in Judah and Israel.

> Whether or not Amos' references to Judah are original parts of his prophecy, he could not have affirmed that Judah would be saved from the general destruction. Amos, it is true, made a distinction between Jahwe's people and other nations; but even this did not allow Israel a greater opportunity for survival. Jahwe's justice, when his day came, would be based purely on ethical standards. And although the social and economic abuses of the Southern kingdom had not yet reached the intensity of those in Samaria (Morgenstern, pp. 338ff., etc.), we may be sure that they were already sufficient to arouse the fury of a prophet as sensitive as Amos. For a full discussion of the genuineness of the passages referring to Judah, see Buttenweiser, pp. 225-236.

Both the popular and the prophetic concepts of the Day of Jahwe consisted essentially of the belief that the nations surrounding Israel were to be destroyed by Jahwe's vengeance.[1] According to some opinions, Israel was to escape entirely;[2] according to others, Israel would suffer in the general upheaval.[3] But although the prophets introduced, within this framework, an unprecedented ethical orientation, they contributed little to the framework itself. Amos shared the general belief that the nations surrounding Israel were to suffer in the same holocaust which would bring Israel to judgement. His condemnation of Damascus, Gaza, Ammon, and Moab (1:3-8, 13-15; 2:1-3)[4] was not a meaningless exordium to win the attention of the worshippers at Beth-El, but an integral part of his message.[5] The neighbors of Israel, he maintained, were to be judged by the same standards as Jahwe's own people.

---

1. See, for example, Jer. 28:8

2. Thus the popular view criticized by Isaiah 5:18f. Cf. Jer. 5:12; 6:14; 14:13; 23:17; etc., quoted by Sellin, Heilandserwartung, p. 6.

3. Thus Zephaniah 1:2f., 18; 2:4-15; Micah 1:3f. The genuineness of the eschatological framework of pre-exilic prophecy makes it unnecessary to delete these verses as late additions (cf. Sellin, Proph., p. 113).

4. On the originality of these four oracles, see the commentaries.

5. Cf. Sellin, Proph., p. 30.

He gave the Day of Jahwe an ethical interpretation insofar as it concerned other nations as well as Israel. But he in no way abandoned the conviction that the judgement of these peoples would be the first indication of the approaching vengeance of Jahwe.

In fact, Amos had long struggled with the popular concepts of judgement, and vacillated between the milder and the ethically more consistent points of view. He, also, must have yearned that Israel might remain an oasis amid the wilderness of destruction. Only in this way can we interpret Amos' plea for the salvation of his own people, when Jahwe revealed to him his intention to begin his avenging work:

סלח נא
מי יקום יעקוב
כי קטן הוא (7:2; cf. 7:5)

(Forgive. Would that Jacob might stand, for he is small).[1] From a purely ethical point of view, such a request has no meaning. Why should Israel's smallness excuse his crimes, or diminish his punishment? Certainly the prophet's uncompromising concept of justice would preclude so sentimental a consideration. But the petition fits very well into the eschatological framework of the first two chapters of the Book of Amos. Amos did not doubt that Jahwe must effect some form of retaliation for the crimes of the lands surrounding Israel. But for some time, he preferred to adhere to the belief that a nation, more aware than her neighbors of the nature of Jahwe's laws, could thereby escape his judgement. The crimes which Amos charges to Israel are by no means so serious as those which he ascribes, in a succinct phrase, to each of the remaining nations which he condemns. Even from a strictly ethical point of view, the prophet might hope for the sal-

---

1. Gressman's explanation of the plague described in Amos 7:3 on the basis of mythology rather than of an actual occurence is not entirely convincing. However, he does not comment on the more evident eschatological framework of these visions.

vation of the people which was uniquely related to the avenging god (3:2).

But why, then, does he ask salvation on the merit of Israel's smallness? A similar plea to that of Amos, preserved in the Book of Genesis, gives us a clue to the reason. When Lot was instructed to flee from the destruction of the city of Sodom, he also spoke on behalf of a minute area of land, this time the village of Ṣôʿar, and asked that it might be spared because of its insignificant size: הנה נא העיר הזאת קרובה לנוס שמה והוא מצער (Gen. 19:20). The story of the fall of Sodom need not go back to a tradition of a more widespread disaster; but undoubtedly the fugitives from Sodom regarded themselves as the sole survivors of humanity (19:31 ff.). Lot's plea for the salvation of a "small" village then becomes fully understandable. The traditions which spoke of such wholesale destruction envisaged some such island which would escape the general fate, and from which the future of mankind was to be established. Thus did Lot plead for Ṣôʿar, and Amos for Israel. Lot expressed the point of view which the prophets were slowly modifying on the basis of their ethical standards,[1] but which continued to color all their exhortations. Until Amos was convinced that Israel could not be saved this easily, he tried to preserve the more comfortable doctrine, and to cling to the hope that Jahwe might spare his own people from the terrors of his vengeance. (7:2, 5).

Nor can the process of reasoning by which Amos came to adopt the sterner view of Israel's future be easily separated from the eschatological framework of his prophecy. He adopted from his background, as did Joel at a later period,[2] the belief that the final doom of a people is announced by a

---

1. Whether Sellin is correct in assuming that the Jôm Jahwe must have had an ethical basis even before the literary prophets (Proph., pp.122 ff., etc.) cannot be finally determined.

2. The warnings which precede the Day of Jahwe, in order to give the people the opportunity of repentance, are still be to found in Joel (cc. 1 and 2). The late prophet, however, has the belief that repentance for the entire people is still in the realm of possibility, so that the destruction of Judah may be entirely averted.

succession of milder disasters. His summary of the successive warnings of Jahwe to his land (4:6ff.; cf. Is. 1:4-9)[1] readily suggests the parallel warnings listed in the Epic of Ea and Atrakhasis,[2] the failure to take heed of which leads to the annihilation of humanity, and a new creation. The Babylonian epic describes a series of disasters which occur in successive years. The descriptions of the first two warnings are lost, but the poem continues:

> In the third year . . . .
> The people revolted against their . . . .
> When the fourth year came . . . . their cities were reduced to straits,
> Their broad . . . . became narrow (?) . . . .

The successive disasters of the fifth and sixth years are then cryptically described. Finally (col. 3), pestilence makes an end of the clamor of the people. Since their sins (?) have not been diminished, the end of humanity is now definitely decided. The actual account of the destruction is wanting, but after a lacuna, the final column of the Epic describes how the god Ea sets out to effect a new creation of mankind.

Guided by the same popular beliefs, and convinced that Jahwe's warnings to Israel could already be discerned, Amos was forced to abandon the more comfortable interpretation of the Day of Jahwe. He could not suppress the unwilling conviction that Israel would be treated no differently from its neighbors when the day of wrath came.

On the basis of this more dismal concept of the Jôm Jahwe, the ultimate messianic hopes of the early peophets came to be founded. The more naive hopes were abandoned, but, as we shall see, an equally real, and a more consistently considered hope, continued to motivate the ministry of Amos and his successors. Before considering the nature of prophetic messianism,

---

1. Cf. Is. 5:25. The series of disasters listed by Amos are: 1. Famine (v.6); 2. Drought (vv. 7f.); 3. Mildew and Blasting (v.9); 4. Pestilence (v.10); 5. Overthrow compared with that of Sodom (v. 11).

2. Rogers, R. W., Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament, pp. 113 ff.

we must examine, in somewhat more detail, the beliefs and suppositions which were associated with Jahwe's judgement of the nations on the day of his wrath.

B. The Power Beyond Damascus

Popular eschatology painted a clear picture of how Jahwe would destroy the nations which had angered him. The early prophets, living at a time of Assyrian hegemony, looked to Assyria for the imposition of the first part of Jahwe's sentence.[1] But we cannot doubt that this view of Assyria is colored by an a priori concept that a mighty Eastern empire would act as Jahwe's instrument when the time of judgement had arrived. The prophets give many indications of the necessary role which is played in their eschatological beliefs by the nation "beyond Damascus." The very use of this expression by Amos is already revealing. Amos unmistakeably had the Assyrian Empire in mind when he foretold, in the words of Jahwe:

והגלתי אתכם מהלאה לדמשק

(And I shall exile ye beyond Damascus [5:27]). But the vagueness of his phraseology suggests that his attitude towards Assyria was based upon the more general idea that a great Eastern power was to be the instrument of Jahwe, an idea which need not have arisen with the resurgence of the Neo-Assyrian Empire, and which continued to convince the prophets, even after the death of Ashur-bani-pal, that the instrument of Jahwe's power would always come from the Babylon-Mesopotamian area.

> The vagueness with which the prophets refer to the Assyrian power is too constant to be merely accidental. It clearly stems from the mythological beliefs in the destructive powers of the

---

1. Sellin believes that the conquest by Assyria is only incidental to a general upheaval and destruction (Proph., pp.116ff.). It must be admitted, however, that political conquest is, to Amos, the principal means by which Jahwe's purpose is to be effected. The vagueness by which the Assyrian power is referred to (cf. 3:11; 6:14; in addition to 5:27), is characteristic only of the eschatological style, and does not imply, as Sellin asserts, the equal importance of other means of destruction.

> north. Isaiah speaks at one moment of a smoke out of the north, which is to put an end to the Philistine aspirations (14:31), at another, of the swift nations from afar which are to wreak Jahwe's vengeance upon his own people (5:26ff.). In precisely parallel language, Jeremiah calls down upon Judah threats which involve "all the families of the kingdoms of the north" (1:14f.; cf. 6:22). Whatever powers Jeremiah may have had reference to, the vagueness of his allusions, which continues to mystify scholars, makes inescapable the reader's impression of the same background of eschatology.[1]

The very essence of Jeremiah's prophecy is to be explained on the basis of these eschatological ideas. It was not an accident of history, nor alone the ultimate triumph of the neo-Babylonian Empire, which led Jeremiah to his pro-Babylonian bias. The fact that Jeremiah has no condemnation, but rather deep sympathy for Jahoahaz (22:10f.), despite the utter disapproval of the deuteronomist (2 Ki. 23:32), is to be explained most reasonably upon the basis of Jehoahaz' foreign policy. We may venture to assert, therefore, that Jeremiah's anti-Egyptian bias existed even at this time of apparent Egyptian strength, when, as far as any inhabitant of Judah might perceive, Egypt might well have been the great empire of the future.[2] Jeremiah, like his predecessors, could not escape the conviction that Jahwe would work his destruction through the instrumentality of the power "beyond Damascus."

The prophecies of Isaiah at the time of the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis are equally significant in the light which they shed upon the prophetic belief in the triumph of Assyria. Isaiah has no doubt of the course of history which is in store for his people (7:1ff.). The alliance of Damascus and Samaria cannot prevail over Judah. But no sooner is deliverance effected than

---

1. These ideas, of course, receive their full development in Ezekiel 38 and 39 (38:6, 15; 39:2). That a power originating in the Eastern arm of the Fertile Crescent, and entering Palestine by following the pathway of the crescent, can be thus referred to, is shown by the second Isaiah (41:25).

2. We assume, of course, that Jeremiah's distinction does not lie in the political sagacity which enables him to perceive, unlike his contemporaries before the Battle of Carchemish, that the political bases of Egyptian power were less stable than those of Babylon. These facts could not have been apparent in Judah, evident as they are to those who can interpret in the light of subsequent history.

a new disaster is prepared. The Assyrian, who has swept through Aram and Israel, will complete his work of havoc on the kingdom of Ahaz. The child who was gullibly named Immanuel at the moment of deliverance shall witness the final shattering of those hopes which he was meant to personify. "Jahwe will bring upon thee the mighty and powerful waters of the river, the king of Assyria and his splendor.....and the stretching of his wings shall be the full width of thy land, O Immanuel" (Is. 8:7f.).[1]

At first sight, it is difficult to understand how Isaiah can be so specific in his fortelling of the future. That he was, to a considerable extent, vindicated by the subsequent course of history can scarcely make his prediction more understandable, unless we regard the final form of Chapter 7 of his book as a reworking of an original prophecy in the light of later events. But disregarding this unlikely hypothesis, we must still ask why Isaiah, convinced from the beginning of his ministry that the destruction of the Jôm Jahwe will inevitably include Judah (6:9-12, etc.), should have predicted this brief respite for his people. Why could not Damascus and Ephraim have worked their destruction upon Judah, and only afterwards have met their own fate at the hands of Assyria? If, as has generally been supposed,[2]

---

1. For a justification of this interpretation, see below.

2. Thus Sayce (p.44); Driver (p.31); Skinner (p. 50); W. R. Smith (p. 265); H. P. Smith (p. 235); Fullerton, Immanuel (p. 263); Robinson (375); etc. It is difficult to understand how this interpretation of Isaiah's ministry during the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis should have persisted. If an alliance with Assyria would, from a practical point of view, have led, after the destruction of Pekah and Rezin, to an Assyrian conquest of Judah, certainly Judean neutrality towards Assyria would have made the Assyrian ambitions even more dangerous. If, then, Isaiah believed that only trust in Jahwe would save Judah, he would have to make clear by what means Assyria would be halted. There is no hint in the text of how such a possibility is to eventuate.
On the other hand, if Assyria were the instrument of Jahwe, Isaiah's principal purpose could hardly have been to denounce an Assyrian alliance as the greatest evil. The text itself gives no evidence that this was the basis of Isaiah's attack upon Ahaz. (The text of Is. 8:6 would, if genuine, suggest the contrary). Isaiah's opposition to other than Assyrian alliances was based upon his recognition of Assyria as the inevitable conqueror, and therefore, provides no basis for analogy.

Isaiah had been interested only in preventing an alliance between Judah and Assyria, surely the most natural way to advise the people against the alliance and to force them into neutrality would have been to warn them that their political adventure would not avail them even for a moment. Nor are we justified in supposing that Isaiah was gifted merely with a higher degree of political accuity, which convinced him that the Damascans and Israelites would be thwarted at the outset of their attempt to wage war against Judah. The king of Judah and his officers were fearfully preparing for the attack; Isaiah could scarcely have possessed more reliable political information than they. The prophet was able to speak with assurance only because of his theological postulates. The Immanuel prophecy, and its assurance of deliverance from the immediate danger, shows that Isaiah believed in a predetermined order in which Jahwe's judgement would be accomplished. Convinced from the start that Assyria would be Jahwe's instrument, Isaiah could not believe that the alliance of Pekah and Rezin could succeed. Yet so imminent did their triumph seem, even in his judgement, that the deliverance of Judah would, in itself, be a miraculous sign, to convince the people that the Day of Jahwe, as he interpreted it, would not be many years in the future.

With Hosea, Egypt as well as Assyria is involved, to some extent, as the power of judgement (8:13; 9:3, 6). Hosea, in these passages, adopted an eschatological pattern which is known to Isaiah also, but definitely alluded to only on one occasion (Is. 7:18ff.). The acceptance of this less usual pattern does not, of course, contradict the dominant role which, both Isaiah and Hosea were convinced, Assyria must play in the overthrow of the Israelite states, and even of Egypt. The originality of the reference to Egypt in Is. 7 is discussed below (Page [illegible], note [illegible]). But contrast the interpretation of Sellin (Proph., pp. 116ff.).

C. The Second Phase of Jahwe's Judgement

The overthrow of the kingdoms centered around Israel was but the first stage in the prophetic concept of the Jôm Jahwe. The pre-exilic prophets describe a restoration of Israel or Judah, bound by covenant to Jahwe, and built upon the ruins of the former peoples. This cyclical pattern of prophecy, most clearly revealed in the writing of Hosea, can be discerned, likewise, in the message of his great contemporary, Amos, and in the prophecies of their successors, Isaiah and Micah.

The first and third chapters of the Book of Hosea reveal the prophet's concept of a cyclical pattern of history. These two chapters refer to two successive actions undertaken by the prophet to symbolize the fate of Israel.[1] The phraseology and ideas of the third chapter, referring to incidents completely different from those which have already been described, must mark a chronological development in the sequence of events which the prophet is predicting.[2] Taken together, the chapters reveal very clearly the first two stages of prophetic eschatology.

To begin with, as we have already noted, comes the destruction. Hosea takes to himself a "wife of harlotry," to symbolize the harlotry of his people.[3] She bears children, who are symbolically named, to announce the doom of Israel. The last child, Lô-ᶜammî, symbolizes the nullification of the

---

1. There is no reason to deny the apparent sense of the passage, and to regard the marital experiences of Hosea as the cause of his disillusion and prophecy of doom, as do, for example, W.R. Smith (pp. 178f.) and Harper (p. 205). Hosea's marriages are no more than a common form of symbolic action, similar to many others performed by the prophets. Batten, who agrees with this interpretation, denies the originality of the third chapter, which, he claims, was ascribed to Hosea only because of its similarities to Hosea's figures of speech (Batten, L.W., "Hosea's Message and Marriage," JBL, vol. 48, pp. 257-273, cf. Marti, Dodek, pp.33f.) But the threat, explicit in v. 4, fits clearly into a pre-exilic context, and we have no reason to deny its authenticity.

2. Note the use of לקח (whether it be construed with "ל" or with את), suggesting an additional experience, and the difficulty of reconciling the ideas of the first chapter (the birth of three children, the determination of Jahwe no longer to have compassion upon Israel) and those of the third chapter (the woman is to sit solitary for many days, without contact with her husband, Israel, is to be without prince and king for many days). But contrast Nowack, pp. 24 ff.

3. Thus interpreted by Toy (Toy, C. H., "Note on Hosea 1-3" JBL, vol. 32, 75ff.). Even if the woman is not to be considered a sacred prostitute, we have no reason to delete the expression זנונים .

covenant between Jahwe and his people (1:9). As unequivocally as Amos, Hosea portrays the final doom of his people.

But now the prophet is called upon to perform a new symbolic act. Jahwe speaks to him again (3:1), and he is bidden to marry an adultress. After marriage, she is to sit in solitude, having intercourse neither with the prophet, nor with any other man. The meaning of this act is then explained. Presumably after the destruction which has already been symbolized, Israel will sit solitary for a specific period of time. Jahwe will no longer be their ruler, but neither will they pay homage to any other god. Whether or not the final peroration (3:5) is genuine in Hosea's prophecy,[1] the sense of the first two stages which have already been described demand some such conclusion. After Israel has been completely overthrown, and then has remained for a specific period of time rejected by Jahwe, the reconciliation must follow. Otherwise the first stage alone would have been sufficient, and the many days (3:3, 4) during which Israel is to be desolate would be without meaning.

> Whether or not we place Hos. 2:1-3 after 3:5, as Buttenweiser has ingeniously suggested (pp. 251ff.), thus bringing three stages of Hosea's belief into three precise and chronological divisions, it remains evident that some such continuation for 3:1-4 is, if not stated, at least implied.
>
> The same idea of waiting amid desolation for Jahwe may be intended by Is. 8:17. If vv. 16-18 follow v. 15, the destruction has already taken place when the prophet takes these steps for the preservation of his disciples. V. 17 itself implies that the destruction has been completed.

---

1. Even Gressman conceded that the words "ואת דויד מלכם" are to be regarded as an interpolation (pp. 84f.).

Isaiah implies the same cyclical pattern in the elegy which is recited in the first chapter of his Book over the doomed city of Jerusalem (1:21-26). The passage has generally been accepted as belonging to the prophecies of Isaiah;[1] the condemnation of the city is characteristic of his style; the passage is free of what have usually been taken as indications of late authorship. Most interpreters, moreover, would not deny a close connection between the idea of purification, as it is expounded in this elegy, and Isaiah's prediction of a remnant to be saved from destruction.[2] Nevertheless, the all inclusive character of the doom which, this passage insists, must precede any restoration has not always been sufficiently emphasized.[3] The redemption is not to be accomplished simply by "purging out the sinners and their sin, and bringing back the remnant of the nation to obedience and right worship."[4] The future destruction, which is the occasion of the prophetic elegy, must be as complete as that which Isaiah portrayed originally in his inaugural vision (6:11), and from the affirmation of which he never deviated. The "dross" which will be purged with lye (v. 25) does not represent a single element, albeit a considerable element, of the people. The destruction of Jahwe's adversaries (v. 24) will involve the desolation of the entire land.

The Immanuel prophecy of Isaiah (7:10-25; 8:1-8) reveals even more clearly the definitely marked stages by which the eschatological future of Israel is to be assured. The most satisfactory interpretations of the "Immanuel" sign recognize that the hopeful element implicit in the name is twisted, by the prophet, into an ironical forecast of the impending destruction of the kingdom.[5]

---

1. Cheyne, p. 6; Duhm, pp. 10ff.; Skinner, pp. 10f., Gray, pp. 32ff., esp. p. 36.

2. Thus Marti, p. 187; Duhm, p. 11.

3. Gray has accepted this interpretation (p. 34), but contrast Pfeiffer (p. 432), Skinner (p. 11), etc. Duhm contrasts Isaiah's concept of purification here expounded with his "later" idea of total destruction (p. 12).

4. W.R. Smith, p. 247.

5. Thus K. Fullerton ("Immanuel," AJSL, vol. 34, p. 256) and Sellin

But once this interpretation of the name is accepted, Isaiah's portrayal of the rapid advance of Assyrian power, of the destruction of all who stand before her, and of the final vindication of Jahwe's people point clearly to an eschatological frame of reference.

Ahaz refuses to ask a sign of the prophet because he is convinced, from the beginning, that Isaiah will tell only of the destruction of his kingdom. He piously disguises his refusal, but Isaiah insists upon presenting him with a sign. Ironically enough, the sign of doom is to consist of the deliverance of Ahaz from the very danger which he fears. Within less than a year, Judah will be saved from Pekah and Rezin: expressed symbolically, a young woman shall conceive, and when she bears a son, she shall call his name Immanuel,[1] for the redemption will have been accomplished (7:10-14).[2] But scarcely has the boy grown up when the work of utter destruction begins. Damascus and Samaria are forsaken (7:16). The terror spreads to Judah (7:17, 20)[3] — an

---

(Heilandserwartung pp. 25ff.) recognize, from two completely different points of view, this essential character of the Immanuel prophecy. Fullerton has accepted the fact that the name Immanuel is given an ironical connotation. The name which heralds salvation is to be a sign of the doom of Judah. But, failing to concede the rapid transitions of the eschatological style, he is forced to the difficult assumption that the naming of the child is itself an act of predictive prophecy while Judah is still in danger. That the child may be thus named compels him, likewise, to assume that the ʿalmâ is not an undetermined woman, but a wife of Ahaz, an assumption which can scarcely be established on the basis of our evidence. Sellin uses the same framework of ideas to establish the messianic identity of Immanuel, an idea which cannot altogether be excluded.

1. Despite Sellin, most attempts to establish Immanuel as a messianic figure (H.C. Ackerman, AJSL, vol. 35, pp. 205 ff.; Gressman, pp. 235 ff.) are not entirely convincing.

2. Presumably by Assyrian attack upon the aggressors. But as yet the prophet has not spoken of the complete destruction of Damascus and Samaria. This follows rapidly in the succeeding verses, without transition, in typical apocalyptic style. But contrast Fullerton's interpretation, loc. cit.

3. We can scarcely follow Duhm (pp. 52ff.) and Hackmann (pp. 64ff.), who see no threats to Judah, but only to Israel, at this period of Isaiah's ministry. Duhm regards v. 17 as a later addition to the text. Hackmann takes the threats of this v. as applying still to the Northern Kingdom.

old proverb is quoted by Isaiah to add strength to his words (17:18f.).[1] Only when the destruction is thoroughly effected, is the first part of the Jôm Jahwe at an end.[2]

But now, even as in the third chapter of Hosea, a second stage begins. The cities are desolate, wilderness replaces the cultivated land; the hunter (v. 24) supercedes the farmer; the shepherd represents the highest stage of civilization. But those who remain are to be cared for in this primitive society. Life will be reduced to its simplest form. A man shall possess only a young cow and two sheep. But the cow shall yield milk so abundantly that its owner will consume only the curds — the thin milk will be discarded, because of the abundance which prevails in this transitional period of history (v.22).[3]

> The cyclical pattern in which a period of regeneration follows the overthrow of Jahwe's people is, of course, even more clearly discernible in Jeremiah, whose ministry, by the force of circumstances, required that he emphasize the elements of hope, which had been alluded to only casually in the prophecy of his predecessors. The prophetic interpretation of history is already evident in his inaugural vision, when he is still a "prophet of doom." The two fold purpose which he is required to fulfill, presumably in chronological sequence, is:
>
> To root out and to pull down
> And to destroy and to overthrow;
> To build and to plant. (1:10)
>
> However, a full examination of how Jeremiah made use of the eschatological elements of prophecy is beyond the scope of this paper.

---

1. If "Egypt" is original in the text; cf. the commentaries. It should be pointed out, however, that to delete "Egypt" from this, and similar vv. in Hosea, is to adopt a lectio facilior. It is difficult to imagine the reasons why a later glossator should thus interpret Isaiah's imagery.

2. Omitting verse 15 from 7:10-20. No fully satisfactory explanation of this verse has been given. Perhaps the b) party is an alternative of v. 16a; or possibly the v. may already apply to the third stage of the development, when all who remain in the land, including Immanuel, are living upon such a diet (v.22).
A second version of this same destruction is given in 8:1-8, culminating, with fitting irony, in the phrase עִמָּנוּ אֵל.

3. Gray believes that this last verse, also, spoke originally only of destruction (pp. 139f.). But even without v. 22, the impression that life continues for the nation amid this havoc is undeniable. It should be noted, however, that Cheyne considers the complete passage (vv. 21-25) as un-Isaianic in its present form (pp. 34ff.), and similarly the entire section is deleted by Duhm (pp. 54f.).

The cyclical pattern which we have so far considered makes it clear that for Hosea and Isaiah, at least, the eschatological framework of prophecy envisages a period of transition which follows the final judgement and precedes the coming of salvation.[1] Yet in the case of both of these prophets, a period of complete doom is anticipated, as unequivocally as the destruction which is presupposed in the message of Amos.[2] It would thus be reasonable to assume, if it can be shown that Amos, likewise, possesses the same half hopeful elements which can be observed in the prophecies of his successors, that Amos also worked within the same cyclical framework. We have already shown that Amos' message of doom was based, in its outline, upon the popular eschatology. It would therefore seem probable that he incorporated within his message also the most acceptable features of the hopeful elements of the pre-prophetic belief.

The most characteristic expression of Isaiah's hope for the future consists in the naming of his son, Šᵉ'ar jâšuḇ.[3] That the hope expressed in this name in no way contradicts Isaiah's confidence in the destruction of Judah is clear on the basis of Isaiah's eschatology. The name itself emphasizes the negative, rather than the positive side of the salvation; that which returns shall be the merest remnant. Significantly enough, it is Šᵉ'ar jâšuḇ who accompanies Isaiah on his mission to announce to Pekah Jahwe's determination to destroy the entire nation.[4]

> This concept of a remnant, almost negligible by human standards, is known also to Ezekiel, and characteristically enough, all its implications are brought to specific expression by him. The beginning of Ezekiel's ministry is marked by predictions of doom as thoroughgoing as those of his predecessors. To symbolize the fall of his people, the prophet is instructed to take a sharp sword, and shave his hair and beard. Of the

---

1. Compare Is. 8:17.

2. Thus Is. 6:11; 5:29f.; 3:1-8; 2:12-17; Hosea 5:14; 9:3; 14:1. Cf. Micah 3:12; etc.

3. For the antiquity of the remnant idea, Sellin quotes I Ki. 19:18 and Gen. 45:7 (E) (pp. 150ff.). However, the proof offered by these passages is hardly convincing. Perhaps Amos 5:15f. is anticipating the same idea.

4. However, the actual occasion for the naming of Šᵉ'ar jâšuḇ is unknown to us.

hair which is thus removed, a third part is to be burned, a third part to be smitten with the sword, and a third part, scattered to the wind, will yet be pursued by the sword. There could be no more vivid symbolizing of the devastation of war. But, as a matter of course, with no purpose of foretelling any alleviation of the disaster, the prophet is instructed to take a few hairs, and to bind these within his garments. Even of these, some are still to be cast into the fire. But those which still remain, accepted in the prophecy of Ezekiel as a matter of course, are those whom the predecessors of Ezekiel had long envisaged as the future nucleus of Jahwe's people. If the idea had been new with Ezekiel, he would have introduced it as a means of comfort. The fact that it is an accepted eschatological feature, mentioned only in the course of a threat, is testimony to its antiquity.

Such a negative portrayal of a remnant, but of a remnant nevertheless, is to be found precisely in the familiar simile of Amos.[1]

כאשר יציל הרעה מפי הארי
שתי כרעים או בדל אזן
כן ינצלו בני ישראל הישבים בשמרון
בפאת מטה ובדמשק שרש (3:12)

Here is no promise for the suppression of Jahwe's verdict, no hope offered to the community at large. But here, without doubt, is the negative but nonetheless substantial assurance that a remnant will survive the destruction, spoken by the prophet incidentally and with no intention to reduce his threatening tone, for his real concern, even more than in the case of Isaiah, was to announce the first part of God's judgement and the imminent fall of Israel. Yet upon the existence of such a remnant, we shall try to show, Amos also based his hopes for the future of his people.

---

1. Cf. Amos 5:3.

D. The Prophet's Function as a Messenger of Jahwe

Only upon the basis of these insights into prophetic eschatology may we understand the cryptic language of Isaiah's consecration vision (6:9ff.). The early literary prophets understood, from the outset of their prophetic careers,[1] that their message must pass unheeded by their contemporaries. Punishment had to precede any regeneration. The merest handful would survive the process of purification. Isaiah knows, therefore, that the result of his preaching will not prevail to save his contemporaries. If the nation would harken, it could be saved; so much is the ethical axiom of prophecy.[2] But since the nation cannot be saved from the destruction of the Jôm Jahwe, it follows that they cannot pay heed to the prophet's words. The early prophets have none of the naive optimism of the author of the Book of Jonah, which postulated the immediate conversion of the city of Nineveh when its inhabitants had once heard the words of the prophet, nor even of Joel, who believed that repentance was still possible for his listeners at the eleventh hour (Joel 2:12ff.). The psychological approaches of the pre-exilic and post-exilic thinkers stand completely opposed.

Although the prophets know, therefore, that obedience (Is. 1:18-20), faith (Is. 7:9), and the quest of Jahwe (Amos 5:4b) could all achieve salvation, they are equally convinced that the time for such conversion is long overdue, and that the possibility for its realization has ceased to exist. Hosea explains, most

---

1. It is generally recognized that we are not justified in assuming that Isaiah edited his consecration vision in the light of his later disappointments (Cheyne, p. 26; Buttenweiser, p. 256; etc. [But contrast Gray, p. 101]).
Note also the visions of Amos, which preceded his message, and which assured complete destruction of the state (Amos 7:1-3, 4-6, 7-9; 8:1-3. Cf. Morgenstern, pp. 52ff.). Compare also the first chapter of Hosea.

2. Thus Amos 5:4b, 14f. Buttenweiser recognizes that these imperatives are to be construed as unfulfilled conditions. But the hypothetical character is not so much in the grammatical construction (e.g. vv. 14f., which Buttenweiser retains, must be translated as imperatives, even though v. 4b may be rendered "If ye sought me"), as in the nature of the prophetic utterance. The prophet pleads, knowing in advance that his words will fall, for the most part at any rate, upon deaf ears. Note also the idea expressed in Is. 7:9 (אִם לֹא תַאֲמִינוּ כִּי לֹא תֵאָמֵנוּ), where the prophet lays down a similar condition which the vast majority of his listeners cannot fulfill. Cf. Is. 1:18-20.

affectingly, with what reluctance he is forced to admit that the gates to repentance are closed. Israel has realised, at last, that it owes its loyalty to Jahwe, and seeks to turn away from the false gods which it has been serving (6:1-3). But it will not avail. Hosea rejects without qualification the possibility of repentance. Theoretically repentance could bring salvation; but true repentance is no longer possible, and inevitably the disaster is on its way.

> Harper retains these verses (6:1-3) as genuine in Hosea by supposing that they describe a return to Jahwe, but with a conception of Jahwe so false "as to make the whole action a farce" (p.281). By connecting Hosea's idea with the eschatological teaching that the time for repentance is past, and that therefore any attempt at repentance cannot be successful, we have added reason to retain these verses. On this basis also we would retain Hosea 2:8f., which, interpreted thus, in no way destroys the sense or sequence of ideas in Hosea's condemnation and prophecy of doom. In v. 8, Jahwe sends a warning sign, such as those described by Amos (4:6ff.). But already it is too late for real repentance. The people will now attempt to return to Jahwe (v. 9), but it will be impossible for them to do so. The final catastrophe will be on its way.
>
> But contrast, on Hos. 6: 1-3, Volz (p. 33), Marti (p. 170, note), and Marti, Dodek. (pp. 52-55) [On Hosea 2:8f., contrast, in addition to these scholars, Harper (p. 236)], who deny the originality of these passages. Contrast, also, Nowack, who, although maintaining these vv. for Hosea, believes that they are out of place in their present context (pp. ~~[illegible]~~8f).

Just as decidedly does Amos affirm that the time for return has already past. In a series of visions, he is shown the ever diminishing possibilities for salvation which had formerly been vouchsafed to Israel. But when the allotted time expired, first the destruction of the land, its sanctuaries, and the monarchy (7:7-9), finally the annihilation of the people (8:1-3), are definitely ordained.[1] On the basis of this assurance, the first phrases of the prophet, in his address to the people, affirm the unwillingness of Jahwe that his people be permitted to repent of their evil: "For the many sins of Israel, I shall not suffer him to return."[2] In the thought of the prophet, Jahwe himself will put obstacles in the way of a penitent people (Is. 8:14),[3] so completely has he determined that history shall run its

---

1. Cf. Morgenstern, pp. 71ff.

2. So Morgenstern interprets the concept לא אשיבנו (p. 420).

3. The similarity to the theology of the priestly code, where Jahwe hardens Pharaoh's heart (Ex. 10:1b), or to the conception of the lying spirit by which Jahwe entices the prophets to false prophecy (1 Ki. 10:20ff.) is unmistakable.

ordained course.

It was inevitable, therefore, that Isaiah should be summoned to his ministry with the same warnings which were understood by Amos and Hosea. By the time that the prophet speaks his words, the people cannot possibly return to Jahwe. In effect, therefore, the preaching of the prophet only makes fat the heart of the people and makes heavy their ears (Is. 6:10). Nor is it in disillusionment that the prophet compares his uncomprehending listeners to drunkards who cannot recognize the simplest sensations (29:9ff.). Such things must be. The promise of the future does not lie in the hope that these insensitive listeners will realize the truth of the prophetic utterance. The salvation is to be sought elsewhere.

> Perhaps Isaiah 28:10-13 should be connected with 6:9ff. and 29:9ff. The letter which cannot be read because it is sealed, or because of illiteracy (29:11) and the message spoken before insensitive and drunken listeners (29:9f.), are paralleled by the words of the prophet which, inevitably, and by the nature of prophecy, come to the people as a mumbo-jumbo (28:10-13), without effect upon the multitude.

It becomes pertinent, therefore, to enquire what, precisely, was the function of the prophet, and how his teaching was necessary within this eschatological framework. Was he, as has been suggested,[1] merely a messenger of Jahwe, to announce that since the people had broken their part of the covenant, Jahwe was no longer bound in his relationship to them?

Such a point of view, while recognizing the inevitable nature of the adverse fate which Jahwe had prepared for his people, is difficult to reconcile with the rhetoric and fervent exhortations even of a prophet as rigorous as Amos. The prophet would, naturally enough, catalogue the sins and offenses of the people if he proposed to show how they had failed to fulfill the demands of Jahwe. But we would scarcely expect the language of the fifth chapter, the fervent pleading דרשוני וחיו (5:4), from one whose purpose was thus limited to announce a decision which had been already determined.

---

1. By Morgenstern (cf. pp. 418-421).

The answer must be that as early as Amos, the prophet, convinced of the certainty of the approaching Jôm Jahwe, sought some means of assuring that a remnant would remain faithful to Jahwe, and so survive the inevitable punishment. On the basis of the idea of a "remnant," which Amos shared with Isaiah, the existence of such disciples, clearly illustrated in the Book of Isaiah (8:16), may be assumed to have existed from the beginning of literary prophecy.

Essentially, therefore, the task of the prophet may be summarized thus. All must be given the opportunity of repentance; so much is demanded by the ethical nature of the prophet's task (Is. 1:18ff., etc.). But the prophet knows that there will be only a few who will heed his words. It is his duty to "seal the instruction" among his followers, who will survive the downfall of the state, and wait for Jahwe amid the desolation (8:18f.). Such is the small group of disciples whose task is envisaged in the prophecy of the remnant, and upon whom the future of the people will depend (Is. 10:20-23).

> The passage, Is. 10:20-23, may be expanded by editors, but undoubtedly the original sense of Isaiah's explanation has not been altered. On the basis of the idea expressed in 8:16f., we should have to assume some such explanation as occurs in verse 20.[1] An understanding of the eschatological background of Isaiah's prophecy renders inapplicable the objection that we cannot easily assign a historical event which would fit the description of Israel's reliance upon Assyria as depicted in the words:
>
> > And it shall come to pass in that day
> > That the remnant of Israel
> > And they that are escaped of the house of Jacob
> > Shall no more stay upon him that smote them,
> > But shall stay upon Jahwe, the Holy One of Israel, in truth.
>
> We have seen, in the case of Hosea's prophecy most clearly, the presupposition that after the destruction of Israel, a period elapses during which Israel is no longer Jahwe's people, but is presumably under foreign domination. Such a contemplated, rather than historical, event may well be presupposed in the first part of this verse.

So far, we have been able to follow several distinctly separated stages in the eschatology of the early prophets. The Day of Jahwe is preceded by warnings, during the course of which, repentance is still possible for the people. Finally, but before the prophet receives his commission, the possibility of

---

1. Buttenweiser, however (pp. 258ff.) denies the originality of verse 20. Others (Hackmann [p. 71, note], Cheyne [pp. 51f.] Gray [pp. 202ff.] Duhm [p. 78]) assign none of these vv. to Isaiah.

repentance vanishes. At this point, the doom is announced. The nations surrounding Israel are overrun by the mighty empire, and Israel itself succumbs to its power. Subsequently, Israel passes through a process of purification. Under the dominance of the imperial power, which is the instrument of Jahwe, without, however, acknowledging Jahwe's authority,[1] the remnant subsists, for a period of time, among primitive surroundings. But on the basis of the remnant which thus survives, the future of Jahwe's people will, presumably be established.

---

1. Thus Hosea 3, "I will not be their god." The official god of the land, that is to say, will, in this transition period, be the patron deity of the conquering empire.

CHAPTER II

The Future

The prophets regarded the punishment of the sins of Israel as merely one feature of a much larger upheaval which would involve all the nations with which they were acquainted. We have already considered how essential to the message of Amos was the prologue to his prophecy, in which he denounces Israel's neighbors, and predicts their punishment. Nevertheless, in spite of this clear analogy, critics have been reluctant to attribute much significance, within Isaiah's thinking, to the oracles against the nations, which are included among his utterances, but the nationalistic or vengeful spirit of which is supposed to stand in such contrast to the ethical and universalistic denunciations of his own people.[1]

In general, therefore, only those prophecies which can definitely be linked to some event in the contemporary history of Israel, and which reflect the accepted teachings of Isaiah, have been considered authentic. Yet by comparison with Amos, we should hardly expect Isaiah's condemnation of Israel's neighbors to be based upon such transitory considerations as would immediately identify, for the convenience of critics, the precise occasion for which they were spoken. Where Isaiah does refer to contemporary events (14:28-32; 20), his oracles do not fit particularly within his world outlook, but are merely incidental warnings to Israel. These recognized Isaianic oracles are in no way comparable to the exordium of the Book of Amos.

Moreover, current explanations of the structure of the twenty-one chapters which include Isaiah's oracles against the nations are not fully satisfactory. It is recognized that Chapters 13-23 are characterized by the introductory word משא (oracle), while the latest chapters (28-33) begin with the interjection הוי. But if the basis of the first collection of oracles is post-Isaianic, and the few Isaianic

---

1. Pfeiffer, p. 443. Note also the commentaries on the individual oracles.

sections were added only after the collection as a whole existed as a unit,[1] it is difficult to see why this group of prophecies should have originally been attributed to Isaiah (13:1), or included among his prophecies. On the contrary, the passages which can without question be attributed to Isaiah (14:28-32; 20: 22), and which allude to contemporary history, are so different from the oracles which largely compose these chapters that they can scarcely have formed a nucleus around which such a collection would gather, but must have existed independently of the collection, and have been added on the strength of their references to foreign powers only when the larger collection existed as a whole, and as a part of Isaiah's work.

If, however, an appreciable nucleus of these chapters were Isaianic, some bearing the description משא, and others characterized by the introductory הנה, it is easy to see how they could have become the core of a host of additional prophecies, similar to these condemnations both in content and in their introductory catchword. Indeed, with an understanding of prophetic eschatology, it becomes possible to derive from these chapters a considerable body of material which may be attributed to Isaiah, and to find within them a plan of treatment at least comparable to the artistic arrangement of the Book of Amos. Speaking only in the broadest terms, Isaiah passes to the farthest South, and foretells the extinction of Ethopia and Egypt (18:1-6; 19:15). The lesser neighbors of Israel are not even mentioned by name,[2] before the prophet hastens to expound in detail the crimes and punishment of Judah (28:7-31:4).

This exordium to a collection of Isaianic prophecies could have been written at almost any time in Isaiah's prophetic career. But the prophecies themselves provide a clue as to the actual occasion on which they were spoken. Most of the 28-32 may be assigned to the later years of Isaiah's ministry, when he struggled to prevent an alliance with Egypt, and to stave off a revolt against

---

1. Cf. Duhm (pp. XII-XIV); Skinner (p. lxxiii); Gray (p.232).

2. Caps. 15, 16, and 23 clearly refer to specific misfortunes of Moab and Tyre. Whether they are to be attributed to Isaiah is therefore irrelevent for our purposes.

Sennacherib.[1] With this fact in view, the precise intention of the exordium of Isaiah becomes even clearer. Like Amos, he foretells the general destruction which is to be executed by Assyria; but in this case, he concentrates with characteristic irony, specifically upon those nations whose help Judah might be ready to invoke. Having disposed of these, he is ready to attack Judah itself, whose fate, he is convinced, will be as devastating as that of any of its contemporaries. But the fate of Judah's neighbors in these two chapters is not merely described to demonstrate that they will be forced to withdraw from the struggle, and be unable to support Judah effectively in the war against Assyria. The prophet is describing an overwhelming, universal disaster, in which the doom of Egypt is at least comparable to the fate of Jahwe's own people. (cf. 18:3, 6; 19:5-7).

The destruction of Judah, however, will not end the overturning of nations. When Assyria has fulfilled its task, it, also, will be repaid for its rebelliousness. The same destiny which it has hitherto been imposing upon the rest of the world is then to overtake the power which, unknowingly, had been demonstrating not its own strength, but the uncontradictable purposes of Jahwe (33:1, 3f., 7-12). This teaching of the overthrow of the Assyrian Empire, is, we shall see, one of the fundamental aspects of the teaching of Isaiah.

Isaiah 18:1-6. Isaiah 18:1-6 is recognized as Isaianic by Duhm (pp. 113f.), Cheyne (pp. 95ff.), and Gray (pp. 306ff.). However, vv. 5f. can scarcely refer to the destruction of the Assyrian army, as these scholars have concluded. Isaiah nowhere implies that Assyria is to be destroyed before her work of conquest is over. If Isaiah is here sending back, with an optimistic message, the ambassadors who seek a Judean alliance, he would be announcing the end of Assyria even before Judah has been overcome. The confusion in the interpretation of this passage comes from the identification of the land to which Isaiah refers the messengers of

---

1. For a full discussion of the history of the criticism of these chapters, see Fullerton, "Viewpoints." Hackmann (pp. 100-102), and Cheyne (pp. 180-202) regard all of this material, except 28:1-4 as originating in the time of Sennacherib (cf. W. R. Smith, pp. 322ff.). However, Duhm tends to assign the majority of chapters 28 and 29 to the reign of Sargon and the revolt of 711 (pp. 171ff.). Since we accept the first of these views, and have no basis for denying a common date of origin for all of these passages (with the exception of 28: 1-4), we see no reason for denying the literary unity of this collection of oracles likewise.

v. 2 with the land from which they have originated. The expression "go," rather than "return," would suggest, at first sight, that they are not being sent back, from Judah, to the land of their origin. The descriptions of the land itself, insofar as they can be deciphered, suggest much more readily the land of Assyria: thus, "a people extended and . . . (?), a people dreaded from where it is [1] and onward, the people of the measuring line (?) and treading down, whose land rivers [i.e. the tributaries of the Tigris] divide. Thus the messengers are instructed by Isaiah not to come to Judah (for an alliance), but rather to go to Assyria (to behold her strength, or to submit to her rule). The continuation is then clear. The mythological Day of Doom is ushered in with the raising of an ensign and the sounding of a horn, and the destruction of all nations at the hands of Assyria is then metaphorically described. (Verse 7 is accepted by all interpreters as a later addition to the text).

Isaiah 19:1-15). Cheyne recognizes many similarities in this passage (excluding 5-10) to the language of Isaiah. But he considers the inferior style and the scanty references to history as proof against Isaianic authorship. (Similar arguments are advanced by Duhm and Gray). It has already been shown, however, that the historical allusions of such an eschatological passage must necessarily be conventionalized. The possibility of civil war in Egypt could not have seemed remote at any time during Isaiah's ministry,[2] and may have been assumed by him as the natural prelude to the Assyrian victory. The condemnation of the Egyptian princes is an evident parallel to prophetic denunciations of the ruling classes of Israel.

Thus we have no reason to regard the passage as a prophecy after the event. That the somewhat rough verses are not of the calibre of some of Isaiah's utterances is no proof against his possible authorship.

These considerations will adequately explain the structure of chapters 13-33, and the attributing of them to Isaiah (13:1). Various oracles (משא), some Isaianic, others originating at a later period, were placed around these condemnations of 701 because they dealt with the denunciation of the surrounding nations, and since they began with the same term, משא, which introduced the oracle against Egypt. However, a genuine Isaianic oracle (c. 18), though not starting with this term, was not displaced. Chapter 20, another Egyptian oracle, although referring to a specific event in history, and not to the prophet's eschatology, is naturally placed after chapter 19, although it does not start in the conventional manner. Following these eschatological passages, but before their natural conclusion condemning Israel, a late author has inserted his own description of the end of days (24-27), considerably expanded). Similarly, the woe to Ephraim (28:1-4) was inserted among the later prophecies beginning with the same catchword.

It might be suggested that Isaiah began his introduction to this series of condemnations of Judah with an attack upon Babylon, which had preceded Egypt as the instigator of the revolt against Sennacherib. Such an oracle might well have been displaced by the more dramatic denunciations of Chapters 13 and 14, which were evidently written by a later poet at a time when the Medes were preparing to overthrow the Neo-Babylonian Empire. The destruction of the Babylonian Empire was

---

1. Or "from the time of its existence" — cf. Ehrlich, Randglossen, Jes., p. 68.

2. Breasted, "History of Egypt," (pp. 547f.).

evidently a more exciting accomplishment than the defeat of Marduk-apal-iddina.

If Isaiah did introduce these oracles of 701 with such a denunciation, it becomes even easier to understand how the Babylonian oracle of Chapter 13 should have been attributed to Isaiah. Isaiah 13:1 is a reference to an original Isaianic utterance, the text of which has been replaced by the later oracles.

A. The Fall of Assyria

Isaiah's concept of the fall of Assyria is one of the key doctrines of his ministry. By refusing to separate this teaching of Isaiah from its suspicious context of the inviolability of Zion (Is. 37:33), however, modern critics have tended, more and more, to deny the Isaianic authorship of the anti-Assyrian oracles.[1] In reality, the teaching of Isaiah is incomplete until he foretells the destruction of Assyria. The concept creates difficulty only if we regard it as a delayed revelation to the prophet, whose eyes are suddenly opened to the wickedness of the Assyrian Empire, of which he had previously formed an idealized image. Actually, Isaiah's anti-Assyrian oracles mark no change in his thinking. He remains convinced, even as he utters them, that Judah is doomed (10:12). The imperial armies will not be halted, miraculously, at the gates of Jerusalem. Judah will have paid the full penalty before Assyria succumbs.

We need not search for any date, therefore, at which the prophet, disillusioned by the brutality of the Assyrians, and mellowed, perhaps, by the misfortunes of his people, should have brought this milder message to his countrymen, and reversed the sentence of doom which characterized the beginning of his teaching (cap. 6), and which remained, throughout, the essence of his prophetic ministry. Very obviously, no such period in Isaiah's life could be found. Nor are we justified in assuming that all these passages condemning Assyria must be contemporary with one another, because of their similarity in style, or their

---

1. Note, especially, Fullerton, "The Problem of Isaiah, Chapter 10," AJSL, vol. 34, pp. 17ff., discussed below.

anticipation of imminent Assyrian attack.[1] Isaiah must have maintained his concept of the fall of Assyria as an integral part of his world outlook throughout his prophetic career. Only the necessity for mentioning it explicitly, or for placing greater or smaller emphasis upon it would vary, depending upon political circumstances.

At least two of Isaiah's anti-Assyrian oracles can be dated with some accuracy. The condemnation of the tenth chapter fits clearly into the reign of Sargon. The boastful emperor in verse 9 is, without doubt, the conqueror of Samaria.

> Is not Calno as Carchemish?
> Is not Hamath as Arpad?
> Is not Samaria as Damascus?

Not only is he boasting that Carchemish, Hamath, and Samaria have become like Kullani, Arpad, and Damascus, which fell to his predecessor on the throne.[2] Indirectly, we hear his pompous declaration that he is as great a conqueror as Tiglath Pileser III. Such an utterance belongs very shortly after the fall of Carchemish. Cheyne's date of 711[3] is as late as the oracle can reasonably be placed. We can hardly follow Duhm in his supposition that the condemnation may be as late as the reign of Sennacherib.[4]

> There is little justification for the radical deletions which have been made in this chapter, and which culminate in Fullerton's supposition that of vv. 5-14, only vv. 5-7a and 13-14 are original.[5] That Isaiah was interested only in a theological argument to justify

---

1. Thus Hackmann (pp. 86-88), who believes that 10:5-34 cannot belong to the same period of Isaiah's ministry as, e.g., cap. 20 (711), since in 711 Isaiah still believed in the supremacy of Assyria. Cf. Driver (p. 70), Skinner (p. 84), etc. Similarly H. P. Smith conjectures: "This thought. . . . seems to have come only on later reflection" (p. 249).

2. Cf. Cheyne, p. 50; Rogers, pp. 308-332.

3. Based upon the fact that Assyrian invasion seemed imminent that year. However, such invasions or threats are not necessary as a motivation of these oracles of Isaiah, and an earlier date is just as likely.

4. Page 75. Gray, non-commitally, assigns the passage to any date after 717. Cf. note 1, above.

5. Fullerton, "The Problem of Isaiah, chapter 10," AJSL, vol. 34, pp. 17ff.

> Jahwe's ways, and unconcerned with practical consequences to be drawn from such an argument is contrary to all we know of Isaiah's ministry, which emphasizes that punishment is the automatic result of guilt. Moreover, the deleted verses do not change the sequence of ideas in their context; the distinction which Fullerton makes between the two crimes of Assyria which are presented in these verses - 1) that she does not realize that she is Jahwe's instrument, and 2) that she advances to destroy even innocent (?) nations — is too subtle to warrant the belief that we have here two different and irreconcileable accounts of Jahwe's purposes. The entire passage implies, with the fatalism characteristic of Isaiah (cf. cap. 6), that Jahwe's instrument must inevitably commit the sins of which Assyria is guilty. Therefore, not only in refusing to recognize Jahwe (7a), but likewise in the very fulfillment of the purposes of Jahwe (10f.), Assyria has merited her own destruction. Moreover, there is no need to be suspicious, as is Cheyne, of the term סלמי in verse 10[1]. Isaiah is merely using square brackets in quotation marks. Sargon evidently spoke of the "gods" of these nations, which he destroyed. To emphasize his own contempt, Isaiah replaces Sargon's expression with the term "idols," in his report of the Emperor's words.

On the other hand, the thirty-third chapter of Isaiah, forming a climax to his denunciations of 701, is to be assigned to the reign of Sennacherib. Interpreters have suggested that this chapter contradicts the fundamental message of doom which Isaiah predicted for Israel, and that if this oracle is genuine, it must reflect a change in Isaiah's attitude, which became apparent after the withdrawal of the Assyrian armies. Rejecting such improbable conclusions, critical scholars have been forced to deny the Isaianic authorship of the entire chapter. But if it is recognized that the ideas of this passage are not to be based upon the account of a miraculous deliverance of Jerusalem, (2 Ki. 18:13-19:37), but rather are fundamental teachings of Isaiah, it becomes evident that this chapter in no way contradicts the sequence of Isaiah's thought, and that the central portion of it may well be attributed to the prophet. We have no reason to believe, therefore, that Isaiah's prediction of the fall of Assyria was confined to a brief period of his ministry. At least between 711 and 701, this was an active feature of his teaching. The fall of the tyrant was implied, if not definitely stated, in the prophecy of the Day of Jahwe, proclaimed by Isaiah from the

---

1. Page 49. It is a little surprising to find Cheyne suggesting that although editors would know, as well as Isaiah, that the Assyrian emperor was likewise an idol-worshipper, "accidental slips are more easily attributable to them than to Isaiah."

earliest of his utterances (2:12). From his absolute faith that this would be the pattern of eschatological fulfillment, Isaiah appears never to have wavered.

Stade[1] lists several reasons, in addition to the "inferior style" of chapter 33, for denying its Isaianic authorship. However, once we delete the liturgical additions of v. 2 and vv. 5f., the entire section vv. 1-12 reads like an oracle of Isaiah. It would, in fact, be strange if Isaiah here listed the various parties within Judah, as Stade expects him to do, and for the lack of which irrevelent material, the prophet is accused of vagueness. Isaiah is no more vague in this chapter than he is, for example, in 28:2. Since he has now finished with his own people, and announced its doom, he is concerned henceforth only with a similar judgement of Assyria.

Turning to Stade's criticism of the language and style of this passage, we find very few of his suspicions aroused by the vocabulary[2] of any of the verses the genuineness of which we attempt to maintain. Naturally, we cannot agree with his view that an eschatological framework such as we find in this chapter is known only in post-exilic times. Moreover, at least some of the paranomasias of this chapter (e.g. 33:1) are as artistic as those for which Isaiah's style is noted (1:23; 7:10), and are no proof of a late origin.[3]

Nor is there any reason to deny the Isaianic authorship of the peroration of this chapter (33:12), which belongs to the so-called "Many-nations" passages, in which the prediction of the doom of Assyria is replaced by oracles which assure that the many nations which plunder Jahwe's people will, in their own turn, be destroyed. We have seen that Isaiah did not hesitate to refer to the triumph of Assyria in such vague terms (5:26-30). For this reason, such oracles as 17:12-14, the Isaianic character of which scholars like Cheyne (94f.), Duhm (111f.), and Gray (304f.) have been forced to concede, are yet another indication of the complete circle which will be described with the fulfillment of Jahwe's judgement. (Cf. Is. 8:9f., possibly inserted into its present context by the catchword Immanuel).

We exclude from these oracles, however, such prophecies as Is. 31:5-9, which is not an eschatological prophecy, but a conditional promise of escape for Judah (cf. Buttenweiser, pp. 282ff.), a promise which, by its dependence upon impossible conditions, was itself impossible, as the prophet realized, but which the ethical nature of prophecy compelled him to enunciate.

Once the Isaianic authorship of the main part of chapter 33 is accepted, we are justified in assuming that it is not out of place in the collection 13-33, and belongs to the reign of Sennacherib. It must be admitted, however, that the slight internal evidence (e.g. v. 7) occasionally used to prove that the passage originates about this time is not conclusive.

---

1. Most criticisms of this chapter are based upon Stade, "Jesaia 32-32," ZATW, 1884.

2. Cheyne, of course, finds such suspicious phrases, but he could undoubtedly find them in any passage whose lateness he was interested in proving (p. 167).

3. However, compare with Stade the criticisms of Duhm (pp. 214ff.) and Cheyne (pp. 163ff.), who accept his post-exilic date for the whole of chapter 33.

The condemnation of Assyria is therefore no afterthought. It is not spoken by a man whose last idealized picture of the instrument of Jahwe has suddenly been shattered. From the very beginning, the course of events has been clear to him. First comes the destruction of Judah; later the destroyer himself will inevitably be destroyed. Upon the ruins of the old empire, the new kingdom will be built. Jahwe's reign will be established, and his annointed representative will exercise his sovereignty on earth. In such prophetic teaching, messianism is the inevitable outcome of the Day of Wrath.

B. The Messianic Redeemer

An understanding of the fundamental eschatology of the early literary prophets makes unnecessary the supposition that all of the references found in their work to a Davidic messiah must be exilic or post-exilic additions to their prophecy. The distinction made by Volz that the biblical messianic hope is always secular, whereas the prophets speak from an ideal of religious universalism,[1] is hardly reliable. The work of the pre-exilic prophets was characterized by a particularistic recognition of Israel's destiny, which was more than a transitory stage in the development of a more consistent universalism. Systematic ideas of the especial relationship of Israel to Jahwe, and of Israel's particular function in history, can be discerned as early as Amos (3:2) and as late as the second Isaiah (41:8ff., etc.). There would therefore be nothing unprophetic in the doctrine that Jahwe's rule over the entire universe would be characterized by the supremacy of his own people, and the just rule of his own king.

Nor can we agree with Volz[2] that the prophets regard the neighbors of Israel merely as the instruments which Jahwe employs in his dealings with Israel. The prophets, as we have seen invoke upon Israel's neighbors the same fate as they predict for Israel (Amos 1:3-2:3; Is. 8:16; 10:16; 14:28-32; etc.). It was their distinction, moreover, that they applied the same standard of judgement to the heathen as to their own people (cf. Amos 9:7). It would be strange, therefore, if, in their view of the future, the entire world were not involved, on a basis comparable to that of Israel, recognizing the universal supremacy of Jahwe, and also the particular task of his own people.[3]

To foretell such future bliss would not be contrary to the spirit of prophecy, even though the prophet's main task was preaching rather than prediction. The

---

1. Volz, pp. 3-7.

2. Ibid., pp. 10f.

3. There is considerable evidence, collected by Julius Lewy to show that Jahwe was, from earliest times, regarded as a world god of the character of Enlil, rather than as a merely national deity — thus his association with the number seven, his nature as a wind-god, etc. (Cf. Lewy, H. and J., "The Week and the Oldest West Asiatic Calendar," HUCA, vol. 17, pp. 22-27. These parallels were suggested in Classroom lectures by Dr. J. Lewy.) In prophetic thought, at any rate, it is Jahwe whose authorization permits the great Assyrian Empire to undertake its conquest of the civilized world.

distinction between the function of the prophet as preacher and predicter[1] is a valid one, and the essential gauge of Israelite prophecy is not in the success with which the prophet may describe the future. But the element of prediction is nonetheless an important one (cf. Deut. 18:22).[2] If the prophets had argued upon a purely ethical basis, they would not, for example, come to the idea that the time had past when Israel might be accepted as a valid penitent before Jahwe. The Jôm Jahwe which they foretell, on this basis, is a pure prediction, to be explained by revelation, rather than by ethical deduction. Repentance was not, to the prophet, the sole means by which salvation was to be achieved.[3] The future was to be founded upon divine intervention, symbolized in a Day of Jahwe. For humanity as a whole, the gateway to repentance had long been closed. But if the prophet's message of doom rested as much upon abstract prediction as upon moral judgement, we could scarcely expect their ultimate hope to rest, in complete contrast, solely upon a rationalized ethical system of belief.

Similarly, too much stress has been laid upon the gratuitous theory that such theocratic and non-political thinkers as the prophets could have set no value upon the institution of the crown.[4] Volz admits that the prophets are careful not to attack the royal house, but aim their invective rather at the aristocracy. Yet on the basis of such flimsy analogies as Elijah's conflict with the monarchy, and the fact that Isaiah has no reference to the king in his admittedly hopeful prophecy of the first chapter (1:26), Volz assumes that the pre-exilic prophets could not have predicted the coming of a Davidic messiah.

Hosea's supposed derogatory comments upon the monarchy should probably be interpreted as attacks c heathen deities. Even if he refers, as used to be supposed, to temporal rulers, however, his words apply only to the

---

1. Volz, p. 7; cf. Hackmann, pp. 143f.

2. Various predictions of the prophets were more than an announcement of the inevitable consequences of a certain kind of ethical behavior: cf. Isaiah at the time of the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis, etc.

3. Ctr. Volz, loc. cit.

4. Volz, pp. 15F. Cf. Cheyne, p. 45 on Is. 9:1-6; etc.

non-Davidic dynasty of the Northern Kingdom (7:3; 8:4, 10; 13:10f.). Vogelstein has even suggested (Jeroboam II) that Hosea may be campaigning on behalf of return (cf. the expression שוב) by the Northern Kingdom to the House of David. The "blood of Jezreel" (1:4) to be visited by Jahwe would refer essentially, therefore, to the murder of Ahaziah, rather than of Joram. However, the evidence is insufficient to establish such speculations, likely though they may seem.

Quite to the contrary, Isaiah's attitude towards the monarchy always reveals his respect for the dignity of the royal office. In addition to his interviews with the king, we would point to the clear acceptance of the principle of legitimacy in his utterances at the time of the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis (7:8f.; 8:6ff.). His constant references to Pekah as the "son of Remaliah" are designed to cast scorn upon the usurper, whose father was not even a king. Rezin, a legitimate monarch, is not referred to in this derogatory way. The son of Tabeel can scarcely be identified with the Syrian king: but on the contrary, Isaiah's reference to him in the same disrespectful language, even in a quotation from the Arameans, is a similar sarcastic reference to his unkingly birth.

In fact, Isaiah accepts the institution of royalty as a matter of course (cf. Is. 3:12). The principle of legitimacy is a vital consideration throughout biblical thought. One of David's claims to succession lay in his marriage to Saul's daughter, Michal (2 Sam. 3:12, 14). Since the Davidic dynasty was the most legitimately entrenched at the time of Isaiah, it would naturally represent the source from which he and any of his contemporaries would await the ultimate salvation of the people.

Finally, we cannot lay much weight upon the argument that if Isaiah had actually foretold the coming of the messiah, later prophets would have referred to those prophecies which had been preserved in his work. Gray very correctly remarks:[1] Unless we place [Is. 9:1-6] as late as the second century B.C. (Kennett), why does it also find no echo in still later writers, Zechariah, Haggai, Malachi, the Psalms?" We might venture further to compare the limited extent of biblical literature which has come down to us with what must have been a considerable body of messianic traditions, all of as much authority as this passage which was used

1. Gray, p. 166.

by Isaiah. We cannot be positive that the prestige of Isaiah would at once make the form of belief, as he chose to quote it (Is. 9:1-6; etc.), more popular than the numerous other traditions which could be drawn upon.

On the other hand, several factors lead us to suppose that the doctrine of a Davidic messiah is an essential part of prophetic theology. If our assumptions so far are correct, then the Jôm Jahwe was the day not only when Jahwe would wreak his vengeance upon humanity but likewise when he would establish his sovereignty over the residue of all peoples which escaped his wrath. The most natural way in which Jahwe might accomplish this end would be by the triumph of his own people, and the supremacy of their king. The rule of a Davidic messiah would in no way contradict the theocratic supremacy of Jahwe, but would rather be a means towards its fulfillment.[1]

There are, of course, significant differences in prophetic thought between the judgement of Israel and the judgement of its neighbors, despite the universal ethical standard which was applied to both alike. Amos, for example, does not hint that the process of eradication will be as thoroughgoing among the other nations as within Jahwe's own people. Explicitly he states that Israel's particular relationship with Jahwe is to be the cause of its especial punishment (3:2); and the fate of Moab (2:3), or Ammon (1:14f.) is in no way comparable to the utter devastation inflicted upon Israel.[2] Presumably only Israel undergoes the purification

---

1. In the parallel concepts of Aramean religion, the universal dominion of a deity coincides with the sovereignty of his temporal king (Lewy, p. 49, etc.).

2. On the basis of the parallel oracles, we interpret שְׁאֵרִית of Amos 1:8 not in its technical sense, but as referring to the Philistine cities not yet mentioned, i.e., in addition to Gaza, Ashdod and Ashkelon. It would be difficult to explain why Amos should invoke such thoroughgoing destruction upon the Philistines, as compared with the other nations, as to predict the utter destruction of the entire race. But contrast Harper, p. 27; Cripps, p. 126. The use of this term, among other considerations leads Marti (Dodek., p. 160) and Nowack (p. 123) to deny the originality of this oracle.

Similarly Isaiah does not find it necessary to mention the concept of a remnant of the nations other than Israel, which are to be destroyed. Is. 14:30 is not a reference to any kind of favored group, but a common method of describing revolutionary disturbances such as are envisaged for the Jom Jahwe (cf. the Leiden Papyrus, quoted by Dürr [pp. 2ff.] , which describes as a feature of a similar catastrophic destruction the fact that paupers have become enriched, and rich men have become poor [VIII, 1-2; VII:1]).

demanded by Isaiah before the resurgent people can be established in Jahwe's favor (Is. 1:24ff.). We have no hint that Egypt (caps. 18, 19) or Philistia (14:29ff.) are to undergo a punishment so thoroughly unrelenting.

The reason cannot be that Jahwe, excessively indignant at his people only because it had greater opportunities of satisfying his demands, will bring upon Israel punishment disproportionate to its guilt. Such an irrational concept of Jahwe's anger would hardly accord with the strict measure of justice which Amos or Isaiah consistently proclaimed. But since Israel will have the future duty of representing the sovereignty of Jahwe, it must be especially fitted for its task. We have here, of course, the roots, already well developed, of the suffering servant concept of the second Isaiah, which makes it Jahwe's purpose that Israel be purified for a larger service. That Isaiah, with his concept of Assyria as Jahwe's instrument in world-history, must have asserted that Jahwe is concerned with more than the future of his own people would seem, a priori, to be a reasonable supposition. Only if we deny such a possibility can we refuse to accept the authenticity of Isaiah's interest in the future of the entire world.

This interpretation of the mission of Israel is, at any rate, considerably older than deutero-Isaiah. In the Jahwist's conception, Abraham and Jacob are destined to become the source of blessing for "all the families of the earth" (Gen. 12:3; 18:18; 28:14), a function for which the prerequisite seems to be that Israel shall become a strong and numerous people. Even more clearly does Jeremiah foretell that if Israel will return to Jahwe, then, automatically, such an aspiration shall be fulfilled, and all the nations shall be blessed by Israel's merit (Jer. 4:1f.). That such a hope is older than Jeremiah seems evident from the casual way in which the blessing of the nations is mentioned by him. Jeremiah must be referring to some such tradition as is preserved by the Jahwist. That the same tradition was also supposed in popular Israelite eschatology does not appear too much to assume.[1] Perhaps some such idea was in Isaiah's mind when he compares

1. Sellin rightly refers to Jud. 5 and Exod. 15 for the antiquity of the concept that Jahwe is a god who may assert his supremacy, through conquest, over other

Israel, after its full destruction has been effected, to a beacon upon a mountain or an ensign upon a hill (30:17). The image reflects both the thoroughness of the process of purification, and the purpose to be served by the remnant. If this is Isaiah's meaning, the prophecy would supplement the announcement of purification as it is found in the first chapter (1:25f.). The purpose of the meagre remnant which survives the Jôm Jahwe is to serve as a beacon or an example to humanity of the supremacy of Israel's god.

> Duhm (p. 196) and Cheyne (pp. 196f., 410) recognize v. 17b as genuine in the oracle 30:8-17. By rendering " תֹרֶן " simply as "pole," Cheyne suggests that the figure of speech has reference only to the meagreness of the remnant. Duhm likewise emphasizes this aspect of the simile, although neither discusses it fully. However, the fact that the pole and banner are to be set upon a hill-top calls for some explanation. The suggestion which we have given seems to be self-evident.

Thus we may discern one of the principal elements of biblical messianism clearly implicit in the teachings of Isaiah and his contemporaries. On the basis of such an eschatological background to the prophetic writings, we may no longer assert that every form of prophetic messianism must at least be as late as Ezekiel. Every suspected passage must once again be examined, and the possibility of its genuineness, even within a context of utter condemnation and predictions of doom, must be admitted. At least some of these formerly rejected oracles can, we believe, with some certainty, be attributed to the author to whom centuries of tradition had assigned them as a matter of course.

> a) Is. 9:1-6. Hackmann argues that the messianic oracle contained in these verses fits more readily within a period after the destruction of the Davidic dynasty (pp. 130ff., 143ff.). The strong expressions of vv. 1, 3, and 4, he argues, cannot refer to the tribute paid by Judah to Assyria in the reign of Ahaz. But, he continues, if we assign this passage to the time of Sennacherib, it would contradict Isaiah's prediction at this time of the complete and utter destruction

---

gods (Proph., pp. 133f., 160; cf. Dürr, pp. 138ff.). Since, however, most of Sellin's attempts to illustrate these ideas from the early prophets rely upon passages the genuineness of which is challenged by modern critics (e.g. Zeph. 3:8f.; Hab. cap. 3; etc.), we have not presented his arguments in any detail in this study.

of Judah. We have seen, however, that this was Isaiah's unshatterable view not only in 701, but from the outset of his ministry, and this passage in no way contradicts the basic prophecy of doom. With the unified view of the prophetic ministry which we have presented, these arguments of Hackmann lose their forcefulness.

Similarly Cheyne (pp. 41-46) points to the lack of connection of c. 9 with any context in the book of Isaiah, to the unusual fact that Isaiah should have referred to the past history of Israel (v. 3b), and to the vagueness of thought which the passage exhibits. The vagueness and lack of connection are, of course, explicable on the basis of eschatology, and the use which is made of the historical reference to deny the genuineness of these verses seems entirely inappropriate. The Day of Jahwe consists of two distinct stages. The destruction is merely a preliminary to the rebuilding. Having portrayed the darkness at its climax, the prophet launches, without pause or transition into the converse of his prophecy — that which will be the future for those who are found worthy to survive the holocaust — the people that walked in darkness have seen a great light. The ruler on the Davidic throne will uphold his kingdom even the by same principles as, the prophet declares, Zion will be redeemed by those who survive the evil judgement, by justice (מִשְׁפָּט) and righteousness (צְדָקָה) (9:6; cf. 1:27).

It has, moreover, been pointed out that the references in vv. 3 and 4 suggest the tyranny of Assyria, and at any rate quite clearly exclude an exilic date, since they do not anticipate any return from captivity.[1] Moreover, it is not only unnecessary, but deceiving, to seek to date the oppression described in vv. 1, 3f. The darkness described is much more probably that of the predicted Jôm Jahwe, than an actual experience of the prophet and his people.

Gray (pp. 164ff.) is even less confident than Cheyne. He admits that the linguistic criteria of Hackmann and Cheyne are indecisive. (We might add that the "idea" of the word קָרָא , which Gray regards as more suspicious than any actual criteria of vocabulary, offers hardly better reason for denying this chapter to Isaiah. The concept of קָרָא is used twice by Elijah in a prophetic catch-phrase [I Ki. 19:10, 14], the repetition of which suggests that the words are not the appropriate pious phrases which a late author thought that Elijah should use, but rather that there was a received tradition that this was the actual phraseology of Elijah).[2] Nevertheless, Gray also tends to place this prophetic poem in exilic times.

On the other hand, Duhm (pp. 65ff.), recognizing the Isaianic authorship of this passage, assigns it to the time of Sennacherib, since the tyrant of vv. 3f. must be the Assyrian. Such an interpretation, however, is by no means necessary. The predictive nature of the poem, which Duhm must concede if he regards it as an utterance of Isaiah, may well have reference to the "darkness" as well as to the "light." Isaiah is describing a deliverance from evil as if it had already occurred. Perhaps, likewise, the evil itself has not yet taken place, but is only predicted. Isaiah was confident, long before the time of Sennacherib, that such devastation would be wrought by Assyria. The description of verse 9 can, therefore, give no clue as to the date of this utterance of Isaiah. On the whole, we have no reason to remove the passage from its context as a fitting conclusion to certain of the prophecies of the time

---

1. Gressmann (pp. 242ff.); Sellin, Heilands. (pp. 28ff.); cf. Louise Smith.

2. Cf. 2 Sam. 21:2

of the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis.[1] Samaria and Judah are to be destroyed (8:1-8); both royal houses to be annihilated (11-15). Amid the devastation, a few disciples of Jahwe will escape (16-23). Upon them the future will be established, the darkness[2] changed into light, and a new and more suitable Davidic monarch place upon the throne, which had been vacated as a result of Assyrian force of arms.[3]

b) Amos 9:13-15. For similar reasons, we would include the final verses of the Book of Amos among the genuine utterances of the prophet. That vv. 11f. are a later addition to the text, presupposing the exile, is reasonably clear. Thus the fallen tabernacle of David, but especially the hostility towards Edom, are most naturally to be explained. But the following verses, completely independent of vv. 11f., give no such indications of a later origin. Only on the basis of their conflict with Amos' message of doom (cf. Amos 4:9; 5:11) can their authenticity be denied.[4] But if the prophetic concept of the Day of Jahwe was, as we have shown, a two-sided idea, every argument for the omission of the verses becomes invalidated.[5] The criticism of Gressmann and others that

---

1. Unless we believe that already in biblical times Immanuel was interpreted as a messianic figure, and this poem was placed fairly close to the Immanuel prophecies of cap. 8 because of the similar miraculous, messianic birth which it announces. Thus we might explain 7:15 as a gloss, originating in attempts, already in biblical times, to interpret Immanuel as the messiah. However, 8:8 and 8:10 have no reference to a personal messiah, as we have shown (p. 18, note 2, and page 33), and the evidence for such a hypothesis is altogether too flimsy. It is simpler to assume another reason for the position which chapter 10 now occupies in the Book of Isaiah.

2. Cf. 8:22. Note also the darkness which Amos associates with the Day of Jahwe (5:18).

3. For a fuller study of other messianic passages in Isaiah, the genuineness of which can possibly be maintained, see Louise Smith, Gressmann, and Sellin. The principles brought forward in this paper give added strength, we believe, to the arguments in these studies.

4. Harper, p. 199, Volz, pp. 23f., Cripps, pp. 67-77, Nowack, 168f., etc. Cf. also Gressmann, p. 234, who would expect a more clearly ethical orientation in a genuine utterance of Amos.

5. That the technical term שוב שבות (v. 14) has no relation to a captivity is clear from Job 42:10. Whether שבות is a cognate accusative, and a variant of the noun שיבה (Ps. 126:1), or else a derivative from the verb שבה in the sense of "to deprive," the meaning of the entire phrase is evidently "to restore the fortunes of."

The mention of waste cities (v. 14) and even of a deportation (v. 15) are clearly references to the destruction of the Day of Jahwe, which was forseen by Amos as a necessary preliminary to the fulfillment of these good tidings (cf. 9:14 with Amos 5:11). It is not those who return from captivity (9:4), but those who survive both destruction and exile, upon whom it is promised that the devastation will never again be visited. Such a promise is certainly no indication of a post-exilic origin. Volz' criticism of the vocabulary (p. 23) is not conclusive, nor are his questionings of the eschatological phrase הרה ימים באים and of the lack of connection between this passage and the context. In this, the less vindictive side of his prophecy, Amos would have no reason to avoid such a comparatively mild appelation of the deity as יהוה אלהיך, a concept which certainly is in accord with his theology (cf. 3:2).

we should expect from Amos a more ethical exposition of the future days is at best an argument ex silentio. Amos, in foretelling how Jahwe, the god of Israel, will bring doom upon his own people, is constrained to bring forward ethical arguments and to prove his paradoxical assertion. The golden future is much more a matter of course. That the survivors of the Day of Jahwe will be worthy of this future needs no elaboration from the prophet.

c) Hos. 2:16-20. This oracle of Hosea, parallel in many ways to the above utterances of Isaiah and Amos, is shown to be genuine on the basis of Hosea's pattern of thought, already illustrated from the sequence of chapters 1 and 3. That verse 16 does not speak of a literal wilderness seems clear from the following verse, where עמק עכור is parallel to משבר . If משבר refers to the wilderness, it must be the wilderness which is created of the land of Israel, even the fertile valley of עכור , rather than an area outside the land of Israel. Vv. 16f. are therefore to be connected with the desolation described in Hos. 3:3f., in which the prophet speaks of the solitary havoc of Israel awaiting the return of Jahwe[1]. If the third chapter of Hosea demands a sequel, these verses also require some such hopeful conclusion, as, indeed, occurs in 2:18ff. On the basis of all these considerations, then, the second chapter must be considered as a single unit, succinctly expressing the entire prophetic interpretation of the course of history:

1) The warnings of the approach of Jahwe's vengeance (vv. 4-9a).

2) The attempts at repentance, coming too late (9bf.).

3) The punishment of the people (11-15).

4) The remnant amid destruction (16-19).

5) The messianic age (20-25).

The style of vv. 16-25 is so reminiscent of the recognized portions of Hosea that it is hard to see how the ideas within them, for all their messianic orientation, could have been denied to the pre-exilic prophet. The new reference to Jezreel (v. 24); the contrast between עמי לא and עמי אתה (25); the reference to the produce of the earth (24), and above all, the everlasting betrothal of Jahwe and his people (21f.); all these must be part of an artistically unified oracle, not the skillful adoption by a later writer of Hosea's terms of reference, used to deny the basic teaching of the prophet.

---

1. Marti (Dodek., pp. 27ff.) believes that the expression ובלכתיה excludes this interpretation. However, Marti's view that Jahwe is here bringing back his people from captivity arouses more difficulties. The לכן of verse 16 would be hard to interpret, even from a much later author (the comparison with Is. 30:16) hardly offers an analogous use of the term). The correction of משבר to ושבתי simplifies the text, but becomes unnecessary if we realize the connection which exists between the ideas of the second chapter and the narrative framework of chapters 1 and 3.

The messianic hope was not, therefore, an invention of exilic Judaism, nor did it consist of ideals adopted by desparate patriots as compensation for the disastrous fall of their kingdom. From earliest times, it was implicit in the prophetic concept of Jahwe as a universal world god. The literary prophets understood the idea ethically. They completely moralized the cyclical interpretation of history, which they adopted from the same background as did the Aramean religion of Nabû-na'id. They taught that the evil of the Day of Jahwe came as punishment for evil. But the good which followed was equally the ethical fulfillment of all their purposes. Jahwe would rule the world through his people, Israel, and through the scion of David, their king. This was the prophetic hope from earliest days. This was the hope which, in its modifications, has continued to nourish Judaism amid catastrophes greater than those which the prophets awaited from a wrathful god.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

			Abbreviation (When not the author's name)
Ackerman, H.C.	"The Immanuel Sign & its Meaning."	AJSL, vol 35. p. 205	
Berton, G.A.	Archaeology & the Bible	Philadelphia, 1944	
Batten, L.W.	"Hosea's Message & Marriage"	JBL, vol. 48, p. 257	
Briggs, C.A.	Messianic Prophecy	New York, 1902	
Buttenweiser, M.	The Prophets of Israel	New York, 1914	
Cheyne, T.K.	Introduction to the Book of Isaiah	London, 1895	Cheyne
	Micah	Camb. U. P. 1909	Cheyne, Micah.
Cripps, R.S.	A Critical & Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Amos	London, 1929	
Driver, S.R.	Isaiah, His Life & Times	New York, 1888(?)	
Duhm, B.	Das Buch Jesaia (3rd. ed.)	Gottingen, 1914	
Dürr, L.	Ursprung & Aufbau der Israelitisch-jüdischen Heilandserwartung.	Berlin, 1925	
Ehrlich, A.B.	Randglossen zur hebraischen Bibel	Leipzig, 1912	
Fullerton, K.	"Immanuel"	AJSL, vol. 34, p. 256	
	Isaiah's Attitude in the Sennacherib Campaign."	AJSL, vol. 42, p. 1	
	"Viewpoints in the Discussion of Isaiah's Hope for the Future."	JBL, vol. 41, p. 1	Fullerton, Viewpoints
Gray, G.B.	The Book of Isaiah	New York, 1912	
Gressmann, H.	Der Messias	, 1929	
Gunkel, H.	Schöpfung & Chaos in Urzeit & Endzeit.	Gottingen, 1895	
Hackmann, H.	Zukunftserwartung des Jesaia	Gottingen, 1893	

.	Harper, W.R.	Amos and Hosea	New York, 1905	
.	Jastrow, M.	Hebrew & Babylonian Traditions	New York, 1914	
.	Lewy, H.	Nabû-na'id, the King of Babylon and Prophet of the Arameans; and his immortalization in Iranian, Israelite, and Arabic Legend.		Lewy
.	Lewy, H. & J.	"The Week and the Oldest West Asiatic Calendar."	HUCA, vol 17.	
.	Marti, K.	Das Dodekapropheten	Tubingen, 1904	Marti, Dodek
.		Geschichte der israelitschen Religion	Strassburg, 1903	Marti
.	Morgenstern, J.	Amos Studies	Cincinnati, 1941	
.	Nowack, W.	Kleine Propheten	Gottingen, 1922	
.	Olmstead, A.T.	History of Palestine & Syria	New York 1931	
.	Pfeiffer, R.H.	Introduction to the Old Testament	New York, 1941	
.	Robinson, T.H.	A History of Israel	Oxford, 1932	
.	Rogers, R.W.	Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament	New York, 1912	
.	Sayce, A.W.	The Life and Times of Isaiah	Oxford, 189-	
.	Sellin, D.E.	Der alttestamentliche Prophetismus	Leipzig, 1912	Sellin, Proph.: Sellin
.		Die israelitisch-jüdische Heilandserwartung	Berlin, 1909	Sellin, Heilands.
.	Skinner, J.	Isaiah, 1-39	London, 1897	
.	Smith, H.P.	Old Testament History	New York, 1903	
.	Smith, L.	"The Messianic Ideal of Isaiah"	JBL, vol. 36, p. 158.	
.	Smith, W.R.	The Prophets of Israel	London, 1902	
.	Stade	"Jesaia 32-33"	ZATW, 1884, pp. 266-271.	
.	Toy, C.H.	"Note on Hosea 1-3"	JBL, vol. 32, pp. 75ff.	
.	Volz, P.	Die Vorexilische Jahweprophetic und der Messias.	Gottingen, 1897	