



# LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

[www.huc.edu/libraries](http://www.huc.edu/libraries)

## Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

THE DOCTRINES Z'EVUT 'ABOT AND L'FA 'AN S'NO

IN

BIBLICAL LITERATURE

by

H E N R Y K A G A N

THESIS

Hebrew Union College

1 9 2 9

*Rec. 10/78*

D E D I C A T E D

To my Mother

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction. . . . .	p. 1
	A. Jahweh's Covenant with Israel . . . . .	2
	B. The Prophets of National Doom . . . . .	5
II.	Jeremiah's Message of the New Covenant. . . . .	8
III.	The Problem - How Justify National Restoration. . . . .	11
IV.	Jahweh's Covenant with the Patriarchs . . . . .	15
V.	The Doctrine of Individual Responsibility . . . . .	34
VI.	Ezekiel's Answer - Lema'an Semo . . . . .	40
VII.	Subsequent Application of the Doctrine. . . . .	51
VIII.	Conclusion. . . . .	61
	Notes . . . . .	(1)

INTRODUCTION

In Exodus, chapter 32, we read that Israel had proven herself to be an unworthy and sinful people. On several occasions in the wilderness she was absolutely faithless. The climax to Jahweh's patience came when Israel made the golden calf as her deity. Jahweh would have then completely destroyed Israel, for she merited such punishment, were it not for these two considerations: first, Jahweh feared the disparagement of His potency by the Egyptians if Israel were destroyed, in other words, out of regard for His reputation Jahweh refrained from destroying Israel; secondly, Jahweh was bound by His oath to the Patriarchs to give the land of Canaan to Israel, their descendants, as an eternal possession. In order to be faithful to His promise Jahweh could not destroy Israel. Because of these two factors Jahweh is persuaded by Moses to forgive Israel despite her faithlessness and consequently merited punishment.

The usual procedure for a God of justice would be to punish sin and faithlessness. In the above account, however, we have an illustration of two theological doctrines which were evolved in Judaism to justify the forgiveness of Israel despite her sin. We propose to make a study of these two doctrines, attempt to determine their origin and development in Biblical literature. The doctrine of the covenant with the "fathers" by which Jahweh is bound by His oath to protect Israel we designate as the doctrine *Zekut 'abot*. This term does not occur in the Bible, but is derived from the later Rabbinical use of the same doctrine. We have called the doctrine which justified Jahweh's

forgiveness of Israel because of His regard for His reputation the doctrine *l'ma 'an šemo*, "for the sake of His name". This expression is repeatedly employed in the Bible to denote this idea. These doctrines are correlated by the fact that they both attempt to answer the same problem, viz., why Jahweh a God of justice and faithfulness forgives Israel even though she be faithless; why Jahweh does not destroy Israel for her sins of faithlessness. Before proceeding the writer wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness to Dr. Julian Morgenstern for the main outlines of this thesis as well as the solution to the problem, received from conference with him and from the manuscript of the first of a series of his lectures delivered at The Garret Biblical Institute, 1929.

#### A. Jahweh's Covenant with Israel

Forgiveness of Israel's faithlessness is the central theme of the two doctrines *z'kut 'abot* and *l'ma 'an šemo*. Because of the "merits of the fathers" and "for the sake of His name" Jahweh forgives and restores Israel despite the fact that according to her grievous faithlessness she merits nought but punishment. Such a theological thought could not possibly have been current during the period of Israel's national religion. The problem of keeping faith with Jahweh did exist from the very birth of Israel's national religion. But the solution that these two doctrines present, namely, forgiveness despite the lack of faith, was foreign to the basic principle of Israel's national religion. In fact, when we examine this principle we find that by its implications the condonement of faithlessness could not possibly have been permitted.

The fundamental principle in Israel's national religion was Jahweh's covenant at Sinai, by which He had taken Israel for His people. This tradition placed Israel's religion upon a basis different from that of the usual tribal religion. Semitic deities were generally believed to be bound to their worshippers by ties of kinship which were thought to be indissoluble. In this arrangement no matter how unethical or faithless the worshippers might be the deity was compelled to protect them, otherwise he would cease to be a deity.<sup>1</sup> Jahweh, however, was related to Israel not by kinship but by contract. The relationship was a reciprocal one between the deity and the nation. Jahweh obligated Himself to take Israel as His people, give them a land and protect them. In turn, Israel obligated herself to worship Jahweh alone according to the ritual of the code of agreement which tradition held to have been consummated between all Israel and Jahweh at Sinai.<sup>2</sup> If Israel, however, did not fulfill her part of the contract, she could not expect Jahweh to fulfill His agreement. In this relationship the nation as well as the traditional ten laws of the covenant was conceived of as a unit. That is, there was no specified punishment for any individual Israelite violator of the covenant. No penalty was stated as long as the nation "en masse" observed the whole covenant faithfully. The disobedience of any one single law of the code was tantamount to the violation of the entire covenant and, therefore, to be regarded as faithlessness to Jahweh. According to its implications, such violation would bring about the nullification of the whole covenant and thus terminate Jahweh's relation with Israel. Faithlessness

constituted the breaking of the covenant through the nation's disobedience of its laws. In retaliation Jahweh would forsake Israel and leave her without divine protection. The punishment for faithlessness to the covenant was rigid, for a people without a God to protect them was doomed to destruction. Thus we see that there was no place for a doctrine of forgiveness despite Israel's faithlessness in the implications of Jahweh's covenant.

If Israel disobeyed the laws of the covenant, then Jahweh would repudiate His relationship with her and annul the covenant. This conditional character of the covenant relation became the cornerstone of Israel's religious development. The demands of Jahweh, the terms of His covenant were variously interpreted as the religious thought progressed from age to age. As Israel's social life became transformed by her new agricultural environment, and as her religious life became infused with Canaanitish practices, prophets arose to champion the democratic social organization of the desert and its simple religious practices. These they conceived to be Jahweh's demands. The social injustices that developed in Israel's new agricultural economic life, their adoption of licentious agricultural rites--these were regarded as not established by Jahweh. They constituted absolute faithlessness to Jahweh's covenant and if persisted in would bring about the complete rejection of Israel. The desire to save Israel from the direful results that would follow the loss of their God became the basis of many religious reformations in Israel's history. It was hoped that by these reformations Israel could reestablish her covenant relation with Jahweh and thus prevent its repudiation.



### B. The Prophets of National Doom

To the pre-exilic literary prophets, however, Israel had proven herself to be so unquestionably faithless to Jahweh that His repudiation of the covenant was certain and beyond recall. Their interpretation of Jahweh's demands was so highly ethical as to be almost impossible of fulfillment by Israel. Certainly, the rampant injustices showed how grievously Israel had sinned, how complete had been her disregard of the ethical demands of Jahweh's covenant. The complete destruction of Israel as a nation could be the only outcome of Israel's failure to fulfill her obligations. Jahweh had rejected her and without her God's protection the doom of Israel was sealed.

Since the doom of Israel was the dominant message of the pre-exilic literary prophets, it is not surprising that we do not find in their writings any notion of the forgiveness of the entire nation; at least, they certainly do not contain any thought of the forgiveness of Israel despite her faithlessness. Amos rigorously proclaimed the complete destruction of Israel for its sins and faithlessness to Jahweh. Reinterpreting the יום ה' as the day of Israel's doom, he declared that when Jahweh destroyed Israel He could take another people as His worshippers. This was the first step in the evolutionary process that finally transformed Jahweh from a national god of Israel into a universal God. Yet in Amos' new view of Jahweh's actions Israel's only fate was complete annihilation.

Isaiah was the first to modify the principle of the total destruction of Israel by Jahweh for its faithlessness. Even

Hosea, who loved his people ardently could see but destruction for the nation. He did announce the doctrine of repentance by which Israel might return to Jahweh, regain His favor and thus avert the impending doom. But Hosea admitted that he saw little hope of Israel's repentance. He pointed out the way the doom might be averted, but concluded that Israel would not hearken and, therefore, she must be punished. Isaiah, on the other hand, distinguished between a "righteous remnant" and the nation at large. The faithful to Jahweh would escape the general doom. Yet this very grace shown to the few faithful made the destruction of the sinful majority of the nation for its faithlessness all the more certain. Isaiah's dominant message, therefore, was like that of his predecessors--the complete destruction of the nation. To these prophets there could not possibly be any forgiveness for a people so faithless and sinful as Israel. Jahweh justifiably had rejected Israel. He had repudiated His covenant and, therefore, Israel's end as a nation was imminent. Isaiah may have spoken of a righteous remnant but the impending doom of the nation was uppermost in his mind. In the final analysis of their writings, as far as the nation was concerned, they pronounced upon it an irrevocable sentence of doom.

The two doctrines z'kut 'abot and le'ma 'an š'mo, which portray the hope, nay, even the assurance of Israel's forgiveness and restoration, could certainly not have been held by these prophets, nor could they have been created by the people to whom these prophets preached. The people could not even imagine any faithlessness on their part nor the destruction of

the nation and, therefore, they needed no forgiveness nor assurance of restoration. Furthermore, the two doctrines implied the forgiveness of the nation despite its sin and faithlessness. Such a notion was the very contradiction of the message of the prophets of doom. Only from some message of hope, such as Jeremiah's message of the new covenant, could these two doctrines have evolved.

## II

### JEREMIAH'S MESSAGE OF THE NEW COVENANT

In his earlier prophecies Jeremiah followed the thought of his predecessors, Hosea in particular. The sins of Israel which he denounced, namely, the foreign non-Jahwistic cults and the social injustices, constituted faithlessness to Jahweh and, therefore, Jeremiah likewise threatened the nation with the impending termination of its existence.<sup>3</sup> Israel had nullified her covenant relations with Jahweh through this faithlessness and consequently her doom was sealed. The threat of the Scythian hordes of the North lent weight to his gloomy forebodings, even as it supported Zephaniah's predictions of woe. With the same depth of feeling that characterized Hosea, Jeremiah concerned himself with the hopeless end of Israel. This was the burden of his message before the Deuteronomic reformation.

Jeremiah's expectations concerning the failures of this reform were substantiated by the reaction that set in after Josiah's death.<sup>4</sup> But when he resumed his ministry at this time he proclaimed a message not only entirely different from that of his predecessors but also at variance with his own earlier prophecies. His thoughts had matured under the influence of the rapid changes that were taking place between the years 608 and 586 B. C. E. Babylon had established her supremacy over Egypt; the first deportations from Jerusalem occurred in 597. The doom, which to his predecessors was a prophecy of the future, became to Jeremiah a very imminent reality. Like the other prophets,<sup>5</sup> he had championed the justice of God's judgement. But as the

sentence was being carried out before his very eyes he was filled with a love for his condemned people, and overcome by his sympathy for their sufferings. His love for his people struggled with his loyalty to Jahweh's justice. Out of this struggle there emerged Jeremiah's new message, a creation of his hope.<sup>6</sup>

In deserved punishment for her faithlessness, proclaimed Jeremiah, Israel must go into Exile. It was not the will of Jahweh that Israel should be completely destroyed. The sufferings, the tribulations of the exile were not for the annihilation of Israel but for her discipline, correction and final regeneration. Purified by this trial, Israel would come to understand Jahweh's ways and demands and return to Him repentant. Then Israel, forgiven, would be restored to her national land and once again live in perfect faithfulness to Jahweh. Jeremiah's thought was summed up in the new word ~~TOIX~~<sup>7</sup> which he coined to express "discipline through suffering". Utilizing Hosea's figure of paternal love, he proclaimed that Jahweh, the Father, would chastize, not destroy Israel. His son, and in doing so would temper His justice with love.<sup>8</sup> This chastisement would come in the form of exile which Jeremiah said would continue for some time (seventy years) until Israel had been sufficiently disciplined by her suffering. Israel would then return to Jahweh and her land. As a final climax to this restoration, a new covenant would be established between Jahweh and Israel.<sup>9</sup>

This covenant would not be like the ancient covenant which could be nullified and terminated. The new covenant would be an everlasting covenant, inscribed in the hearts of the people.

"Verily, days shall come, says Jahweh,  
When I shall make a new covenant with the House of  
Israel and the House of Judah -  
Not like the covenant which I made with their fathers  
The day I took them by the hand to lead them out of  
Egypt,  
Which covenant they broke so that I cast them off;  
But this shall be the covenant which I shall make with  
the house of Israel.  
In days to come I will implant my law in their minds,  
Then I shall be to them a God,  
And they will be to me a people;  
Then will they no longer need to teach one another  
With the words, 'Know Jahweh',  
For they will all know me  
From the meanest of them to the greatest.  
Thus<sup>10</sup> will I forgive their iniquity  
And remember their sin no more."

The pre-exilic prophets held no hope for Israel.  
With their message of doom they ended Israel's national religion.  
Jahweh had repudiated his covenant and all therefore was ended.  
Jeremiah, however, with his new message of hope, created a new  
covenant doctrine which became the initial step of a new develop-  
ment in Israel's religion. It was the starting point of the whole  
process that finally transformed Israel's national religion into  
a universal religion, into Judaism. Jeremiah's new covenant  
initiated theological speculation concerning Israel's future and  
opened many religious problems. In answer to one of these pro-  
blemes, there evolved the two doctrines, z<sup>a</sup>kut 'abot and l<sup>e</sup>ma 'an  
s<sup>a</sup> mo.

### III

#### THE PROBLEM - HOW JUSTIFY NATIONAL RESTORATION

Jeremiah implied by his message of the new covenant that Jahweh had not irrevocably renounced Israel. This was a striking contradiction of his predecessors' declarations that Jahweh would completely sever His relations with Israel. Such a startling attitude aroused a disturbing problem for the religious conscience, for this doctrine implied Jahweh's forgiveness of Israel despite its present sin. It definitely provided for Israel's national restoration despite her present faithlessness.<sup>11</sup> Jeremiah did not deny Israel's sinfulness, nor to be sure did he modify the principle that God works through justice. Then how-- and this is the problem with which the two doctrines under our consideration are concerned--how could Jahweh, a God of justice, forgive Israel who was sinful? How could Israel's future restoration be justified?

The natural and immediate answer to this problem was that Israel's restoration was assured because of her repentance. By restoring an Israel cleansed by the exile, Jahweh could in no way be accused of compromising with His ways of righteousness. Though theologically acceptable, such an answer was not sufficiently in accord with the historical circumstances. In the first place, the repentance of Israel was not a fait accompli but merely a hopeful prediction of the future. As such, it could not convincingly become the basis of an argument for Israel's restoration. Furthermore, the doctrine of the new covenant had been pronounced before the exile and yet Jeremiah stated that the

repentance would follow after the exile. This implied, at least, the assurance of restoration before the repentance was a certainty. Thus the argument of repentance appears to be an a priori reasoning based upon an already formulated belief in restoration. That is, since Israel will be restored, it follows that she will repent. We are thus left with national restoration still to be justified. The answer of repentance did not suffice. Particularly does this appear to be the case when we realize that the repentance was not to come through Israel's own initiative but was to be brought about by the act of Jahweh Himself.<sup>12</sup> This implies that Jahweh wanted Israel as His people despite their present sinfulness, and because of this fact He would make Israel repent. So the problem remains. How could Jahweh, a God of justice and faithfulness, forgive and restore Israel who was openly a sinful and faithless people?

The first acceptable answer to the question arose from the implications of Jeremiah's message of the new covenant itself. The very expression "new covenant" recalled the whole principle of the covenant relationship between Jahweh and Israel established of old at Sinai. We have shown that by the terms of this contract Jahweh did not have to protect Israel if Israel did not fulfill her obligations.<sup>13</sup> This provided the basis for the prophecies of doom, namely, Jahweh's repudiation of the covenant. But, on the other hand, it was just as possible that Jahweh would not choose to annul the covenant. We find the intimations of such a notion in Hosea. Though he proclaimed doom, his idea of repentance implied that though the covenant was threatened it was



not definitely repudiated. Israel might save it by repenting; but once Israel had delayed so long that Jahweh, though desirous of forgiving, was compelled by His sense of justice to renounce the covenant, then all possibility of restoration would vanish.<sup>14</sup> It was to avoid just such a direful situation that the various prophetic reforms, such as those of Hezekiah and Josiah, were instituted. They desired to reestablish Israel's covenant obligations in order to avert the doom that otherwise would surely follow its repudiation.<sup>15</sup>

It was on this very point, however, that the message of Jeremiah differed. He did not imply by his doctrine of the new covenant that a separate covenant would be established that would take the place of the old repudiated and now inoperative contract. His message was rather an entirely new and wider interpretation of the old covenant. For Jeremiah it did not follow that because Israel was being divinely punished by the exile Jahweh had completely annulled the covenant relations and, therefore, Israel was doomed. The exile was for discipline, not for annihilation. And, as a corollary to this doctrine of discipline, or as its sister thought, arose the new thought that the covenant between Jahweh and Israel was eternal--never to be repudiated by Jahweh.<sup>16</sup> Israel must pass through the discipline of suffering then voluntarily, out of the convictions of her own heart would she return to covenant relations with Jahweh that always await her. In this sense, the new covenant, or rather the renewal of Israel's allegiance to Jahweh, would be recorded not in stone according to the old Sinai tradition, ~~now~~ written in a book as the

Deuteronomic Code, but inscribed in the hearts of all people.

Thus the covenant idea became an eternally established fact, and afforded the first sort of satisfactory answer to the problem of justifying national restoration. Briefly formulated, it was because of the old covenant with the fathers, which was newly interpreted by Jeremiah and those that followed him as eternally binding, that Jahweh would not destroy Israel completely but would discipline her and eventually forgive and restore her national independence.

This was the initial statement of the doctrine that Jahweh would forgive Israel despite her faithlessness. It was a radical new thought, in direct contrast to the prophecies of doom and the conditional Sinai covenant upon which these prophecies were based.

IV

JAHWEH'S COVENANT WITH THE PATRIARCHS

The Covenant which in its original traditional meaning implied only Jahweh's conditional relationship with Israel was now transformed by Jeremiah's message into an eternal contract binding Jahweh to Israel for eternity. Upon this new interpretation was based the assurance and justification of Israel's restoration. Because of Jahweh's everlasting obligations to an eternal covenant of old, Israel will be forgiven and restored. Thus we read in Deuteronomy 4:31: "For a merciful God is Jahweh thy God, He will not forsake thee, nor let thee be destroyed for He will not forget the covenant of the fathers which He swore to them." It is interesting to note that in this chapter, vv. 24-40, we find the several attitudes toward Israel's sin and punishment. Vv. 25-26 represent the pre-exilic, pre-Jeremiah view that Israel is to be completely destroyed for her sin. These verses are, therefore, older than verses 27 ff. The latter present the view evolved by Jeremiah. They state that the punishment, far from being an annihilation, was to be an exile for the purification of the nation. Jahweh could not destroy Israel because of the eternally binding obligations of the covenant which "He swore<sup>17</sup> unto the fathers."

The question arises as to what "fathers" the passage, Deuteronomy 4:31, refers. We find the answer in vv. 37-38: "For just because He loved your fathers and chose their seed after them did He bring thee out of the land of Egypt by Himself with His mighty power in order to drive out nations

greater and mightier than thou from before thee, to bring thee in and to give thee their land as a possession even as it is to-day." It is obvious that by the "fathers" the author meant the Patriarchs. This is what most likely happened. The doctrine of the eternality of the covenant became associated with the Patriarchal covenants. The correct hypothesis seems to be that the notion of a covenant with the Patriarchs was an outgrowth of Jeremiah's doctrine of the eternal covenant. If the covenant was an eternal one, it would be natural that it should have begun with the very first father of Israel. This appeared to be not only a logical corollary but a necessary complement of the doctrine. For, despite Jeremiah's reinterpretation of the covenant idea, the well established traditional implication of the Sinai Covenant was that it was not an eternal but a conditional contract depending wholly upon Israel's fulfillment of her obligations. Each religious reformation served to reestablish this tradition. The original documents of these reformations show the covenant to be conditional and not eternal.<sup>19</sup> The pre-exilic prophets held the same view. Since the established attitude toward the Sinai covenant was that it was a conditional contract, it became necessary after Jeremiah's pronouncement, to find some substantiation for his new thought of an eternal covenant. This was provided for by carrying the tradition of the conditional covenant at Sinai back to an eternal covenant made with the Patriarchs themselves. To give weight, therefore, to Jeremiah's message the tradition took form that Jahweh entered into an eternal covenant with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Because of their

righteousness and particularly their faithfulness they had merited the promise from Jahweh that He would give them posterity numerous as the stars and the sands and to their posterity would He give possession of the land of Canaan forever. This promise was for eternity, for Jahweh Himself had sworn to keep it by an irrevocable oath. Because of it Israel would never be destroyed but must eventually be restored to her heritage. In this manner, must have originated the doctrine zekut 'abot. Because of the merits of the fathers and consequent thereto, the Patriarchal covenant Jahweh must forgive and restore Israel despite her faithlessness.

The Sinai covenant in turn came to be interpreted as the fulfillment of the ancient eternal promise made to the Patriarchs. And it is significant that Jeremiah was the first in prophetic literature to connect the Sinai covenant with the Patriarchal promises.<sup>20</sup> In Jer. 11:3b-5a we read: "Cursed be the man that obeyeth not the words of this covenant which I commanded your fathers in the day I brought them forth from Egypt...saying, Obey my voice...all that I command you, so shall you be my people and I will be your God: In order that I may perform the oath which I have sworn unto your fathers, to give them a land flowing with milk and honey, as it is this day." Thus Jeremiah, besides formulating the idea of an eternal covenant to justify Israel's forgiveness and restoration, carried that covenant back to an eternal promise that Jahweh swore to Israel's progenitors themselves. This whole process resulted in the final formulation of the doctrine that because Jahweh was bound by His promise to

Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Israel must be forgiven and restored to her eternal possession. This is the meaning of the post-exilic prayer inserted in Micah 7:18-20: "Who is like unto thee, who forgivest iniquity and overlookest transgression for the remnant of His possession. He does not retain His anger forever for He delights in lovingkindness. He will again show mercy unto us, He will tread underfoot our iniquities. Yea, Thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea, for Thou wilt show the faithfulness to Jacob and the lovingkindness to Abraham which Thou didst swear to our father in days of old."<sup>21</sup>

This new doctrine of the eternal promise to the Patriarchs that resulted from Jeremiah's attempt to justify Israel's restoration, initiated an entirely new concept of the motivation of Israel's history. The central starting point now became the covenant with the Patriarchs. And curiously enough, though this thought evolved from Jeremiah's reinterpretation of the Sinai covenant, it soon appeared to eclipse the Sinai covenant in importance. Israel's historic relationship with Jahweh no longer began with the deliverance from Egypt and the consummation of a covenant at Sinai. It began at the time of the oaths with the fathers. Because of these promises Israel was delivered from<sup>22</sup> Egypt, given a covenant at Sinai,<sup>23</sup> and the land of Canaan,<sup>24</sup> and also because these oaths were eternally binding Israel would<sup>25</sup> be restored to that land. This is the interpretation of Israel's history to be found in Psalm 105:6 ff. and its exact parallel, I Chronicles 16:16: "Oh, ye seed of Abraham, His servant, ye children of Jacob, His chosen...He hath remembered His covenant

forever the word which He commanded to a thousand generations, which covenant He made with Abraham and His oath unto Isaac and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law and to Israel for an everlasting covenant: Saying unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your possession." Here the Psalmist recounts all the marvelous deeds Jahweh performed for Israel from her entrance into Egypt until her deliverance--all this because "He remembered His holy promise unto Abraham, His servant." Here we have a complete elaboration of the part Jahweh's promise to the fathers played in Israel's history. But before this point was reached the thought passed through a process of development.

To retrace our steps, we concluded that Jeremiah's interpretation of the covenant as eternally binding preceded the formulation of Jahweh's promise to the Patriarchs. The Patriarchal covenant proceeded from Jeremiah's new message. Further substantiation of this conclusion is to be found in the fact that nowhere in prophetic writing prior to Jeremiah is there mention made of the Patriarchal covenants. In fact, they do not even contain authentic references to the Patriarchs at all. When the Patriarchs are mentioned by name the prophets generally refer to the whole people, as for example, the house of Jacob. The references to the Patriarchs as individuals in Micah 7:20 and Isaiah 29:22 are post-exilic. Hosea refers to Jacob but certainly not<sup>26</sup> as an exemplary character. The post-exilic references to the Patriarchs in prophetic literature, however, are numerous, as in Deutero-Isaiah. The Patriarchal covenant was dependent upon the doctrine of the eternality of the covenant. Now, since the

thought of an eternally binding covenant was the very contradiction of the message of these pre-exilic prophets of doom, it follows that they could not possibly have had any notion of a Patriarchal covenant. Their silence upon the subject, therefore, lends proof to our argument that the doctrine of the covenant with the fathers was introduced after Jeremiah's pronouncement of the "New Covenant".

The doctrine of the covenant with the fathers was elaborated by various schools of writers which followed Jeremiah; first, the Deuteronomic writers who were mostly influenced by him and whose work resembles Jeremiah the most closely; secondly, a group of writers we designate as  $J_2$  and who performed the task of fixing the doctrine into a historical framework; and thirdly, a group of Priestly writers who, profiting by the work of the first two groups, wove the idea into the Priestly writings.

The post-Jeremiah Deuteronomic writers make repeated use of the doctrine of the covenant with the Patriarchs.<sup>27</sup> We have quoted several Deuteronomic passages above in which the doctrine is made the basis of the assurance of Israel's forgiveness despite her sin. Another striking example we find by the Deuteronomic compiler of II Kings 13:23 who attributes Hazael's failure to destroy Israel to the fact that "Jahweh was gracious unto them (Israel) and had compassion upon them and regarded their welfare; for the sake of His covenant with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob He would not let them be destroyed nor cast them out of His presence as yet."<sup>28</sup>

The deliverance from Egypt was spoken of by these Deuteronomic writers as but a fulfillment of Jahweh's oath to the



Patriarchs. "Not because you were more in numbers than any people did Jahweh delight in you nor choose you, for ye were the fewest of peoples. But because Jahweh loved you and because He would keep the oath which He swore to your fathers, hath Jahweh brought you out of the house of bondage...."<sup>29</sup> Or, as we read in Deuteronomy 10:5: "It is only because Jahweh delighted in your fathers to love them did He choose their seed after them, even you above all people, as it is this day."<sup>30</sup> If it were not for the covenant with the Patriarchs, Israel would never have possessed Canaan for she herself could not have merited it. "Not because of thy uprightness or righteousness in heart dost thou come to take possession of their (the Canaanites) land, but because of the wickedness of these nations does Jahweh drive them out from before thee and in order to establish the word which Jahweh swore unto thy fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob."<sup>31</sup> In the following verses of this same chapter, all the sins and faithless acts of Israel are recounted, but Moses by appealing to Jahweh to remember the Patriarchal covenant succeeds in mollifying His anger.<sup>32</sup> Jahweh performed the marvelous deliverance from Egypt not because Israel merited such favor, but only "in order to establish His covenant which He swore unto the fathers."<sup>33</sup> For the same reason, Jahweh cannot keep Israel from Canaan because He must be faithful to His oath. "I made you go up out of Egypt and have brought you to the land which I swore unto your fathers for I said I will never break my covenant with you."<sup>34</sup> In the exilic or post-exilic chapter 30 of Deuteronomy we find a statement of Jeremiah's doctrine of discipline and the eternal covenant. There

we read that after the punishment of the exile Israel will return to Jahweh's commandments. Then Jahweh will reinstate Israel and "will again rejoice over thee for good as he rejoiced over thy fathers."<sup>35</sup> "And it shall be when ye hearken unto these judgments and keep and do them, then Jahweh your God will keep unto thee the covenant and the mercy which He swore unto your fathers."<sup>36</sup>

The repeated reference made by these Deuteronomic writers to the covenant that assured Israel possession of Canaan (אשר נשבע יהוה לאבותם ליצחק וליעקב לתת להם ולזרעם אחריהם:)<sup>37</sup> shows the very important part it played in their theologies. Constantly they emphasize the perpetuity of the Patriarchal promises. At a time when Judah was in imminent danger of losing its heritage they placed all their hope in Jeremiah's formulation of the eternal covenant. The divine assurance of Israel's restoration lay in Jahweh's promises to the Patriarchs.

Motivated by the same desire of assuring Israel her eternal claim to her land, and consequently the justification of her restoration, a group of writers took upon themselves the historical task of carrying the tradition of the conditional Sinai contract back to an eternal Patriarchal covenant. Placing all their hope in Jeremiah's new message, they reinterpreted and reevaluated the history of the Patriarchs so as to make it harmonize with the new doctrine of the covenant with the fathers. This was accomplished by a group of Jahwistic writers who used many of the traditions and stories already built up around the Patriarchs by earlier E and J writers. They employed these

accounts as a framework for their development of the covenant with the fathers. We will call them J2 writers.<sup>38</sup> They were Jahwistic writers of the Southern kingdom contemporaneous with Jeremiah, and perhaps continued their work even after the exile.

By the time we reach the period of Jeremiah the figures of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as progenitors of the race were fairly well established in the popular mind. They stood merely as progenitors of the nation, however, without any notion of a covenant relationship existing between them and Jahweh. The first statement of Jahweh's covenant was thought to be the conditional contract at Sinai. Nevertheless, the Patriarchs were closely associated in various ways with Israel's national religion. In the majority of cases the stories and traditions that cluster about the Patriarchs personalities are introduced in such a way as to show that they are popular explanations of the origins of certain holy places, objects, wells, popular etymologies of names. Some of these have several popular explanations and, therefore, we find a repetition of stories.<sup>39</sup> The Holy places, sacred stones, terebinths where spirits dwelt and which were taken over by the Hebrews from the Canaanites were gradually associated with the Patriarchs. Various sanctuaries existed throughout the land. It was desirable to lend special Jahweh sanctity to these "high places" in place of their Canaanite traditional Baal sanctity. Thus arose the accounts which attempt to prove that in ancient times Jahweh, the God of the Hebrews, revealed Himself to the various Patriarchs at these holy places. This provided Jahweh sanctity to former Baal shrines at Bethel,

Bearsheba, Hebron, Shechem, etc.

The story of Jacob's vision at the sacred stone of Bethel, when divested of all its later accretions and insertions, may have originally been devised for the purpose of lending special Jahweh sanctity to the long established sanctuary of Bethel. The words which Jacob utters upon awakening, "Behold Jahweh<sup>41</sup> is in this (holy) place and I knew it not", may have been just for this purpose. And it is significant for this argument that<sup>42</sup> when we analyze Gen. 28:10-22, we find that the E writers of the Northern kingdom were interested only in the sacredness of the stone at Bethel. They make of it the "house of God" (v. 22).<sup>43</sup> They are interested in lending Jahweh sanctity to Bethel and this accounts for the elaborate story of Jacob's vision. They are not concerned with a covenant made to the fathers. E nowhere makes mention of Jahweh's covenant to the patriarchs which assured their posterity possession of Canaan forever.

Let us return to our main interest. This elaborate account of Jahweh's revelation of Jacob at Bethel composed by E writers of the North and with some addition of J became the framework in which our J2 writers worked a statement of Jahweh's covenant with the Patriarchs, providing Jeremiah's doctrine with a historical background and proof. Thus the J2 writers inserted in the fanciful story of Jacob's ladder dream: "Behold Jahweh<sup>44</sup> stood above him and said, 'I am Jahweh, the God of Abraham, thy father, and the God of Isaac, the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it and to thy seed. And thy seed shall be as dust of the earth and thou shalt spread abroad to the West,

East, North, and South. And in thee and thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blest. And behold I am with thee, and will keep thee in all places whither thou goest." These verses give further indication of their late composition. The phrase, "In thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blest", is definitely of Deutero-Isaianic flavor and in itself may be a later addition to J2. The idea of Jahweh accompanying Jacob everywhere is also a late advanced religious thought.<sup>45</sup>

This promise of Jahweh to Jacob was but one of a whole ordered series of promises that J2 writers developed as historical substantiation of Jeremiah's new doctrine of the eternal covenant with the fathers. As in chapter 28, they took an already existing account of the Patriarchs particularly an E or J account or a combined E and J account of an appearance of Jahweh to the Patriarchs at some sanctuary or holy place and to this account they attached a promise to the fathers. Thus in a J account which attributed to Shechem Jahweh's first appearance to Abram in Canaan, J2 writers inserted Jahweh's promise: "Unto thy seed will I give this land." This verse, Gen. 12:7, was the initial promise in the J2 series. As we shall see later, Gen. 12:1-4 are later additions. They are part of the Babel story and show the influence of Deutero-Isaiah. 12:5 is the original sequel of 11:32 continuing Abraham's itinerary through Canaan. At Shechem he built an altar where Jahweh appeared to him. Thus the sanctuary was provided with special Jahweh sanctity. And it is at this place that the J2 writers wove in the covenant with the fathers. In passing, we might note that in the J account of an altar which Abraham

erected to Jahweh in some indefinite place between Bethel and Hai (12:8) the J2 writers did not insert any promise. Perhaps this account appeared even indefinite to them, or the importance of that altar place had by their time diminished.

The second J2 insertion of Jahweh's covenant with the Patriarchs is found in chapter 15:14-17. The original J framework had merely the fact that Abraham built an altar to Jahweh at Hebron, thus accounting for its sanctity.<sup>46</sup> Here J2 inserts an elaborate statement of Jahweh's promise: And Jahweh said to Abram..."Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, southward, eastward and westward, for all the land which thou seest to thee will I give it and to thy seed forever; and I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth, so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed be numbered. Arise, walk through the land in the length of it, and the breadth, for I will give it unto thee." We see the definite relation of J2's account to the formulation of the doctrine of the eternal covenant with the fathers for the purpose of justifying Israel's restoration. Israel must be restored because, as J2 states, Jahweh promised to give the land to Abram's "posterity forever".

The first statement of a defined covenant established between Jahweh and Abraham is found in Genesis 15. The preceding references were only promises given by Jahweh. In Gen. 15 a <sup>47</sup> covenant is consummated with complete ceremonies. The chapter presents various difficulties with regard to its sources. It is obvious that a separation must be made between verses 1-6 and 7 ff. In

the former, it is night, in the latter, it is daytime; the former is concerned about Abram's immediate heir; the latter with his future posterity. The original J account of vv. 1-6 told of Abram's concern about an heir. These verses are 1-2a, 5b-4. J2 has added to these verses 5-6 which parallels J2's account of the promise to give Abram great posterity in Gen. 12:14-17. J2 adds here that Abram believed in Jahweh's promise and "it was counted to him for righteousness". This passage recalls Isaiah's test of faithfulness. Because Abraham was faithful, therefore, Jahweh would be faithful to his promise.

There is a distinct contrast between Abraham's faith recorded in verse 6 and his doubt of Jahweh's word in verse 8. Verses 7-8 appear to be the work of a redactor who joined the independent story 1-6 with verses 9 ff, by mere mechanical use of the word וְ. Plainly, the promise of vv. 1-6 was originally independent of the rest of the text. Bacon conjectures that the assurance of an heir in J originally served as an introduction to chapter 16 where such an addition appears to be necessary.<sup>48</sup>

The singular revelation in vv. 12-16 must likewise be separated from Genesis 15. The "deep sleep" does not fit in with the conclusion of the Berith in which Abraham takes a wide awake part. These verses properly come after vv. 17-20 where they make sense, for they anticipate the covenant described there. As the original statement, therefore, of the covenant described in Genesis 15, there remains vv. 9-11, 12b, 17-20. The preparation of the sacrifices for the consummation of the covenant are described. Abraham participates by cutting the animals in two

parts and the sacrifices are miraculously burnt by Jahweh. Then the covenant is recorded: "Unto thy seed have I given this land." This covenant account, like the promises quoted above, is by our J2 school. The original place of the account most likely came after 12:7a where we find the exact expression of the covenant used. It logically follows there after Abraham first set his foot on the promised land.<sup>49</sup>

The enumeration of the nations to be dispossessed is a J2 elaboration. These J2 authors, writing at the time of Jeremiah, employed the ceremonies common to the consummation of a covenant, and applied them to their account of the ancient Patriarchal covenant. See, for example, Jeremiah's account of Zedekiah's covenant to free the slaves.<sup>50</sup> The phrase *מֵהָר מִצְרַיִם עַד* *הַנָּהָר הַגָּדוֹל* indicates also the late composition of this covenant account. The dream of the strong patriot was to have Israel's possessions reach from the Nile to the Euphrates between the two great world powers. The same hope is portrayed in a post-exilic passage, Isaiah 19:24ff. This phrase in Gen. 15 likewise represents a post-exilic dream.

We can only indicate here various other passages in J2's series of Patriarchal covenants. Aside from the dependence of these passages on the doctrine of the eternal covenant with the fathers formulated after Jeremiah, these passages show their late composition both by their Deuteronomic affinities and Deutero-Isaianic flavor. Thus in Gen. 18:18-19 which has been assigned to a D insertion in the sodom account,<sup>51</sup> but which is most likely J2: "And Abraham shall surely become a great nation



and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him. For I know that he will command his children and his household after him and they shall keep the way of the Lord to do righteousness and justice in order that Jahweh may bring upon Abraham that which He spoke to him." The thought expressed here is that Jahweh would keep the eternal covenant with the Patriarch. Of course, Abraham's posterity must be as faithful as Abraham their progenitor, but if they are not, Jahweh is still bound by His oath and, therefore, must purify Israel and make them do justice in order to fulfill His covenant. (Verse 18b is Deutero-Isaianic, depending upon this prophet's idea of Israel becoming Jahweh's messenger to the world.)

The story of the sacrifice of Isaac presented an excellent opportunity for J2 writers to reiterate Jahweh's covenant with Abraham. This we find in Gen. 22:15-19.<sup>52</sup> They had before them E's story of the offering of Isaac, Gen. 22:1-13 and 19. The point of E's story was to show that human sacrifice was not necessary for piety. An animal substitute is sufficient indication of man's obedience. The story is illustrative of the prophetic attempt to break down the practice of human sacrifice, as in the Book of the Covenant as well as in the K Code.<sup>53</sup> The account had no connection in its original form with any promises of offspring to Abraham. J2 appended the promises in vv. 15-18 as a second angelic revelation in manner of an afterthought. Such a story decidedly proved the faithfulness of Abraham. J2 emphasized this fact, not the animal substitution for human sacrifice. Abraham's faithfulness they had already described in Gen. 15:6.<sup>54</sup>

And now this greatest act of Abraham's faith they crowned with a repetition of Jahweh's promises. Other indications that show the late composition of these verses, 15-18, is the use of **מלאך יהוה** ; such expressions as **גם יקוק** never found in J or E; and late Deuteronomic expressions **עקב אשר**, **יען אשר**. <sup>55</sup> 18a is Deutero-Isaianic.

J2 writers in their series of promises had them given to Isaac and Jacob as well as Abraham. These we find in Gen. 26:2-7, 26:24, 32:13, etc. These are all repetitions of the Abrahamic covenants. Indications of their late composition, aside from the fact that these Patriarchal covenants were formulated after Jeremiah, may be seen in their late expressions. Gen. <sup>56</sup> 26:2-7 definitely contains Deuteronomic expressions. In Gen. 26:24, in the J legend accounting for the name of Beer Sheba, J2 inserts a repetition of the covenant to Isaac. The expression **בְּעֹבֵד אֲרָמָה** <sup>57</sup> in this passage shows the influence of Deutero-Isaiah. In 32:13, J2 bases Jacob's prayer for protection from Esau on the fact that Jahweh promised Jacob's father, Abraham, numerous posterity. When Jacob goes down to Egypt (Gen. 43:3-4) Jahweh assures him that He will lead Jacob's posterity out of there, a great nation.

After these accounts of the Patriarchal covenants were created they were joined together with the existing J and E accounts of the deliverance of Egypt that preceded the Sinai covenant. J2 may have been responsible for some of these passages. <sup>58</sup> Moses came to deliver Israel in the name of Jahweh, the God of the Patriarchs, to whom He had sworn an eternal oath. To fulfill

that promise Israel must be delivered. Priestly writers, however, were for the most part responsible for these passages that link the Patriarchal covenants with the deliverance from Egypt. Thus in Exodus 2:24: "And God heard their (Israel's) cry, and God remembered His covenant with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob." By this covenant Jahweh had to free Israel and bring them to the land which He swore unto the Patriarchs to give as a possession to their posterity forever (Ex. 6:8). Priestly writers, however, believed that the deity named "Jahweh" appeared for the first time to Moses, and to harmonize the Patriarchal covenants conceived by J2 they arranged a definite progression for Jahweh's various revelations. Thus Ex. 6:3-5, 7-8, where the Priestly writers describe the deity as appearing to Moses for the first time as "Jahweh", saying, "Unto Abraham, Isaac and Jacob I appeared as El Shaddai but my name Jahweh was not known to them. And I have also established my covenant with them to give them the land of Canaan....and I have also heard the groaning of the children of Israel whom the Egyptians keep in bondage and I have remembered my covenant....and I will take you to me for a people and I will be your God....and I will bring you into the land which I swear to give to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob..."<sup>59</sup> The Patriarchal covenant binds Jahweh to Israel and because of its eternal promise He must deliver Israel from oppression and exile, and eventually restore her to her possession. Thus in a post-exilic passage in Ph. Lev. 26:41-2, we read that after Israel is punished for her iniquity and cleansed of her sins, Jahweh will restore her. He cleanses Israel and restores her for He

"remembers His covenant with the Patriarchs" and, therefore, in their exile Jahweh says "I will not cast them away...to destroy them utterly and thus break my covenant with them...." (v. 44). This post-exilic Priestly passage is exactly the same as Jeremiah's doctrine of the restoration of Israel because of the covenant with the fathers. The Priestly account of the Patriarchal covenant is found in Gen. 17:1-8.<sup>60</sup> The deity appears to Abraham as El Shaddai and makes the covenant: "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generation for an everlasting covenant, to be a God to thee and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee and to thy seed after thee...all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession." The phrasing of this eternal covenant shows its definite dependence upon Jeremiah's message of the new covenant, Jer. 31:31. By connecting this final discussion of the Patriarchal covenants directly with Jeremiah's message, we conclude our study of the doctrine z'kut 'abot.

We have traced in D, J2 and P accounts the development of the Patriarchal covenants and have attempted to show that they all evolved after Jeremiah's pronouncement of the new covenant, as an attempt to justify Israel's restoration despite her faithlessness. This thought was particularly developed by the post-Jeremiah Deuteronomic school and given historical elaboration by J2 and P writers. By the time we reach the period of Deutero-Isaiah, the qualities of faithfulness and righteousness (that had been attached to the Patriarchal personalities as a result of the creation of the covenants just described) were fully

developed and elaborated. So Deutero-Isaiah, though he does not employ the argument of the covenant with the fathers for the salvation of Israel, makes great use of the patriarchal figures. They personify for him the good qualities of Israel, they are examples of faithfulness and righteousness. Abraham is the example for Israel of the *נביא צדק* who is to bring the nations to a universal worship of Jahweh. To his influence must be attributed the passage in Gen. 12:2-5 where this holy task is conferred upon Abraham.<sup>61</sup>

We see that the Patriarchal characters by reason of the Patriarchal covenant underwent a great change that differed radically from the derogatory attitude toward them held by Hosea. By their great faithfulness and righteousness they merited the eternal promise which Jahweh was compelled to fulfill. This alone justified the restoration of Israel despite her faithlessness, for Jahweh must be faithful to His promise.<sup>62</sup> This doctrine first formulated by Jeremiah and developed by these followers (in D, J2 and P) continued to play an important role in later Jewish theology and culminated in the elaborate rabbinical usage of the *zekut 'abot*.<sup>63</sup>

V

THE DOCTRINE OF INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY

We have thus far traced the origin and development of the doctrine of *berit 'abot*. We have shown that the concept of the eternally binding covenant with the fathers was formulated to justify Jahweh's forgiveness and restoration of a faithless Israel. The *berit 'abot* was a more acceptable justification than the hypothesis of a future repentance on the part of Israel. But even it was not sufficient. The ever-widening definitions of religion and the growing concept of the deity began to conflict with the limitations of this doctrine. The universalistic elements variously expressed and developed by the prophets of doom were gradually accumulating. The culmination of this development we find shortly after the exile in Deutero-Isaiah's definitions of Jahweh as the only God, universal, omniscient, and ruling the world with a purpose ( *PTS* ).<sup>64</sup> The doctrine of the covenant with the fathers, on the other hand, was a nationalistic reversion. In fact, its implications were much like the implications of the ancient Semitic kinship relationship (the deity being bound to his special tribe regardless of their action), for this doctrine implied that Jahweh had to forgive Israel whether He so desired or not. The eternally binding obligations of the covenant compelled Him to take such a course. There was, in other words, no divine freedom of choice, no divine direction.

The doctrine not only left no place for the purposive element of Jahweh's nature, but also implied a limitation of His power of omniscience. If Jahweh were omniscient, He would

have known that Israel would prove herself faithless and, therefore, as a God of justice, He should not have bound Himself by such a covenant with their fathers. Thus the covenant doctrine could not be fully reconciled with the growing sense of universalism. And it is significant that this argument is hardly, if at all, to be found in the writings of Deutero-Isaiah.

In the developing principle of individualism another most cogent argument against the doctrine of the covenant with the fathers was found. While Jahweh was a national god, the nation was the center of interest as well as the unit of action and responsibility. But as Jahweh became a universal god, a new standard of divine judgment became necessary. He was now the judge not only of a single nation but of all mankind. At the beginning of this development Amos declared that Jahweh could destroy one nation and choose another. Now with the whole universe under His jurisdiction there was no such alternative. Jahweh could not destroy the universe as a method of punishment for that would be tantamount to a confession of His own defeat, to an admission of His failure to make His own creation pursue His divine plan and purpose. Yet sin and wickedness must be punished and for this the individual is made responsible. The individual is rewarded or punished according to the degree in which he furthers Jahweh's plan. In this manner the principle of individual responsibility<sup>65</sup> became a necessary and logical corollary of universalism.

The covenant doctrine, however, absolved the individual from any responsibility, for under its application there could be no individual reward or punishment. In covenant

relationships we have seen that the individual receives no consideration as such. The basis of any reward or punishment was the whole nation considered as a unit. Now, if the whole nation was to be restored because of the covenant with the fathers, Jahweh, aside from forgiving Israel under compulsion, would be committing a gross injustice. By taking the nation back to Himself, Jahweh would have to forgive the individual sinners and ignore their guilt. And a universal god who failed to distinguish between the wicked and the righteous could not be said to be a God of justice. This conflict between the responsibility of the individual for his actions and the saving grace of the covenant with the fathers became an insistent problem, continuing to be a theological difficulty in Talmudic times and wherever the z'kut 'abot was considered a potent factor in determining God's actions.<sup>66</sup>

We meet with a definite realization of this problem and an attempt to resolve it in Exodus 34. Here vv. 6-7 are a much later insertion in the original K document.<sup>67</sup> In these verses the thirteen attributes of Jahweh are enumerated:

... יְהוָה יְהוָה אֵל רַחוּם וְיִחוּד אֶרֶץ אֲפִים וּרְב חַסֵּד וְאֵמֶת: נֶאֱמַר חַסֵּד  
זֶאֱלֵפִים נֶשֶׂא עוֹן וּפֹשַׁע וְחַטָּאִה וְנִקְהָ לֹא יִנְקָה פֶקֶד עוֹן אֲבוֹת עַל  
בָּנִים וְעַל בְּנֵי בָנִים עַל שְׁלִשִׁים וְעַל רַבְעִים:

7b seems to be an obvious contradiction of 7a. In the first part of the verse we are told that Jahweh forgives sin, whereas the second part tells us that He visits the iniquity of the fathers upon the children. 6b-7a describes Jahweh as "long-suffering and keeping faith" (רַב חַסֵּד וְאֵמֶת); "preserving faithfulness to the thousandth generation", that is, keeping His covenant relationship with Israel.<sup>68</sup> How does He do this? "By forgiving



iniquity, transgression and sin." We recall that upon the basis of the new interpretation of the covenant idea as eternally binding Jahweh had to forgive Israel. But what about the individual sinner, does he escape punishment in this forgiveness of the nation? 7b answers, certainly not. Jahweh forgives the nation at large but not the individual sinners. His punishment of the individual sinner is rigid for "He even visits the sins of the fathers on the children to the second, third and fourth generation."<sup>69</sup>

If the individual sinner is punished then actually there is no power of forgiveness in the doctrine of the covenant with the fathers. The righteous need no forgiveness nor any restoration, since by further applying the principle of individualism their covenant relations with Jahweh never have been altered. Jahweh is faithful in His obligations to them because they themselves are righteous. They need not the merits of others nor even forgiveness. This is clearly the implications of the passage, Exodus 20:5b-6, which parallels the verses quoted above in Exodus

34:      כִּי אֲנֹכִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֵל קֹנֵן פֶּקֶד עֵין אָבוֹת  
עַל בְּנֵיהֶם עַל שְׁלִשִׁים וְעַל רִבְעִים לְשָׁנָאִי: וְעָשָׂה חֶסֶד לְאֵלֶּפֶּיךָ  
לְאַהֲבִי וּלְשִׁמְרִי מִצְוֹתַי:

In the addition of the words לְשָׁנָאִי and לְאַהֲבִי we find the application of the principle of individualism to the covenant idea. The covenant no longer applies to the nation as a unit, for as we see here a distinction is made between the wicked and the righteous,<sup>70</sup> and only with the latter does Jahweh keep His faithfulness.

Thus obviously a better justification than that of the covenant with the fathers was needed to explain why Jahweh would restore the whole nation despite its sin and faithlessness.

And as the implications of the doctrine of individual responsibility developed more fully, the necessity of a new explanation became the more urgent. In social relations blood revenge and kin responsibility for crime was gradually displaced by the civil law that made the individual alone responsible for his crime.<sup>71</sup> The theologians, on the other hand, who formulated the religious principle by which the individual sinners were not to be absolved by the grace of the covenant, described their religious punishment as so certain as to make it a matter of family responsibility. "The sins of the fathers are visited upon the children."<sup>72</sup> Contrary to the civil law, this implied that the moral personality which is the subject of blame is not the individual but the family. This not only involved the suffering of the innocent for the guilty but also gave rise to the popular contention that the present generation suffers punishment not because they have committed any wrong but because of the past sins of their fathers. Ezekiel, however, vigorously opposed such a view and in doing so completed the whole development of individualism. He asked, "What mean ye that ye use this proverb concerning the land of Israel, 'The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge'? As I live, saith the Lord Jahweh, never again shall ye use this proverb in Israel...(only) the soul that sinneth it shall die."<sup>73</sup>

In a post-exilic passage in Jeremiah 32:18-19 the principle of individualism, from its application to the covenant idea down to its completion in Ezekiel, is briefly summarized.<sup>74</sup> Vv. 18 duplicates the Exodus passages discussed above. Here the saving power of the covenant is modified by the principle of

individualism and like the Exodus verses the responsibility of the individual is so rigid as to make the sin a matter of family guilt. The following verse, 19, completes the process and like Ezekiel makes the punishment apply strictly to the individual alone who sins. Jahweh "requites every one according to his ways and according to the fruit of his doings." Each is rewarded or punished according to his own merits. This theme Ezekiel developed thoroughly. The righteous will be saved but the righteous cannot save the wicked.<sup>75</sup> The merits of Noah, Daniel and Job could not save Israel and it should be noted here that in speaking of the saving grace of the righteous, Ezekiel does not even mention the merits of the Patriarchs. No, for Ezekiel it was not because of Israel's merits or repentance, nor because of the merits of the Patriarchs that he was assured of Israel's restoration. Israel would be restored for an entirely new reason. Ezekiel's answer to the problem of justifying Jahweh's restoration of Israel despite her faithlessness made him so positive of the restoration that he recorded elaborate provisions for the reestablishment of the national state. It is to Ezekiel's answer that we now turn. Several of the passages which will be discussed have been ascribed to authors other than Ezekiel, but their thought and content are so similar to Ezekiel's original prophecies that in our discussion we will not make any differentiation between these writers and Ezekiel.<sup>76</sup>

VI

EZEKIEL'S ANSWER - L<sup>MA</sup> AN S<sup>MO</sup>

In the book of Ezekiel an entirely new explanation is presented to justify Jahweh's restoration of Israel despite her sin and faithlessness. Jahweh would forgive Israel, in fact, He was compelled to forgive, whether He desired to or not, for "the sake of His own name", *לשם שמו*. For the sake of His reputation Jahweh had to restore Israel. If Jahweh did not forgive Israel and reestablish her national independence, if instead He allowed Israel to perish in her exile and vanish, assimilated among the peoples, what would the other nations say? Such complete destruction would be evidence of but one thing, namely, that Jahweh the God of Israel was a feeble, impotent deity, that since He was unable to protect Israel from her conquerors He was inferior to their gods. As a weak deity Jahweh would neither deserve the respect of other nations nor merit the homage and worship of His own people.

Such insult to His Name, such disparagement of His reputation, Jahweh would not tolerate nor permit. To avoid this, He is compelled to restore Israel despite her faithlessness. Thus we read in Ezekiel 36:16-36: "The word of Jahweh came unto me saying: 'Son of Man, when the house of Israel dwelt in their own land, they defiled it by their way and by their doings....Wherefore I poured out My wrath upon them....and I scattered them among the nations...And when they came to the nations, whither they went, they profaned My holy name; in that men said of them (derisively): These are the people of Jahweh, from His land have

they gone forth. But I have compassion for My holy name, which the house of Israel has profaned among the nations whither they have gone. Therefore, say to the house of Israel: Thus saith the Lord Jahweh, I do not this for your sake, house of Israel, but for the sake of My holy name which you have profaned among the nations whither you have gone. I will sanctify My great name which has been profaned in their midst; and the nations shall know that I am Jahweh...For I will take you from among the nations, gather you together from all the lands and bring you into your own land. And I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean... A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you...you shall keep my ordinances and obey them. And you shall dwell in the land that I gave to your fathers; and you shall be My people and I will be your God....Not for your sakes do I do this....In the day that I shall have cleansed you from all your iniquities I will also cause you to dwell again in the cities and the wastes shall be rebuilt...Then the nations that are left about you shall know that I, Jahweh, have rebuilt the ruined places and planted that which was desolate...."

The great act of reinstatement would make the nations honor Jahweh's majesty, as the sufferings of Israel have made them despise and deride it. The single and only motivation of the restoration was Jahweh's selfish care for His name. Of course, the nation was first to be purified, but this was not to come about through their own self-initiated repentance. Jahweh Himself would cleanse them though they do not deserve it, so that He might restore Israel and thus save His reputation as a potent deity. Jahweh's name was inseparably connected with Israel and

to this fact alone the nation owed its preservation.

This very principle served Ezekiel as the basis of his interpretation of Israel's whole history, as we find it reviewed in chapter 20. Again and again Israel sinned and each time she committed a transgression Jahweh's first thought was to destroy her. Then Jahweh would become mindful of His own reputation and the honor of His name and, therefore, despite Israel's sin and merited punishment, He refrained from destroying her. According to Ezekiel, it was <sup>with</sup> the deliverance from Egypt that Jahweh began His relations with Israel (not with the Patriarchs). "In that day I chose Israel...and made myself known to them in the land of Egypt...I am Jahweh your God." That day Jahweh agreed to free Israel on the condition that she give up idolatry (vv. 6-7). Israel did not obey this demand and, therefore, Jahweh resolved to destroy her in the land of Egypt. But lest His name be profaned among the nations He altered His purpose. This is the refrain that is repeated throughout the chapter. "I acted for My name's sake, so as not to profane it before the eyes of the nations, in whose midst they (Israel) were, before whose eyes I had revealed myself to them in order to bring them forth from the land of Egypt." Again in the wilderness when Israel rejected Jahweh's ordinances, for the same consideration of His honor He spared them. (vv. 10-14). For all her sins Israel has been punished by the exile, but Jahweh will restore her, Ezekiel announces, so that Jahweh will "be sanctified in you in the sight of the nations...and ye shall know that I am Jahweh when I have done this with you for My name's sake and not according to your wicked ways and corrupt doings..." (vv. 33-44).

Not only will Jahweh demonstrate His majesty by restoring Israel but the patriotic author of chapter 39 declared that in the future, after the restoration of Israel, Jahweh will further vindicate His honor by establishing His complete supremacy, through His signal deliverance of Israel from the hordes of Gog and Magog. All shall know, then, who Jahweh is and acknowledge His superiority. "My holy name will I make known in the midst of my people Israel; neither will I suffer My holy name to be profaned any more" (vv. 7). The nations will then realize that it was not because of Jahweh's weakness that Israel was exiled but because of His desire to chastize her. But "for the present, saith Jahweh, I will bring back the captivity of Jacob...for I am jealous for My holy name" (vv. 23-25).

There are two factors that contributed most to the formulation of Ezekiel's new justification of Israel's restoration: first, the influence of the exile itself; and secondly, the principle of individualism. The prophet's residence in a foreign land and, therefore, his sense of the social inferiority of his people and consequently of their national god, naturally led him to hope that Jahweh would demonstrate His claim to respect by some striking exhibition of His power, namely, the miraculous restoration of His people. The Assyrians and Babylonians regarded their deities as superior to all others, and Ezekiel had probably heard this boast from the mouth of his conquerors. They naturally recognized in their victory the superiority of their gods and the impotency of the gods of the enemy. Thus in a post-exilic Deuteronomic addition to Isaiah, we find this thought placed in

the mouth of the emissary of Sennacherib, "Beware lest Hezekiah persuade you (from surrendering) saying, 'Jahweh will deliver us.' Hath any of the gods of the nations delivered his land out of the hand of the King of Assyria? Where are the gods of Hamath and Arpad?...Who are they among all the gods of these countries that have delivered their country out of my hands, that Jahweh should deliver Jerusalem out of my hand?"<sup>79</sup> Or, as the parallel passage in Chronicles puts it, "How much less shall your god deliver you." Hezekiah prays that Jahweh show His might and save Israel, "that all the kingdoms of the earth may know that thou art Jahweh God alone."<sup>80</sup> The complete universalism expressed in the latter part shows the influence of Deutero-Isaiah and is thus considerably advanced over the theology of Ezekiel. Nevertheless, the hope expressed is the same as that of Ezekiel's, namely, that Jahweh will not permit dishonor to His name and, therefore, He will not let Israel be destroyed.<sup>81</sup> Isaiah had declared earlier that Jahweh would use Assyria as a tool with which to punish Israel. But Assyria, now victorious, presumptuously boasts of her own prowess and the weakness of Jahweh. Such blasphemy Jahweh cannot suffer. The only way He can save His reputation is by saving Israel, even though she merits but complete destruction. This we find succinctly<sup>82</sup> expressed in a post-exilic passage in Deuteronomy:

"I thought I would make an end of them,  
I would make their memory cease from among men;  
Were it not that I dreaded the enemies' provocation,  
Lest their adversaries should misdeem,  
Lest they should say: Our hand is exalted,  
And it is not Jahweh who hath wrought all this."

The anthropomorphic representation of Jahweh as being influenced by the human emotion, vexation, *צד*, is in keeping with the



83  
thought of Jahweh's jealousy for His name. The enemy by taking to themselves the credit of the annihilation of Israel would certainly not recognize in their success the hand of Jahweh their enemies' God. They would not acknowledge with Isaiah that they were merely Jahweh's tool. By the power of their own gods had they conquered. To retrieve His honor, establish His superiority and potency, and prove that He was doing all this, Jahweh must restore Israel. Or, as it is expressed in Isaiah 48:9-11: "For My name's sake will I defer My anger, for My praise will I refrain from destroying you...For how should it be profaned and My glory given to another?"  
84

This patriotic attempt to champion Jahweh's supremacy in a foreign land put into the background any other argument that may have been employed to assure the people of their restoration. And thus Ezekiel lays more stress upon Jahweh's regard for His name than on the idea of a covenant between Him and the people. Ezekiel ignores any merits of the nation, any love on Jahweh's part for Israel or regard for the national covenant.  
85

In addition to the influence of the exile upon the formulation of Ezekiel's doctrine there was the factor of individualism. We have already noted that the doctrine of individual responsibility reached its culmination with Ezekiel. We have also pointed out how this doctrine conflicted with the z'akut 'abot so as to make necessary a new justification for Israel's reinstatement.  
86  
Now, since we find the first use of the new answer I'ma 'an šemo in Ezekiel, we might draw the plausible deduction from these considerations that it was partly because of Ezekiel's dissatis-

faction with the doctrine of the covenant with the fathers that he formulated the new answer. This cannot be explicitly substantiated from his writings. Though a mere conjecture, it may, however, contain a kernel of truth. First of all, Ezekiel never bas<sup>1</sup> his assurance of Israel's restoration upon the doctrine of the covenant with the fathers. The only place in Ezekiel where the idea of selection occurs is in chapter 20:5. This selection is coincident with Jahweh's revelation to Israel in Egypt, and the expression <sup>ל</sup>בְּחֵרָה יִשְׂרָאֵל here implies that previous to this there was no special relationship between Jahweh and Israel. The Patriarchs are unmentioned save<sup>d</sup> for the one reference in chapter 33:24. Here the <sup>וְאֵלֶיךָ</sup> appeal to Abraham as a proof of their right of possession of Palestine, but the prophet denies them this claim.<sup>87</sup> Kraetzschmar to the contrary, not one of <sup>Ezekiel's</sup> refer-  
ences to the covenant can be said to refer to a Patriarchal coven-  
ant.<sup>88</sup> In fact, it appears that a definite attempt is made to discountenance Israel's ancestry. Repeatedly, Israel's father is<sup>89</sup> disparagingly called an Amorite and her mother a Hittite. The implications of these passages are that Israel was polluted from her very birth and that only with Jahweh's selection of her at the deliverance from Egypt did her religious career begin.

This analysis of the above passages in Ezekiel does not show that the formulation of <sup>ל</sup>מִצְוַת אֱמֶת was a deliberate, conscious attempt to displace <sup>ז</sup>עֲקֻת אֲבוֹת. We can more safely say that the doctrine of Ezekiel resulted only from the circumstances of the exile. Yet from a passage in Deutero-Isaiah we might infer that the two doctrines sooner or later came into

conflict with each other, if not to Ezekiel himself, then to those who accepted his argument and developed it further. In chapter 43:25-28 we read:

"I even I am He that blotteth out thy transgression for  
mine own sake  
And thy sins will I remember no more.  
Remind me (of your own merits if you can), let us  
reason together;  
Speak thou, how canst thou justify thyself?  
Thy first father sinned and thy intercessors have  
transgressed against me."

Israel cannot claim restoration or redemption on the basis of her own merits, nor make out a case to justify deliverance on the basis of the covenant with the fathers, for even her first father sinned. There has been much conjecture as to whom is meant by

יְהוָה אֲבוֹתָם . It seems that the most likely reference would be to one of the eponymous ancestors, the Patriarchs. We need but recall that Hosea did not highly estimate the character of Jacob.<sup>90</sup> Furthermore, since the author of this passage employs the argument of Ezekiel for Israel's redemption, it may be that he did not accept the idea of the covenant with the fathers and consequently discredited their merits, as is indicated in this passage. On the other hand, if this passage refers to Abraham, it contradicts Is. 51:2 ff. where Abraham is glorified. It has been suggested, however, that these verses in chapter 43 are an insertion in the original Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>91</sup> It may be, therefore, that we have in these verses an indication of a conflict between the two doctrines. But our facts are too indefinite to warrant any positive conclusions. In addition to this inconclusiveness, we cannot say that when Ezekiel's answer was used, it inferred the nullification of the doctrine of z'kut 'abot, since later we

find both of these arguments being employed side by side. But before we take up these instances together with other passages that use Ezekiel's answer, we will pause her to summarize all the implications of the doctrine *l'ma'an š'mo* itself.

In our discussion of individual responsibility we stated that the doctrine of *zekut 'abot* conflicted with the growing concept of universalism.<sup>92</sup> The doctrine of *l'ma'an š'mo*, on the other hand, we find to be in keeping with the progressing theology. By this new argument the jurisdiction and power of Jahweh was so extended as to make Him a universal god in a much more practical sense than the conception of Him in pre-exilic times. Jahweh's regard for His name made Him exert influence over the nations other than Israel, so that they, too, might be compelled to recognize His majesty. This does not mean, however, that the existence of other gods was denied. On the contrary, the doctrine as we have followed its development, assumed the existence of other deities and considered them to be in competition with Jahweh for recognition and respect of all peoples. Towering above all these other deities, stood Jahweh. He was the strongest and the highest. His supremacy He proves by His great and marvelous acts. Many of these He performs just so the nations will recognize His might and come to fear His name. We have already quoted above many verses containing this idea. *יְהוָה יִשְׁמַח בָּנוּ* occurs in Ezekiel as a constant refrain, referring not only to Israel but to all the nations. This thought is particularly expressed in the oracles against the nations. Jahweh's name must be revered.<sup>93</sup>

One way Jahweh could win recognition would be to

punish the nations. But He could better demonstrate His might through Israel with whom the name Jahweh had always been associated. Thus, it is just because Jahweh wished to establish His supremacy that He was compelled to forgive Israel, though she was faithless. As a matter of fact, Jahweh dared not destroy Israel or even prolong her exile. If He did, the nations would naturally conclude that Jahweh was either a powerless god or else had faithlessly betrayed His people. Such a deity was not worthy of the respect of His own people nor of other nations. If Jahweh demanded homage, He had no choice in the matter, Israel must be restored. The growing universalistic conceptions demanded this universal recognition of Jahweh and, therefore, Israel's sin must be overlooked in order that this desire might find fulfillment.

The developing universalism was the basis of the doctrine *le ma 'an šemo*, and because of this fact it served as a better justification of Israel's restoration than the answer of the eternal covenant relationship between Jahweh and Israel. But when the universalistic concept reached a higher state of perfection in Deutero-Isaiah, even this argument proved to be inadequate. First of all, the idea of Jahweh being compelled "for His name's sake" differed but little from the compulsion of the covenant idea. By the latter doctrine, Jahweh was compelled to forgive Israel because He was bound by His oath to the fathers; by the *le ma 'an šemo* He was forced to restore Israel in order to save His honor from the derogatory reflections of the nations. In both cases, an external force directed the action. Both may be good excuses for restoration but they contain a limitation of the

ethical character and conduct of the deity. In *l'ma an s'mo* the motivation seems to be selfishness and jealousy. The concept of compulsory divine forgiveness made Israel merely a tool to prove Jahweh's power much in the manner that Jahweh used Assyria. Israel is neither worthy nor deserving. Thus the doctrine placed the disciplinary character of the exile as developed in Jeremiah in the background, for it implied that Jahweh had to restore Israel whether she was cleansed or not.

The insufficiency of such an argument in a complete universalistic conception of the deity is obvious. And so we find in Deutero-Isaiah a new statement of the answer to the problem of justifying Israel's restoration. Since the answer of Deutero-Isaiah does not come under the subject of this thesis we can but briefly indicate it here. The new theory developed was as follows: Jahweh forgives Israel of His own volition, without Israel's prayers and without any compulsion. He does not forgive Israel in order to prove His superiority over other competing deities, for He is the only God, "there is none else". Jahweh's forgiveness is an act of grace justified by the fact that Israel is needed to fulfill God's divine universal purpose. Israel is to be a witness to the world that God directs all events in history. And now that Israel has paid two-fold for her sins she on her part has become regenerated, ready to take up this holy task of being a "light to the nations". Such an answer to the problem of justifying Israel's restoration can be reconciled with an ethical, universalistic  
94  
concept of religion.

## VII

### SUBSEQUENT APPLICATION OF THE DOCTRINE

We have discussed in detail the origin, development and the implications of the doctrine "for His name's sake", as set forth in Ezekiel. There are also, however, many other instances in the Bible where this doctrine occurs. In addition to the fact that these various passages show the influence of Ezekiel's doctrine, they reveal other evidences which substantiate the hypothesis that, therefore, the date of their composition is to be attributed either to the exilic or post-exilic period, that is, either contemporaneous with Ezekiel or after his ministry. We will first consider the prophetic passages, then Hexateuchal passages, and finally instances of the doctrine in the historical books and Psalms.

In Jeremiah there are several passages that present the argument of *l'ma 'an š'mo* as a petition to Jahweh to better the conditions of Israel. In chapter 14, where Jeremiah describes the dearth in the land, we find this placed in the mouth of the people:

"Though our iniquities testify against us,  
Oh Jahweh, act thou for Thy Name's sake;  
For our backslidings are many,  
We have sinned against Thee...  
Why shouldst Thou be as a man overcome,  
As a mighty man that cannot save?"... (vv. 7-9).

and again:

"Do not condemn us, for Thy Name's sake,  
Do not dishonor the throne of Thy glory,  
Remember, break not Thy covenant with us." (vv. 21).

Volz's interpretation of this chapter as a unified work and original with Jeremiah appears to be attractive and

convincing. He divides the chapter into six dramatic scenes. The second (Jer. 14:7-9) and the fifth scenes (vv. 19-21) contain the people's petitions. They use the argument "for His Name's sake" to obtain rain. The chapter, however, would still be complete if these two petitions were omitted. But this is rather a poor argument upon which to conclude that they are secondary insertions. Kraetzschmar in agreement with Stade states, though with very little degree of certainty, that 14:19-22 is not by

Jeremiah. It has been argued that not until post-exilic times did the populace look upon other deities as אלה אחרים (v. 22) and this points to the late composition of the passage. <sup>97</sup> Aside from the fact that these two passages in chapter 14 contain the idea that despite Israel's sin Jahweh forgives for His name's sake (Ezekiel), there seems to be no other evidence of their late composition. To be sure, Jeremiah does not accept this argument, but the references here make it a matter of popular use, the validity of which the prophet denies. On the other hand, there are only two other places in Jeremiah where the doctrine occurs and the post-exilic composition of both is certain. Jeremiah 16:19-21 expresses the idea that Israel alone possesses the true God and that all the nations, recognizing the impotency of their false deities, will come to Jahweh who will make them acknowledge His might and name. Volz from internal evidences proves the secondary character of these verses and particularly shows the relation of vv. 21b (היה ייחודי) to Ezekiel 36:23 and 39:7. He dates the passage as a post-exilic product of those who hoped for the conversion of the world to the worship of Jahweh, a group influenced



by Deutero-Isaiah. Again, in Jeremiah 32:17-21 we have a liturgical hymn of post-exilic composition in which Jahweh is praised for the wonders He performed in Egypt, by which He made a "name for Himself" (vv. 20). The whole prayer parallels Nehemiah 9:6 ff. which is also a post-exilic example of the use of *l'ma 'an š'mo*.<sup>99</sup> The fact, that the only two other references in Jeremiah to this doctrine are post-exilic, lends weight to the conjecture that the passages in chapter 14 are also late compositions.

Further evidence of the probable post-exilic date of the references in Jeremiah 14 may be deduced from a much similar situation described in Joel, chapter 2. In Jeremiah, there is a dearth, in Joel the land is plagued with locusts. In Jeremiah the petition of the people is of no avail; but in Joel, not only is the prayer answered but the prophet himself tells the priests to recite it. "Let the priests, the ministers of Jahweh, weep between the porch and the altar and let them say, 'Spare thy people, Oh Jahweh, and give not thy heritage to reproach, that the nations should make them a byword: Wherefore should they say among the peoples, where is their God?' Jahweh answered, "...I will no more make you a reproach among the nations." When the scourge of the locusts is removed, "ye shall know that I am in the midst of Israel, that I am Jahweh your God."<sup>100</sup> In Joel's time the doctrine of *l'ma 'an š'mo* was considered a potent determining factor in Jahweh's dispensations. And we might conjecture that this argument was inserted at that time in Jeremiah 14 where the same situation of distress is described.

Another instance of the use of *l'ma 'an š'mo* in

post-exilic prophetic writings is to be found in Malachi 1:11-14: "From the rising to the setting of the sun My name is great among the nations and in every place offerings are presented to My name ...For My name is great among the nations, saith Jahweh Zeveaoth... for I am a great king and My name is feared among the nations."

We find complete expression of this doctrine in the late composition, Daniel 9:15-17. Daniel prays, "Now Oh Lord, our God, who hath brought thy people forth out of the land of Egypt with a mighty hand and hath gotten Thee renown, as at this day. We have sinned...let thine anger...be turned away from thy city Jerusalem...because of our sins...Jerusalem and thy people are become a reproach to all that are about us. Now, therefore, Oh our Lord, hearken unto the prayer of thy servant...and cause Thy face to shine upon Thy sanctuary that is desolate, for the Lord's sake ( *יְהוָה יִשְׁמָע* )...forgive, Lord, and act, do not defer for Thine own sake, Oh my God, because Thy name is called upon Thy city and Thy people."

There are many hexateuchal references to the doctrine *l'ma'an šemo*. In Exodus 9:14-16 Jahweh is described as performing wonders in Egypt, just in order to establish His reputation among the nations. These verses are a later insertion in the combined J and E accounts of the plagues in Egypt. We read: "....I will this time send all my plagues upon thy person (Pharaoh) ...that thou mayest know that there is none like Me in all the earth; surely now I had put forth My hand and smitten thee and thy people with pestilence and thou hadst been destroyed from the earth. But in very deed, for this cause have I made thee to stand (namely) to show thee My power and that My name may be declared

in all the earth." "in order that you shall know that there is no god like Jahweh", is a refrain inserted throughout the account of the plagues.<sup>101</sup> All these passages have been ascribed to a late redactor of J and E,<sup>102</sup> or J2 writings.<sup>103</sup> They undoubtedly belong to writers who accepted the interpretation of Israel's history that is to be found in Ezekiel 20.

The influence of Ezekiel upon the Priestly writings in the Hexateuch is well known. Through the greater intimacy that they developed between Jahweh and Israel, they made Jahweh's name even more inseparable from the fortunes of Israel. All the injunctions laid upon Israel, particularly in the Holiness Code, were for the purpose of making Israel fit to exemplify Jahweh's name. "You shall not profane My holy name for I shall be sanctified in the midst of Israel..."<sup>104</sup> The name of Jahweh is associated with Israel--if it is to be magnified, Israel must be holy.<sup>105</sup> Priestly writers also looked upon the deliverance from Egypt as a demonstration of Jahweh's might and name to the nations. Thus in Exodus 7:5: "And the Egyptians shall know I am Jahweh when I stretch forth My hand upon Egypt and deliver the children of Israel." In Exodus 14:4a Jahweh makes Pharaoh pursue Israel that He might further triumph over Egypt at the Red Sea.<sup>106</sup>

To Priestly writings or late D authors should also be ascribed Joshua 7:8-9. Joshua prays after Israel's defeat at Ai: "Oh Jahweh, what shall I say when Israel turneth her back before her enemies? The Canaanites and all the inhabitants of the land shall hear of it, they shall surround us and destroy our name from the earth...then what wilt thou do for Thy great

name?" As in Ezekiel Jahweh must save Israel in order to maintain His reputation.

There are also several exilic Priestly passages in the historical books which make use of the doctrine "for His name's sake". I Samuel 12:22, we read: "For Jahweh will not forsake His people for His great name's sake, since it hath pleased Jahweh to make you His people."<sup>107</sup> Jahweh of His own volition (this represents the advanced thought of Deutero-Isaiah) selected Israel and, therefore, since His name is associated with her, she will never be destroyed. In I Samuel 17:45-46, David says to Goliath: "...I come to thee in the name of Jahweh Zevaoth, the God of the armies of Israel whom you reproach...this day Jahweh will deliver thee into my hands...that all the earth may know that there is a God in Israel." To prove His potency to the world, Jahweh must save Israel. Jahweh's dependence upon Israel for the maintenance of His reputation is the basis of the prayer ascribed to David in II Samuel 7:23 ff. "What one nation in the earth is like my people, Israel whom God redeemed for a people to Himself to make Himself a name..." Finally, in Solomon's prayer, dedicating the Temple, we read: "When a stranger...cometh out of a far country for Thy name's sake, for they shall hear of Thy great name...and pray toward this house, hear Thou in heaven...that all people of the earth may know Thy name, to fear Thee..."<sup>108</sup>

There are numerous passages in the Psalms, all of which are post-exilic, where prayer for deliverance is based upon the doctrine "for His name's sake". Thus the Psalmist in 79:9-10, after describing the destruction of Jerusalem and the derision

of the nations, prays, "Help us, Oh God of our salvation, for the sake of the glory of Thy name, and deliver us and forgive our sins for Thy name's sake. Wherefore should the heathen say: 'Where is their God?'" Similarly in Psalm 106:7-8 we read the forefathers were rebellious in Egypt, "nevertheless He (Jahweh) saved them for His name's sake that He might make His mighty name known." The whole Psalm parallels Ezekiel 20. Often when the Psalmist prays as an individual and not for the nation the same argument is used. Thus in Psalm 25:11, "For thy name's sake, Jahweh, pardon mine iniquity for it is great." Jahweh's power, His ethical and moral nature is demonstrated when He answers the prayers of His righteous worshippers. "He guideth me in straight paths for His name's sake" (23:2) or, as the Psalmist often prays, "For Thy name's sake lead me and guide me" (31:4), "For Thy name's sake quicken me in Thy righteousness, deliver me from trouble" (143:11).<sup>109</sup>

The numerous instances cited above sufficiently demonstrate the importance of the doctrine *l'ma 'an š'mo* in Biblical theology, as it developed after Ezeiel. We turn now to a consideration of several passages in which both doctrines, *z'kut 'abot* and *l'ma 'an š'mo*, occur. Two striking examples of the combination of these two arguments, to justify Jahweh's forgiveness of Israel despite her faithlessness, are to be found in Exodus 32:11-14 and Deuteronomy 9:23-29. The latter is a parallel of Numbers 14:11-23. In the Numbers passage we read that the children of Israel rebelled after the report of the false spies. Thereupon Jahweh, angered by this lack of faith, resolved to

destroy Israel and make a great nation of Moses in their stead. This recalls the idea of Amos that Jahweh can repudiate Israel and choose another nation. Moses, however, declines the honor and intercedes in Israel's behalf. And in his plea he uses the argument *lema'an šemo*: "If thou shalt kill this people as one man then the nations which have heard of Thy fame (name) will say: 'It was because Jahweh was unable to bring His people to the land which He had sworn to give them that He has slain them in the wilderness.'" <sup>110</sup> Jahweh for the sake of His reputation cannot afford to destroy Israel. He can punish individual Israelites but not annihilate the entire nation. This is the implication of vv. 18 where Moses reminds Jahweh that in accordance with His nature He should pardon Israel, for He keeps faith with the nation and punishes only individual sinners. <sup>111</sup> Jahweh accedes and only punishes the faithless leaders and elders. We see the solution is exactly the same as propounded by Ezekiel, namely, the restoration of Israel despite her sin for the sake of Jahweh's name and at the same time accounting for Jahweh's moral <sup>112</sup> nature by insisting upon individual punishment.

The passage in Deuteronomy 9:23-29 is a review of the very same incident, but in recounting Moses' plea to Jahweh the later Deuteronomic writer has added the argument of the covenant with the fathers, which as we have already seen was so dear to the Deuteronomic writers that followed Jeremiah. Thus we have in this passage Jahweh forgiving Israel not only because of His regard for His reputation but also because He was bound by His oath to the Patriarchs. The author, combining Ezekiel's

doctrine with that of the post-Jeremiah Deuteronomic school, places this prayer in the mouth of Moses: "Oh Lord, Jahweh, destroy not Thy people and Thy possession whom Thou hast redeemed through Thy greatness, whom Thou didst bring forth from Egypt with a strong hand. Remember Thy servants, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Turn not to the stubbornness of this people, nor to its iniquity, nor its transgression, lest the land whence thou didst bring them forth should say: 'Because Jahweh was unable to bring them to the land which He promised them and because of His hatred for them has He brought them forth to let them die in the wilderness.'"

The identical plea is ascribed to Moses in Exodus 32:9-14. Moses intercedes when Jahweh threatens to destroy Israel, because of her sin in making the golden calf. Moses boldly reminds Jahweh that if He destroys Israel not only will He bring upon Himself the derision of the Egyptians but will also show Himself to be faithless to the covenant with the Patriarchs. Here all the implications of the covenant are enumerated. "Remember Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Thy servants, to whom Thou swarest by Thine own self, and saidst unto them, I will multiply your seed as the stars of heaven, and all this land that I have spoken of will I give unto your seed, and they shall inherit it forever." Moses declines the honor of becoming the progenitor of a new nation and declares that if Jahweh destroys Israel He must kill him also. Jahweh answers, that only the sinful are punished (vv. 31-34). The doctrine of individual responsibility is here reiterated and Jahweh's moral nature is thereby maintained. At

the same time, we see that, as with Jeremiah and Ezekiel, the nation as a whole is forgiven despite its sin; and this action is justified by reason of the zekut 'abot and lema'an s'mo.

J. Morgenstern has proved the late composition of this passage in Exodus 32 as well as the passage in Numbers 14, ascribing both to the late school of J2 writers who developed the figure of Moses interceding with Jahweh. <sup>113</sup> Their dependence upon Ezekiel's doctrine may place the date of their composition very close to the exile, perhaps after the first deportation, when the troubled theologians were anxious to find a justification for a quick restoration.



VIII

CONCLUSION

In the introduction to this thesis we cited Exodus 32:9-14 as an illustration of the doctrine z'kut 'abot and le'ma'an s'mo. We have finally returned to this passage. Having shown it to be a later combination of the two doctrines after their formation by Jeremiah and his followers, and Ezekiel respectively, we have reached the end of our study. In brief, our study has led us to the conclusion that these two doctrines were the products of that period in Israel's history which witnessed the disintegration of Israel's national religion and the beginning of its transformation into Judaism, a universal religion.

The two doctrines could not have been current during the period of Israel's national religion for by their theological implications they were contradictory to its fundamental basis, the principles of Jahweh's covenant. Jahweh's covenant with the nation did not permit any condonement of faithlessness. The logical result of faithlessness was the repudiation of the covenant and consequently Israel's destruction. As long as this was the dominating principle in Israel's religion there could not be any theological notion of forgiveness nor of restoration. The the pre-exilic literary prophets, basing their prophecies upon this principle, logically concluded the absolute destruction of Israel. By their pronouncement of an irrevocable sentence of doom, they not only declared the termination of Israel's existence as a nation but also brought an end to Israel's national religion.

The initial step in the transformation of Israel's

religion into Judaism was Jeremiah's message of the new covenant. Of course, the pre-exilic literary prophets had contributed to the universalizing of its religious definitions, but Jeremiah was the first to formulate the religious doctrine whereby the maintenance of Israel's existence could still be reconciled with the principles of justice. Jeremiah modified the principle of the destruction of the nation for her faithlessness by declaring that Jahweh would punish Israel only to discipline her for her future restoration. Upon the basis of the covenant principle his predecessors stated that justice demanded Israel's doom. A problem, therefore, immediately arose: If Yahweh is a God of justice, how could He justifiably forgive and restore sinful and faithless Israel? The first answer to this problem was based upon Jeremiah's reinterpretation of the covenant principle. By his message of the new covenant he transformed the covenant from a conditional contract depending upon the fulfillment of obligations into a covenant binding Jahweh to Israel for eternity. Thus evolved the first answer to the problem--Jahweh must forgive and restore Israel despite her faithlessness because He was bound eternally by the covenant with the fathers of old. To substantiate this new thought the tradition of the conditional contract made at Sinai was carried back to an eternal covenant made with the Patriarchs, and thus arose the doctrine of the z'kut 'abot. As a reward for their faith, the Patriarchs received a promise that their posterity would possess Canaan forever. In conjunction with the development of this doctrine we have pointed out that those Biblical passages which contain

the idea of an eternal Patriarchal covenant must, therefore, be post-Jeremiah. This conclusion has an important bearing upon the problem of the composition of the Hexateuch, for it points to the fact that quite an extensive part of the material found in the D and J codes must be placed as exilic or more probably as post-exilic writings.

The doctrine z'kut 'abot did not prove to be a completely satisfying answer to the problem of justifying Jahweh's forgiveness of Israel despite her faithlessness. Its implication that the deity acted under the compulsion of a promise became inconsistent with the growing universalism, and the idea that a nation was saved because of an eternal covenant conflicted with the principle of individual responsibility. A new answer to the problem was formulated by Ezekiel. This was the doctrine l'ma'an šemo. Jahweh in order to prove His potency to the nations must restore Israel with whom His name has always been associated. In time, these two doctrines were joined together to form a double justification of Israel's restoration.

Both doctrines in their final analysis were the products of nationalistic hopes, though by them an attempt was made to reconcile these hopes with the principles of universalism. Since they represent nationalistic hopes, the two doctrines became dear to the heart of the people. Therefore, though Deutero-Isaiah's <sup>Later</sup> solution to the problem was more universalistic, it did not supplant these two doctrines. Z'kut 'abot and l'ma'an šemo became thoroughly established in Jewish theology. They continued to be employed together in the prayers of post-exilic times. Later in rabbinical times both doctrines were incorporated into

the liturgy in the prayer:

ברוך אתה יי אלהינו ואלהי אבותינו אלהי אברהם אלהי

יעקב ואלהי יעקב... וזכור חסדי אבות ומביא גואל לבני

בניהם למען שמו באהבה:

NOTES

1. Barton, G. A.. The Religion of Israel, N. Y., 1918, pp. 64.
2. According to the Kenite hypothesis, Jahweh was a Kenite tribal deity whom a number of Israelite tribes adopted by covenant as their deity in the course of their migration into Palestine. When Jahweh became the national deity after a process of syncretization the fact of His adoption by covenant became nationalized. Thus arose the tradition that all Israel covenanted with Jahweh at Sinai. See Barton, pp. 56 ff.  
Budde, K., Religion of Israel to the Exile, N. Y., 1899, pp. 1-76. For detailed analysis of the K covenant see Morgenstern, J., The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch, H. U. C. Annual, vol. IV, 1927.
3. See Jer. 6:1-6, 26-30; 8:13-17; 13:20-7; 15; etc.
4. See Jer. 11:1-6. The passages regarding Jeremiah's participation are secondary insertions. Volz P., Der Prophet Jeremia, Kommentar zum Alten Testament, Leipzig 1922, pp. 128-9. Also see Budde K., Religion of Israel to the Exile, pp. 187.
5. Jer. 5:7-9; 5:25-9; 9:9-11.
6. See Volz P., Der Prophet Jeremiah,<sup>2</sup> Tubingen 1921, pp. 50.
7. Jer. 7:28; 17:23; 32:33; 35:13.
8. Hosea 11; Jer. 30; 31:9, 20; 32:37-40; 33:9.
9. Jer. 31:31 ff.
10. The 'ו refers to the whole passage. Volz P., Der Prophet Jeremia, Kommentar zum Alten Testament, pp. 283.
11. Jer. 30:1-3.
12. See Hosea 2:16-21. For the analysis in this chapter, see Morgenstern, J., Lecture I, delivered at Garret Biblical Inst., 1929.

13. See above, pp. 3-4.
14. Hosea, chapters 2, 6, 7:13 ff.
15. 2 Kings 18; 2 Chron. 25, 29, 2 Kings 22-23.
16. Jer. 31:31. See also 32:37-42. Volz considers this post-exilic based on 31:31. Volz P., *Jeremia, Kom. z. A. T.*, pp. 301.
17. That these verses 27-40 are post-Jeremiah is further indicated by their Deutero-Isaianic flavor. Cf. vv. 23 and Is. 44:9ff; vv. 32 and Is. 41:22, 45:21; vv. 35 and Is. 43:11; 45:20 ff.
19. The reformation, as already remarked, were enacted because it was feared the covenant would be repudiated unless Israel's obligations were reestablished. See original record of Asa's reformation and K code; Hezekiah's reformation and C code; Josiah's reformation and original D document.
20. Kraetzschmar R., *Die Bundesvorstellung in A. T.*, Marburg 1896, pp. 153. This passage has been considered spurious but Volz points out its authenticity. The secondary insertions are vv.6-8 by a Deuteronomic redactor describing Jeremiah's participation in the Deuteronomic Reformation. Vv. 1-5 were written by Jeremiah later than the Reformation and do not refer to the Deuteronomic covenant, but the old Sinai covenant. Volz P., *Jeremia Komm z. A. T.*, pp. 129.
21. For proof of the post-exilic composition of this passage see Smith J. P., *Micah, The International Critical Commentary*, N. Y. 1914, p. 124.
22. Ex. 2:24, P.
23. Jer. 11:5; also 29:13 where Deut. covenant is interpreted as fulfillment of Patriarchal oath.

24. Dt. 9:4-5.
25. Ibid. 4:31.
26. Hosea 12:3 ff.
27. It should be noted here also that there is no reference in the original covenant documents to the Patriarchs. The original D code does not contain any authentic reference to the Patriarchal oaths. As late as the Deuteronomic Reformation the Patriarchs did not hold a prominent place in Israel's covenant relations. It was the later elaboration that gave them this prominence.
28. The style and phraseology of this compiler resembles Jer. 7:15.
29. Dt. 7:7-8, 6:23.
30. The late composition of these verses is also indicated by the Deutero-Isaianic flavor of the context.
31. Dt. 9:5      *ג' ברשעת הא'ים האלק* In verse 5 may be repetition of verse 4 and therefore to be omitted in verse 5.
32. Dt. 9:26-29. To be more fully discussed later. See below p. 58.
33. Dt. 8:18.
34. Judges 2:1b, which is Deuteronomic.
35. Dt. 30:9. The language is like that of Jer. 32:41.
36. Dt. 7:12; 30:20.
37. Additional Deuteronomic references are 1:8, 21, 35, 6:10, 7:18, 23, 8:1, 10:11, 15, 11:8, 9, 21, 13:18, 19:8, 10, 26:3, 15, 27:3, 28:11, 31:7, 20, 34:4. Joshua 1:6, 5:6, 21:41, 43, 24:3 ff.

38. See J. Morgenstern, Moses with the Shining Face, H. U. C. A., vol. II, 1925, pp. 7 footnote 13.
39. Patton L. B., Oral Sources of Patriarchal Narratives, Amer. Jour. of Theology, vol. III 1094, pp. 658. Also Barton, Rel. of Isr., pp. 39 ff.
40. Budde K., Rel. of Isr. to the Exile, pp. 107 ff.
41. Gen. 28:16. See Jastrow, M., Hebrew and Babylonian Traditions, N. Y. 1914, pp. 26. מקום designates holy place.
42. E passages are 11a<sub>1</sub>, b, 12, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22. In v. 16 לְיָהוָה is a later displacement of אֱלֹהֵי. J passages are 10, 11a<sub>2</sub>, 21, 19. J2 passages are 13 through 15. See Procksh O., Die Genesis, Komm. z. A. T., Leipzig 1913, pp. 164 and 328.
43. This story may have some relation to Jereboam's attempt, after the division of the Kingdom, to minimize the importance of Jahweh's "house" at Jerusalem. I Kings 12:28 when divested of Deuteronomic derogations shows Jereboam desired to make Bethel and Dan take the place of Jerusalem for the North.
44. Gen. 28:13-15, לְיָהוָה applies to Jacob not the ladder <sup>see Gen. 35:13 (?)</sup>  
Dillman A., Genesis, Edinburgh 1897, vol. II, pp. 226.
45. Dillman for this reason recognizes vv. 14-15 as later insertion.
46. The popularity of the Hebron sanctuary is attested by II Sam. 2:2 ff and 15:7 ff. Gen. 13:18 follows vv. 13. In vv. 14 וַיָּבֹאוּ...וַיִּחַן is an editorial edition connecting 14-15 with chapter 13.
47. The writer is indebted in part to Kraetzschmar R. for analysis



of this chapter. Die Bundesvorstellung, pp. 58 ff.

48. Bacon, Hēbrāica, vol. Vii, pp. 76, also quoted by Kraetzschmar, Die Bundesvorstellung, pp. 59
49. See Kraetzschmar, p. 61. Bacon and Wellhausen quoted there place this passage after 13:18, as the solemnization of the promise to Abraham at Hebron.
50. See Jer. 34:18, the account of Zedekiah's covenant to free the slaves.
51. See Procksch, Genesis, p. 115 ff. cf. Dt. 6:1-3, 12:28.
52. Procksch designates these vv. as Rje. Genesis, pp. 310-311; also Dillman, Genesis, vol. 2, pp. 140. Both recognize them as secondary editions. J. Morgenstern's designation of these vv. as J2 is more positive. See The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch, pp. 85.
53. See Ex. 22:28-29, 34:19-20. J. Morgenstern's analysis proves that both laws in K and C refer to human sacrifice. See The Old. Doc. of the Hex., pp. 79-87.
54. Isaiah's test of undaunted faith served J2 as an example.
55. Procksch, pp. 311, compare Gen. 24:7.
56. Ibid., pp. 151.
57. Dillman, Gen. vol. II, pp. 208. cf. Is. 41:8, 51:3.
58. Some of the Exodus passages in which Moses is told to say to the Israelites that he comes in the name of Jahweh the God of the Patriarchs may be J2. See Ex. 3:6, 15, 4:5 and other passages usually ascribed to redactors, as Ex. 13:5, 11, 33:1, Num. 32:11.
59. See also (P) Deut. 29:12.
60. See also P accounts in Gen. 28:3-4, 35:10-12, 48:3-4.

61. Cf. also Gen. 27:29, Num. 24:29, Is. 45.
62. See Nehemiah's prayer 9:7-8.
63. See Marmorstein, The Doctrine of Merits in Old Rabbinical Literature, London 1920. *Of the numerous passages we quote the following, p. 151,* "God has chosen the people of Israel and has made this covenant with them forever. If the children of Israel depart from God's ways and forget His covenant He delivers them for a time into the hands of their enemies but God is ever mindful of His covenant with the Patriarchs. He will always deliver the Israelites and never abandon them." (J. Q. R. X 322).
64. Morgenstern J., Lecture I, delivered at Garret Biblical Institute, 1929.
65. Class lectures at Hebrew Union College, Bible 8, 1927-28, by J. Morgenstern.
66. See Rashbam's comment on Dt. 7:9.
67. For analysis of these verses the writer is indebted to Dr. Morgenstern's Class lectures in Bible 8, H. U. C., 1927-8.
68. The correlation of *טון* and *נזל* is clearly seen in Deut. 7:9 also I Kings 8:23. See Glueck, N., Das Wort Heseb, Giessen 1927, pp. 38-40.
69. See also Num. 14:18-19. These vv. as well as vv. quoted in Ex. 20 and 34 are very late pre-exilic or post-exilic Bt. redactions. See Baentsch B., Exodus-Leviticus-Numbers, Handkomm. z. A. T., Göttingen 1903, pp. 180, 281, 527. See also Jer. 32:18 a post-exilic liturgical insertion (Volz, Jer. p. 299).
70. Also Dt. 5:9; see particularly Dt. 7:8-10 where in the application of the covenant the same differentiation is made.

71. איש בחטא ימת Dt. 24:16, 2 Kings 14:6, 2 Chron. 25:4.
72. See above Ex. 20:5, 34:6; also Josh. 7:24, II Sam. 21.
73. הנפש הקטאת היא תמות Ez. 18:2 ff., chap. 33; also Jer. 51:28-29.
74. See Volz P., Jeremiah. Komma. z. A. T., pp. 299.
75. Ez 14. 14:12-23; see Hùlscher G., Hesekiel, Giessen 1924, pp. 36.
76. For discussion of the sources and composition of Ezekiel see Hùlscher, Hesekiel, pp. 26ff., 108ff., 184ff.
77. In this idea there is the implication that a deity cannot exist without worshippers. They keep his name known on earth, complete his personality as it were. In Ps. 6:5-6 we read, "In the world of death there is no mention of Thee, in Sheol who will give Thee thanks." Such a consideration upon which to base a prayer for salvation from death seems peculiar unless we realize that it is based on this idea—that a deity needs worshippers. cf. Ps. 88:16 ff., Jos. 7:9. See Encyclopedia Biblica, vol. 3, col. 3265.
78. Toy C. H., Ezekiel, in Haupt's Polychrome Bible, pp. 170.
79. Isa. 36:18-20, 37:12, II Chron. 32:15.
80. Is. 37:20. cf. 2 Kings 19:19 and emend accordingly. The universalism is later development of Deutero-Isaiah who uses למנוח instead of לשמוח. See Morgenstern, Lecture I, before Garrett Bib. Inst., 1929.
81. Such is Jahweh's answer to Hezekiah's prayer. See Is. 37:35; also 2 Kings 19:34. Assyria does not realize that she is the unconscious instrument of Jahweh (Is. 10:5-35); therefore, she is humiliated. Jahweh zealous for the honor of His name will do this.

82. Dt. 32:26-7. See Driver 3. R., Deuteronomy, I. C. C., pp. 346.
83. The use of the word *אָק* with Jahweh, Is. 9:6, 37:32.  
*אָק* is used of passion in variety of senses, but chiefly implies resentment. When applied to Jahweh it appears to always express His reaction called forth by injury to His honor. See Ex. 54:14. Driver p. 347.
84. This is the only time that *שִׁמְחָה* appears in Deutero-Isaiah. Although in accord with Deutero-Isaiah's general thought, it may be an insertion. See Ps. 9:15, 48:11 for the correlation of Jahweh's name and praise, e.g. *שִׁמְחָה אֱלֹהִים*.  
*בן תהלתך*.
85. Toy, Ezekiel, pp. 170.
86. See above, pp. 37 ff.
87. Hölischer G., Hesehiel, pp. 55. Herrmann J., Ezekiel, Komm. z. A. T., Leipzig 1924, pp. 216. The reference to Jacob 37:25, 28:25 are product of Redactor. Hölischer, pp. 144, 177.
88. Kraetzschmar, Bundesvorstellung, pp. 163. Nor do the references to the covenant in Ezekiel imply a belief in its eternity (as Jeremiah); see Ez. 16:59, 60; 17:13-18; 34:25; 37:26.
89. Ez. 16:2; 44, 45; cf. Gen. 15:6.
90. Hosea 12:3 ff.
91. Duhm B., Jesaja, Handkomm. z. A. T., Göttingen 1892, pp. 303. It may be that this passage refers to "we'lli" worship / or ancestor worship. Battenwieser M. consider Is. 63:16 to be a case of we'lli worship. See Book of Job, N. Y. 1925, /

pp. 165 ff. And Is. 45:28 may be compared to this passage. There may be some connection between the development of weili worship in Israel to zekut 'abot.

92. See above, pp. 54 ff.
93. Ez. 25:5-7, 11, 14, 17; 28:22, 24; 29:6, 9, 16; 30:8, 19, 25-26.
94. See Isa. 40:1-5; 41:20; 42:8; 43:10-1, 21-5, 27-44:5; 45:3-6; 12ff; 48:11; 49:7.
95. Volz, Jeremia, Komm. z. A. T., pp. 158-168.
96. Kraetzschmar, Bundesvorstellung, pp. 147 where Stade is cited.
97. Volz denies this argument, Jeremia pp. 166, on the grounds that though Jeremiah quotes the people he uses his own language.
98. Volz, Jeremia, pp. XLVIII, 181.
99. This passage, Jer. 52:17-24, is discussed above, p. 44. See Volz, pp. 500 for further proof of later composition.
100. Joel 2:17-19, 27.
101. Exod. 8:6, 8; 9:29.
102. Baentsch denotes these passages as Rje. See Ex-Lev-Num Handkomm. z. A. T., pp. 75 ff.
103. Morgenstern J., Moses with the Shining Face, <sup>HUCA</sup> pp. 18-9. Ex. 18:11b "Now I know that Jahweh is greater than all the other gods" spoken by Jethro after the signal deliverance of Israel may also be J2 writing.
104. Lev. 21:6 and throughout Ph. <sup>100 pps</sup> is often associated with this idea in Ezekiel.
105. Num. 6:27, Lev. 20:6.

106. Baentsch, Handkomm. z. A. T., pp. 121, where this passage is designated as P.
107. Smith G. P. comments, "this is P, influenced by Ezekiel". See Samuel, Int. Crit. Comm. pp. 89.
108. I Kings 8:41-3, II Chron. 6:32-4.
109. Other references in Ps. 6:5, 9:15, 25:7, 102:16, 106:44, 47, 109:21.
110. LXX has  $\gamma^{\mu\psi}$  instead of  $\gamma^{\mu\mu\psi}$ . See Morgenstern J., Moses with Shining Face, pp. 15. Vv. 13-4 are insertions. See Gray, Numbers, Int. Crit. Comm., pp. 155.
111. pp. 36 ff., above.
112. Gray comments upon the dependence of this passage on Ez. 20. See Numbers, Int. Crit. Comm. pp. 155.
113. Morgenstern J., Moses with the Shining Face.