THE EVOLUTION OF THE CONCEPT OF THE CHOSEN PEOPLE IN THE BIBLE.

by

Bertram Wallace Korn

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the title
of Rabbi and the degree of Master
of Hebrew Letters.

Referee:

Dr. Julian Morgenstern

Hebrew Union College
Cincinnati, Ohio
December 7, 1942

CONTENTS.

CONTENTS.

To

Mother and Dad

for everything.

PREFACE

The concept of the chosen people has never lost its importance in any formulation of the theology of Judaism. Its relevance to our thinking and action today is demonstrated by present-day discussions of the Zionist problem, and of the intellectual fundaments of the Reform movement. Anti-Semitic literature constantly utilizes this concept as an excuse for bigotry, and defense literature ever and again traces its history and genuine significance. In the past year and a half two articles have appeared on the subject, one by Rabbi Ben Zion Bokser in the "Contemporary Jewish Record" of June, 1941, and another by Dr. Bernard Heller in the Popular Studies in Judaism Series published by the U.A.H.C.

No attempt heretofore, however, has been made to trace, scientifically, the evolution of this concept through history, or indeed, even in the formulative centuries of Biblical writing. This thesis, then, deals with a field in which there is no literature whatever. It was undertaken at the suggestion of Dr. Morgenstern because it is just the type of investigation to which he has devoted himself so wholeheartedly in his years of Biblical study: the study of the development of ideas in the context of the his-

tory of the people of Israel and their religion.

Adequately to express my indebtedness to Dr. Morgenstern is difficult, because that indebtedness is so thorough and complete. From the time that we agreed on this subject he has given of his time and effort and wide knowledge; in personal conference he has always been most generous and patient. His unpublished notes on various books of the Bible have provided an important source of reference material for this work, as have his lectures in Bible 8. But beyond all of these specific aids, there is something of Dr. Morgenstern's love of the Bible and his human way of treating scientific matters which have given me the spirit which enabled me to enter into this thesis whole-heartedly, and to regard it as much more than a mere academic exercise. And if there is something of worth in this thesis, if it offers in any way a clarification of certain problems, it is because my work has reflected the color and attitudes of his work, as well as the fruits of his own scientific labors. It has been a privilege not only to read what he has written and to attend his lectures, but also to feel that I have achieved something as the result of working with him.

To Professor Blank I must acknowledge my thanks for his organization of the prophetic books

in Bible 2 and 3 without which this thesis could hardly have been written. And I must likewise record my appreciation of Robert H. Pfeiffer's fine work, Introduction to the Old Testament, which has ever and again been referred to and utilized for this thesis.

October 26, 1942

CHAPTER I THE COVENANT TRADITION

No historic tradition had so profound an influence upon the development of the religion of Israel as did the tradition of the covenant of Yahveh with Israel at Sinai. Though, historically, it was Israel that had taken Yahveh to be her God, this God of the Kenites in the wilderness, the religious mind of ancient Israel conceived of the covenant as being directed by Yahveh, who had, rather, taken Israel to be His people.

This tradition of the covenant whereby Yahveh took Israel to be His people and promised to protect and prosper her, and whereby she, in return, obligated herself to worship Him, and Him alone, and to adhere to the laws which He presented as the basis of His worship -- this tradition became the technique through which various religious reforms were instituted. The K Code,[1] promulgated in 899 B.C. in Judah, as the basis of the reformation of Asa, included the earliest recorded decalogue (Exodus 34:14-26) attributed to Yahveh as part of the covenant proceedings. The formulators of the Book of the Covenant, the basis for the reformation in the north in 841 B.C., likewise attributed their decalogue (Exodus 20:23-26 and 23:10-16) to the covenant with the deity at His holy mountain.

The Deuteronomic decalogue, later amplified by the Priestly writers, was the basis, probably, of the reformation under Hezekiah and, certainly, of the reformation of Josiah in 621. That P accepted the D decalogue and revised it to fit its own philosophy, is adequate testimony of the lasting significance of the covenant tradition throughout the period of Biblical writing. In all of these periods, the covenant tradition was the means utilized to effect reform and progress; the covenant tradition was the vehicle which carried the religion of Israel forward in its continuing evolution through the centuries.

Unable to see any well-defined ethical character in the religion of Yahveh at its very inception, Karl Budde perceives in the covenant relationship the germ of ethical development.[2] "How did Israel come to its religion? It went over, at Sinai, to a rude nomad religion.....it served henceforth the same God as the tribe of Kenites to which Moses' wife belonged..... One fundamental difference existed between Israel and the Kenites from the beginning. The latter, like numberless other tribes and peoples, had had their god from time immemorial. But Israel had turned to Him of its own free will, and chosen Him as its God.... Israel served Yahweh because He had kept His word; because He had won Israel as His possession by an inestimable benefit." So, whenever it might have appeared to other

peoples that their gods were powerless, whenever events seemed to demonstrate their gods' inability to protect them, Israel looked to her own life for the cause of ill fortune. So throughout the development of Jewish ethics and theology, this covenant tradition motivated the self-searching which brought forth the ethical grandeur which has never been matched in the religious history of man. "Israel's religion became ethical because it was a religion of choice and not of nature, because it rested on a voluntary decision which established an ethical relationship between the people and its God for all time," concludes Budde.

The covenant tradition was likewise the source from which sprang the monotheism and universalism of Israel, uttered in broadest expression by Deutero-Isaiah. Just because it was a covenant, rather than a natural relationship whereby god and people were born together and died together, this relationship of Israel and Yahveh could become, in the massage of Amos, the basis for his doctrine that Yahveh was a world-god, who could sever that relationship, as He had once inaugurated it, if He saw fit. Because choice and change were part of that relationship at its inception, the deity's character was not fixed and delimited for all time, but could be broadened as the spiritual insight of Israel grew more and more mature. A natural relationship be-

tween Yahveh and Israel would have been inelastic and have hemmed in the god-concept permanently; the covenant-relationship permitted change and expansion. So the tradition of the covenant was the perfect context from which universalism and monotheism could emerge.

And likewise it was the perfect context out of which the concept of the chosen people could emerge. For once Amos had enunciated the principle that Yahveh was more than a national god, innumerable questions became the concern of the theology of Israel, as we shall see. Ultimately men could have come to believe that there was no more distinctive relationship between Israel and God than there was between Him and the other nations. Israel would have been obliterated from the religious scene; and, need we add, so would Israel's contributions to the spiritual welfare of man have been obliterated. There had to be some mechanism by which this new conception of Yahveh as the God of the universe could be harmonized with the self-conscious need of Israel for a special place in His world and in His plans. That harmonization was achieved, primarily, through the concept of the chosen people, which, obviously, was derived from the old covenant tradition. Yahveh had chosen Israel and had made a covenant with her in the desert after He had delivered her from Egyptian

bondage; and if He was a world-god, He made that covenant because He had chosen Israel out of all the nations of the earth to be His people. So out of the covenant tradition, which established the relationship between Israel and Yahveh as a created one, ratified through choice of Israel by Yahveh and acceptance of Yahveh by Israel, rather than a natural one, grew the concept which we are about to trace through Biblical thought.

CHAPTER II AMOS AND UNIVERSALISM

The inhabitants of Israel to whom Amos spoke his revolutionary message of doom, conceived of the relationship between Yahveh and Israel in these terms: Yahveh was a god like the many other gods in the world; but, also, like those other gods, Yahveh was a deity allied to a particular people in a completely natural way. Yahveh happened to be Israel's deity: Israel was Yahveh's people. The two were inseparably bound together. Neither could exist without the other. The state of Israel's fortunes was dependent entirely upon Yahveh. The place of the nation in international events was a reflection of his power and of his ability. Israel needed Yahveh because a people could not possibly survive without the guidance and protection of a deity. On the other hand, a deity, likewise, needed a people -- who would worship him and offer him pleasing sacrifices if he were without a people? And what kind of opinion would other nations hold of a god without a people?[1] What real existence, in fact, would a deity have, a deity without a people, without sacrifices and worship? In addition, how could a god possibly show his power in world events (which was, after all, his purpose in the scheme of cos-

mic affairs) if he had no people who would carry his banner to the nations of the world? Obviously, then, it would at best have been an academic question, this question of the dissolution of relationship of deity and people, if the question had even suggested itself to Israel before Amos' time.

So the people of Israel were confident in their belief in an eternal, natural, relationship between Yahveh and themselves. Of course, it was possible to imagine that Yahveh could be so angered by them that he might for a time reject his people; but at most this could last only for a short time, and then Israel would once more be the recipient of Yahveh's favor. In effect, he had to be satisfied with the best in conduct and loyalty which his people wished to offer him. Besides, did they not display their desire to placate him by bringing to his sanctuaries the sacrifices which were acceptable to him, and this too in great abundance? Actually, then, this nationalistic type of religion, in principle, bound Yahveh to Israel and Israel to Yahveh in an indissoluble relationship.

In this type of thinking there was, of course, no reason for an idea such as that of the chosen people to arise. Chosen people? Every nation had its deity, and every deity his nation. Each combination of people and god was

striving to achieve supremacy in the arena of world politics, striving to secure domination over the other nation-god combinations. But no god could possibly be thought of as having a relationship with more than one people (except as victor god over defeated god and defeated people) -- it would be treachery of the worst conceivable type -- and every bit as reprehensible as for a people to change its god.[2]

Amos, in the first place, did not conceive of the relationship between Yahveh and Israel as the completely natural, eternal one which his contemporaries accepted,[3] but rather as a covenant of adoption whereby Yahveh had taken Israel to be his people. This covenant had included specific terms, as any compact would, and chief among the terms of this covenant by Yahveh with Israel had been the stipulation that Israel live the life which he demanded of her. Obviously, such a compact was not indissoluble; should one of the parties repudiate it and fail to fulfill its terms, then the other party was fully justified in completely severing the relationship established by the covenant. Amos' message, then, in part, was the notification of the cancellation of this covenant. He, as the agent of Yahveh, was announcing that Israel had irremediably broken the covenant and that Yahveh was therefore repudiating

his obligations and casting Israel off. As he had once adopted Israel so he could now reject Israel.

Basic to Amos' conception of the covenant relationship was his revolutionary conception of Yahveh. For the implications of this idea of the covenant, of its dissoluble character, were of no account if they were contained in the compass of the nationalistic type of religion. The same conditions held whether it was an artificial or a natural relationship, whether Yahveh had adopted Israel, or had been Israel's god from the beginning: Yahveh had to retain his people, for he was only one god among many, and what kind of god could exist without a people. But just as he had repudiated the popular notion of the Israel-Yahveh relationship, so Amos repudiated the popular notion of Yahveh's character.

To Amos, Yahveh was not a petty national god whose interests were bound to those of a single people. Yahveh was the world-god: if it was true that he had brought Israel forth from Egypt, so was it also true that he brought the Philistines from Kaftor, and Aram from Kir.[4] Actually, so despised a people as the Cushites, the nation of slaves, were held by Yahveh in so great esteem as were the Israelites. And just as He was repudiating Israel and would not let her return to Him, so too He refused

to permit other nations to repent: Damascus and Gaza, Ammon and Moab.[5] This was the implication of Amos' message which undoubtedly conveyed more of a crushing sense of doom than any other part: that Yahveh would not be an embarrassed God. If He repudiated Israel, he would still be the world-god. Yahveh could actually carry out His intention of casting forth His people, Amos implied, and yet retain His mighty place in the cosmic order.

Amos' universalism was not absolute, however, and in the qualifications of universalism which are revealed in his message are to be found the beginnings of the idea of the chosen people.

World-god or no, Yahveh had still been the God of His people Israel. Sometime in the past, for some unexplained reason, he had taken Israel, set her aside from the other peoples, and made a covenant with her, a covenant which distinguished her from all the other nations over which Yahveh exercised control. He had chosen Israel to lead the life which He desired, had brought her from Egypt and given Palestine to her, Palestine a land made clean because He, Yahveh, was to be found there. He had sent prophets to her, carrying His message, to guide her in following His path. Only Israel had He known intimately, as intimately as a man knows his wife.[6] And He had been patient with

this people He loved, reluctant to sever relations with her, although the provocation arose many times. He had warned her time after time, withholding His natural bounties.[7] But just because He had known her so intimately, just because He had taken such especial care with her, for that very reason, Israel was infinitely more responsible to Yahveh for her rejection of His way of life; for that very reason would all her iniquities be visited upon her.

We have said that in these qualifications of universalism are to be found the beginnings of the concept which we are about to trace through Biblical thought. Perhaps it would be more exact to say that they are the seeds, rather than the beginnings. For though Amos was the thinker who first broadened the scope of Israel's thinking from nationalism to universalism, on the other hand we must not infer from this that he, standing on the very threshold of a vast new world unified by a world-God, perceived all of the complex implications of that world-view, nor that he was conscious of the various paradoxes which his idea brought forth, some of which, indeed, still challenge the minds of men today.

Surely Amos did not pause to consider why, if Yahveh was the universal God, He had ever chosen Israel to be His particular people in the first place.

Nor did he strive to perceive a purpose behind this choice, a purpose which would have not only a nationalistic significance for Israel, but a universal significance in consonance with His universality. Even further removed from Amos' thinking was the question of God's day-by-day relationship to the other peoples of the world. As Dr. Morgenstern has written, "it needed time and rich, complex, historical experience and the thinking and consecrated meditation of successive generations of inspired prophets of the Amos type, to become clearly aware of all these and other parallel implications of the concept of a single world-god..."[8] We could not expect more than the preliminary statement of the universalistic principle from Amos: stunned as he must have been by the realization of the hugeness of this new world that unfolded before his eyes, it was enough that he should see one aspect of that world, and that his mind should be filled with the overpowering sense of that one aspect: his message of doom was to a people which had been given the chance by the God of all nations to live the right way of life, but had rejected that chance.

Amos' thoughts about the significance of Israel's place in the new picture of cosmic unity were not, then, the studied answer of a great thinker to paradoxes and questions by which he was troubled, nor his explanation of his own doctrine in its fullest

implications. His idea of the imtimate relationship between Yahveh and Israel was, to the contrary, his link with his contemporaries, his tie to the past. It was an unconscious usage of accepted ideas (albeit ideas which he was forced to accept, else there was no sense whatever to his message -- for if Yahveh had not been more intimately concerned with Israel, why greater wrath against Israel than against the other nations which of course had been no more loyal to Him); not an attempt to harmonize universalism with nationalism.[9] A child of his own day, not a man out of his time completely removed from his contemporaries, Amos seems to have thought that even a god who had power over many nations and peoples had to have a people, and that if He rejected Israel, impliedly He would choose another people to take Israel's place.

Here, then, in this first stage of the transition between national religion and universalism, we have seen the first hints of the concept of the chosen people -- not, however, as a corollary consciously attached to the universalistic principle, but rather as an idea which survived from the old type of thinking, reinterpreted only slightly if at all to fit into the new pattern. Although it was only the universalistic principle which could estab-

lish the need for the doctrine of the chosen people, the beginning of that doctrine is a link to the rejected principle of nationalistic religion.

CHAPTER III HOSEA

Hosea, Amos' successor as a prophet in Israel, added little or nothing to the growth of the universalistic theory. There is no sign in his writings that he at any time conceived of Yahveh as anything but Israel's national god, or that he conceived of Yahveh as ever having any type of relationship with the other peoples of the world.

We have already indicated that the actual evolution of the concept of the chosen people could take place only in a milieu of universalistic thought; nevertheless Hosea, not a universalist, did contribute something to that development, in the influence which one of his doctrines had upon later prophetic thought.

Amos had firmly believed that the doom fast approaching Israel was fixed, and that it could not possibly be averted. The time and opportunity for repentance had passed and Yahveh not only did no longer desire Israel to repent, but he would never again permit her to repent. Hosea found himself unable to accept this doctrine. He believed that Israel might, after a period of temporary rejection and protracted discipline be reunited with Yahveh in an eternal covenant which would never be broken:

Therefore, behold, I shall entice her,
And take her to the desert;
And I shall speak to her heart.
And I shall give to her her vineyards from there;
And the valley of tribulation for a door of hope;
And she shall answer there
As in the days of her youth
As in the day of her coming up out of the land of Egypt.
And it shall be, at that time,
Saith Yahveh,
You shall call me "my husband"
And shall no longer call me "my Baal,"
And I shall remove the names of the Baalim from her mouth,
And they shall no longer be spoken of by name,
.....
And I shall betroth thee to me for ever;
Yea I shall betroth thee to me in righteousness and in justice,
And in יהוה, and in mercy;
And I shall betroth thee to me in faithfulness;
And you shall know Yahveh as intimately as a wife her husband.[1]

The implication of this passage is clear: Once Israel returns to the kind of life she had led when Yahveh first took her to be his people, i.e., the desert life of equity and simplicity, Yahveh will renew his covenant with her, a new type of covenant, an everlastingly applicable one, to which Israel will be eternally loyal, faithfully carrying out the behest of her god. But Hosea does not believe that this renewal of the covenant relationship can be acheived without distress for Israel. She will first have to be punished, chastised for her faithlessness, discip-

lined and regenerated, before she can come to the realization that she must change her way of life, before she can repent. Devastation to the land, the denial of his (Yahveh's) bounties and protection -- when she shall realize that her false gods can be of no help to her -- will force this realization upon her. Though Hosea pleads with Israel to remember Yahveh's covenant with her, to return to "her first husband", he seems to perceive that only actual punishment will bring Israel to repentance.[2]

This doctrine of Yahveh's renewal of the covenant with a regenerate Israel was the first modification of Amos' doctrine of absolute doom. It had a profound influence, as we shall see, upon the contents of Jeremiah's doctrine of the new covenant. In his foreshadowing of Jeremiah's doctrine which was so important in the development which we shall trace, Hosea made a deep and abiding contribution to the evolution of the concept of the chosen people.

CHAPTER IV ISAIAH AND THE SAVED REMNANT

The pattern of Isaiah's universalistic thinking closely followed that of his predecessor Amos, upon whom he was profoundly dependent, in many ways. Like Amos, Isaiah proclaimed Yahveh's abrogation of His covenant with Israel, because Israel had rejected the path which He had laid out for her.[1] To Isaiah, Israel's great sin was pride and spiritual blindness. This deep-seated rottenness was revealed in her proclivity to idolatry, in her refusal to be loyal to Yahveh and His covenant. Rather than rely upon Yahveh, she preferred to seek help from human agencies and turned to Egypt for strength. The outrageous moral crimes of a society which Isaiah regarded as degenerate were symptomatic of Israel's rejection of the life which Yahveh desired her to lead. Riotous living and social injustices were common phenomena, absolutely antithetical to the clean, simple and righteous life which would connote true obedience to the will of Yahveh; but when the people thought to demonstrate their loyalty to Him, they brought animals in great number for sacrifice, and trampled the courts of His temple on the fixed occasions for worship. Failing to realize that all of these tokens were of no account while their hands

were smeared with the blood of injustice, while the very presence of the oppressed and the down-trodden belied their faithfulness to Him, they persisted in the belief that Yahveh could do nothing to them, even though He might so desire.[2]

Like Amos, Isaiah was fully convinced that the people deluded themselves when they continued to believe that Yahveh was only the god of Israel and nothing more. To the contrary, Yahveh is a world-god. The whole earth is full of his כבוד. His power extends to all the nations, which come from afar to accomplish His determined plan. He sends His bidding to Egypt and to Assyria, and they must heed His call. Just as He is about to cast off Israel for her sinfulness, so He may sentence any nation to destruction when it angers him with its sinfulness. Indeed, although the nations have no consciousness of the part they play in His cosmic plan, still they serve as His agents in accomplishing His will and fulfilling His word.[3]

Total destruction, and nothing less, was the punishment which Isaiah envisioned for Israel, punishment by the world-god who had lost all patience with Israel, the vineyard over which He had exercised such care, and in which He had thought to see fulfilled His highest expectations and hopes: destruction...

> Until cities be waste without inhabitant
> And houses without man,
> And the land become utterly waste,
> And Yahveh have removed man far away,
> And the forsaken places be many in the midst
> of the land.[4]

The vineyard will become completely desolate; no vine-dresser will busy himself in it; brambles and thorns will supplant the vines.[5] Israel shall be like a potter's vessel, shattered to the ground and broken into fragments so small that not one could be used to carry even a drop of water.[6] Only the death of all Israel can atone for their outrageous behavior and their refusal to accept even the direst warnings of impending destruction.[7]

Isaiah developed to the fullest extent an aspect of universalism which had only been hinted at by Amos: Yahveh's utilization of other nations as his agents. So he pictured Assyria, gradually spreading herself over the world, enveloping nation after nation, appreaching ever closer to Israel, as Yahveh's unknowing instrument for Israel's destruction. Assyria's armies will flood into Israel's land like a tempest and the raging waters of the sea, carrying out Yahveh's edict of destruction.[8] Isaiah, prophet of Yahveh, speaks of Assyria in these words:

> O Asshur, the rod of Mine anger,
> In whose hands is Mine indignation!
> I do send him against an ungodly nation,
> And against the people of My wrath do I
> give him a charge,

To take the spoil, and to take the prey,
And to tread them down like the mire of
the streets.[9]

Actually Isaiah made no more of an attempt to harmonize his universalistic ideas and his unconscious use of nationalistic ideas, than Amos had done. Obviously, like Amos, Isaiah believed that for some reason which he did not see fit to guess at, Yahveh had at one time chosen Israel from among the other nations, to be His people, at the same time retaining his power over the other nations of the world. The parable of the vineyard reveals Isaiah's conception of the relationship of Yahveh and Israel: Yahveh had had a particularly intimate concern for Israel and had therefore good reason to expect perfect faithfulness from His people.[10] As we have already pointed out in our discussion of Amos' ideas, we could not expect otherwise than that the pre-exilic prophets should accept this doctrine of nationalistic religion; actually, whether Yahveh was a world-god or not, there had to be some more intimate relationship between Him and Israel for Israel to deserve the punishment which those prophets envisioned. Their consciousness of their own high station in Yahveh's plan told them as much, for Yahveh had made them His messengers and had not taken for Himself messengers among the other peoples.[11] In this regard, then,

Isaiah's ideas about the relationship of Yahveh and Israel, Like Amos', were not a conscious attempt to evolve a concept which might bridge the gap between universalism and national religion, but rather were they ideas unconsciously retained from the rejected principle of a nationistic deity. If Isaiah, then, had gone no further than this, we would be justified in saying that he had contributed absolutely nothing to the development of the concept which we are engaged in tracing. But Isaiah did go further than this.

As we have already indicated, Isaiah's message to Israel was one of complete doom, as was Amos'. Logically, no other result could proceed from the cause-and-effect reasoning which both Amos and Isaiah utilized. Total destruction was the punishment to be visited upon this people which, as a people, had broken its covenant with Yahveh, the world-god. The people had exhausted Yahveh's patience; He did not even desire their repentance, as He had told Isaiah at the very inception of his ministry: "Make fat the mind of this people, and its ears make heavy, and cause its eyes to cleave fast together, lest it see with its eyes and hear with its ears and comprehend with its mind, and it return, and there be healing for it."[12]

Yet into this message of total destruction for Israel, there came a somewhat irrational and illogical hope, yes even conviction, that there would be a future for Israel, a future assured by the survival of the small band of disciples who followed the words of the prophet and were faithful to the covenant with Yahveh. This "saved remnant" would live through the national holocaust and would become, it is implied, the new, more righteous Israel, with which Yahveh would renew His covenant.[13]

Hosea had proclaimed the doctrine of an eternal covenant with a repentant Israel, after a period of rejection. This covenant was to be with the whole people of Israel who would return from their sinful ways. Both Hosea and Isaiah, then, advanced modifications of Amos' message of absolute doom; but there are profound differences between the doctrines of these two prophets. In the first place, Isaiah did not speak of a renewal of relations with all of Israel but only with a small part of the people. And, in the second place, it was not actually a renewal of relations, but a continuation, based on a new premise. Like Hosea, Isaiah believed that this continuation could only be possible because of the righteousness of the survivors, but Isaiah did not believe that this righteousness would be the result

of reformation. Isaiah envisaged a group that had always been righteous and had never been faithless. Thus, although Hosea's message was similar to Isaiah's in some respects, the latter was actually a profoundly different one, setting forth new postulates for the survival of Israel.

Amos had hinted strongly that after Yahveh had repudiated and punished Israel, He might well take for Himself another people, even so lowly a people as the Cushites, to fill the place vacated by Israel. Isaiah, although dependent upon this aspect of Amos' message and in agreement with it in principle, denies that Yahveh would take another people for Himself, but insists, to the contrary, that Israel has an everlasting place in His affections, that in one way or another Israel will continue to be Yahveh's people, even if the only connection, and a very tenuous one at that, between the old and the new people would be this small group of the faithful who had been willing to hearken to Yahveh's word and had kept faith with Him.[14]

Isaiah's earlier ideas about Israel as the beloved people of Yahveh, the world-god, indicate, as we have already noted, his acceptance of the conceptions about the Yahveh-Israel relationship which were characteristic of the national-

istic religious principle. They convey no implication of a desire on the part of the prophet to harmonize his universalism with nationalism. Nor, for that matter, does the doctrine of the righteous remnant, which was Isaiah's original contribution to the theology of Israel, necessarily imply a harmonization -- it is, however, more than an unconscious usage of accepted ideas. It constitutes a reaffirmation of those ideas, a positive rather than a negative approach to the question of the place of Israel in the world. Isaiah was the first definitely and positively to affirm the concept of the chosen people, in his formulation of the doctrine of the righteous remnant which implied that Israel would always be Yahveh's, the world god's, people. Whether it was Isaiah's unconscious loyalty to his people which brought him to this conclusion, or his realization of the uniqueness of his own prophetic relationship to the deity, we cannot presume to judge; but, in any case, Isaiah set forth the theme that was to become an accepted principle in the religious thinking of Israel, as that theme was amplified and developed in the form of Jeremiah's doctrine of the new covenant.

CHAPTER V JEREMIAH AND THE NEW COVENANT

For the major part of his prophetic career (major only in the sense of the greater number of years) Jeremiah adhered to the patterns proclaimed by his predecessors. The burden of his message was that disaster was fast overtaking the people of Israel (the kingdom of Judah, only, of course, at this time) as punishment for Israel's faithlessness to Yahveh. Like Amos and Isaiah he spoke out against Israel's flagrant injustices; like Hosea he emphasized the moral degeneracy of a people which could not see the perfidy involved in the pursuit of foreign worship. Like Hosea, too, Jeremiah believed that repentance, even at the last moment might avert the destruction of Palestine and the dispersion of the people of Israel; but, like Isaiah, he was convinced that repentance would not be forthcoming. Therefore he counseled a more desperate step than his predecessors had ever done: submission to Babylonia, at best the only way to save the people's existence, but at least that.

Like his predecessors, too, Jeremiah found it necessary to repeat the universalistic principle: Yahveh is not merely a national deity, but the Lord of the entire universe.[1] And the nations of the world are at his beck and call. Almost a century and a

half had passed since Amos first enunciated this universalistic doctrine, and still it had not entered into the popular way of thinking, nor even into the ideology of the professional prophets. The most obvious fact of all, to Jeremiah, was that Nebuchadrezzar and his approaching Babylonian armies were the agents of destruction which Yahveh had appointed to punish Judah for her sins. Those armies would bring in their wake death and famine, pestilence and exile -- the lot which Israel had consciously chosen through her persistent refusal to return to Yahveh.

Jeremiah's conception of the relationship of Israel and Yahveh during this period, was the same as that which has been described in the earlier chapters of this thesis. Jeremiah, too, believed that there had been a particularly intimate relationship: the deity had taken especial care of His people, Israel, whom He had betrothed to Himself long ago in the desert, when Israel had been eager to follow Him.[2] In the magnificent parable of the linen girdle, the prophet gives forcible expression to this idea:

> For as the girdle cleaveth to the loins of a man, so have I caused to cleave unto Me the whole house of Israel and the whole house of Judah, saith the Lord, that they might be unto Me for a people, and for a name, and for a praise, and for a glory; but they would not hearken.[3]

This conception is revealed in the many terms which

Jeremiah utilizes to describe Israel: Israel was רֵאשִׁית[4] to Yahveh, His "first fruits"; the "noble vine" and שֹׂרֵק נָטַע which He had planted and which He expected to blossom so beautifully.[5] Israel was to have called Yahveh "father", Yahveh who gave her a place among the nations and a beautiful land in which to live.[6] Israel was Yahveh's עַם, His נַחֲלָה, and His סְגֻלָּה.[7] In such vivid terms does Jeremiah picture Yahveh's love for Israel, the people He, the universal God, had taken for Himself, from amongst all the nations of His world.

Actually, however, during this early period, Jeremiah made no advance upon the thinking of his predecessors. Perhaps in this first period Jeremiah was a universalist only in theory, but in actual practice and pragmatic thinking much more of a nationalist. At any rate, he was in no wise impelled to seek further into the roots of this conception of the relationship of Yahveh and Israel. He sensed no dichotomy between his idea of the world-god and his own deep consciousness of the intimacy of Yahveh and Israel. As we have already pointed out in our discussion of the ideas of Amos and Isaiah, the pre-exilic prophets could not do otherwise than accept the conviction of their time that Yahveh had had a closer relationship with Israel than with other nations; their

whole raison d'etre was based on this fundamental assumption. There simply had to have been such a relationship in the past, and so far as the future was concerned, there could be no speculation about it because they were convinced that there was to be no future. Even Isaiah, who intuitively felt that there must be some kind of future for Israel, albeit a future only for a very minute section of the people, had never actually affirmed that the persistence of that righteous remnant would give concrete guarantee of that future. So Jeremiah, in this earlier period of his prophetic life, when he followed most closely the messages of the preceding pre-exilic prophets, did not speculate about the future relationship of Israel to God, because he felt there would be none.

But the first deportation by the Babylonians in 597 B.C. inaugurated a new period in Jeremiah's prophetic activity. After that event which in part fulfilled his dire prophecies of the certain doom of Israel, somehow logically and at the same time illogically, a confident expectation of a more favorable future entered into his thinking. This change sprang, in a way, from the content of his previous ideas. He had believed that one of the most outrageous sins of the people had been its refusal to accept יהוה,

discipline, correction.[8] He had also believed that one of the forms of the punishment to be meted out to Israel by Yahveh would be exile.[9] When, in 597, a part of the people was actually exiled, although the vast majority of the population remained behind, what could be more logical than to believe that the practical fulfillment of his prophecy had now begun and that this portion of the people already being punished in exile would accept the מוסר, would react favorably to the discipline, and so become regenerate? Indeed, if this did not prove to be so, why then should only a part of the people be punished at this time? If this was the final, complete destruction, why did it not come upon the entire people in one fell swoop? There was abundant basis then, in the very fact of exile, for Jeremiah's new message.

Psychologically, too, this was the proper moment for a new message. Perhaps, in this partial fulfillment of his message of doom, the prophet felt that there was an opportunity at last to bring home his message of regeneration to the people. For we must not suppose that Jeremiah ever gave up the hope of seeing Israel delivered from certain disaster. Jeremiah was always devoted to this people which he was forced to curse and sentence to destruction. He must have felt that here was the most glorious chance, albeit

the last one, to bring Israel to repentance. With the object lesson of part of the people already punished, perhaps he could convince those who remained that the course he advocated was the one which would deliver them.

Chapter 24 of Jeremiah, the parable of the figs, embodies what might well have been Jeremiah's first pronouncement in the reign of Zedekiah, after Jehoiachin and the aristocratic elements of the population, together with the merchants, the military leaders, and the priests, were carried away captive from Judah. Jeremiah sees a vision of two baskets of figs, one full of ripe figs, the other full of rotten ones. And he is told that the good figs represent those men of Israel who have gone into exile. Yahveh will treat them well, will bring them back to Palestine, where they shall be firmly established, and not uprooted or destroyed. He will give them a heart to know Him, and they will surely return to Him with all their heart. The inedible figs represent those who have been left behind, who have not gone into exile and have not yet been punished for their deep-seated iniquity, who have not yet experienced divine discipline. They, and those who have fled to Egypt, will receive the full brunt of the approaching doom: the famine,

the sword, the pestilence. They shall indeed be driven as exiles into many far-off places, and everywhere they shall be looked upon as a shameful people. At last they shall have been completely driven off the land of their fathers.[10]

Behind this message to the exiles and this attitude towards their sufferings, was a doctrine which was gradually evolving in Jeremiah's mind: the doctrine of the new covenant. Jeremiah was convinced that destruction was coming, but he must have sensed that it would not be complete: he was practical enough to realize that though the Babylonians would again take a section of the population into exile, though the Temple might be destroyed and the walls of Jerusalem torn down, though a great number of the men of Judah would be slain in battle and many civilians would lose their lives, and though pestilence and famine might wreak their havoc among the people -- still it was inevitable that many would survive. But he hoped that out of all this suffering and pain, not only those who had undergone exile in 597 and would undergo it some years later, but also all of those who would survive, would become regenerate, would be forgiven by Yahveh for their many transgressions, and that their heart, too, would become a new heart.[11]

12

The doctrine of the new covenant was this: after all the travail had passed Yahveh would make a new covenant with His people Israel, an eternal covenant which could never be sundered. For Yahveh had determined to forgive their manifold sins against Him. Their heart and soul would become transformed in a two-fold way: they themselves, through the discipline of suffering in war and in exile, would achieve a new heart, realizing the depths to which they had sunk in the past and resolving never more to try Yahveh's patience, but ever to live in faithfulness to the covenant, so that He would never be forced to sever relations with them. And Yahveh would give them the new heart, would give to them a new understanding and a new sympathy. In that heart would be written the תורה of Yahveh: His way of life of which the prophets had spoken so many times, the life of justice and honor and faithfulness; and they would all come to know Yahveh, to know His desires, to know Him intimately. Indeed, so faithful would this new heart be, that the teaching of the word of Yahveh would no longer be necessary, for that word would be engraved upon the heart (= the mind + the emotions) of every one of His people, from the least to the most important of them, with the result that as a people never again would they be faithless to Him or stray from His way

and so give occasion for the repudiation of this covenant.

This doctrine of the new covenant was Jeremiah's contribution to the development of the concept of the chosen people.[12a] Isaiah had been the first positively to formulate a doctrine which, in the context of the conscious affirmation of universalism, insisted that Yahveh would always have particularly intimate relations with Israel. Yahveh had chosen Israel from the beginning, and despite His rejection of her for her sins, would continue treating a righteous remnant as His chosen people. Jeremiah accepts Isaiah's belief that Yahveh would never cut off His people entirely, that He would always have intimate relations with Israel -- and goes further than that. Jeremiah boldly affirms that the relationship will be not only with a righteous remnant, but with the entire people, regenerate at last, that the covenant will be an eternal one, one which can never be broken, and to which the people will be wholly faithful. This doctrine is actually a fusion of Isaiah's doctrine of the righteous remnant with Hosea's doctrine of Yahveh's betrothal to a repentant Israel. With Hosea, Jeremiah believes that it will not only be a small section of the people but a very large section, which

has been brought to repentance by some form of punishment. With Hosea, too, he believes that this new relationship will be in the form of a new type of covenant, an eternal one, Yet Jeremiah states much more explicitly the premise that suffering and punishment are necessary for Katharsis, and that the people will have to come to participate in this new relationship through the bitter experiences of exile. With both Isaiah and Hosea, Jeremiah believes that the new Israel will be completely purged of the inclination towards sinfulness and faithfulness. Jeremiah herein establishes the positive basis for every future interpretation of the concept of the chosen people; never more was there any question but that the universal God had chosen Israel for some particular purpose, stated or unstated, and that this relationship between Him and His people was an eternal one.

Obviously, this conviction that Yahveh would never repudiate His people completely, for any possible reason, had far-reaching effects on the theological thinking of Israel.[13] The Deuteronomic historiographers adopted the idea whole-heartedly and wove it into their framework and reinterpretation of the book of Judges which was compiled some time after the middle of the exilic century,[14] and probably as the

preparation for the Zerubabel rebellion. They constructed a rhythmic pattern of apostacy, oppression, repentance, and deliverance for the periods of the judges, expressly to explain the calamity of 586, proving thereby that it was not undeserved, but, on the other hand, that it did not necessarily constitute a permanent rejection of the people of Israel by Yahveh and to suggest, or even promise that deliverance was near. For He had repented of His anger and of His determination to cast off His people many times before, and had He not repeatedly indicated that He would never break off His covenant with them?[15] So thoroughly was Jeremiah's doctrine accepted, then, that writers towards the end of the same century began to treat the doctrine as though it had been part and parcel of Israel's history in ages past.[16]

Despite the fact, however, that it was accepted with such complete conviction, or rather, perhaps, just because it did find such complete acceptance, Jeremiah's doctrine was only the beginning of a whole train of religious and theological questioning. As Dr. Morgenstern has pointed out, there was a paradox inherent in the doctrine which troubled Jeremiah's successors for several centuries: "The paradox was this; how was it possible to reconcile

the concept of Yahveh as a God of complete and perfect justice in His dealings with men and particularly with Israel, His people, with the quite antithetical concept of His complete forgiveness of His people still recognizably and confessedly sinful and faithless?"[17] This paradox bears closely upon the development of the concept which we are tracing through Biblical thought, for answers to this paradox must of necessity seek to explain the question which we have asked in the preceding chapters of this thesis, a question which was not apprehended or was ignored by the pre-exilic prophets: "Why should Yahveh, the universal God, have relations with Israel, one people out of many?" This paradox asks the question: "How is it possible for Yahveh to continue to treat Israel as the chosen people," but at the same time it continues a search for the purpose of Israel's choice. In fact, as we shall see, each of the four answers which were given to this paradox endeavors to explain the purpose of the choice of Israel, as well as the reason for the continuance of that relationship. Not only did Jeremiah, then, establish the principle of the continuance of the relationship brought about by the choice of Israel, but he also set into motion the logical thinking of great religious minds which sought to grapple with

the fundamental question of the purpose behind the choice of Israel. We shall proceed now to the first answer given to the paradox, one which likewise is intended to establish a reason, based upon universalism, for the choice of a people by Yahveh.

CHAPTER VI EZEKIEL AND "FOR HIS NAME'S SAKE".

During the first years of his ministry, before the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., Ezekiel's thoughts on the relation of Israel to Yahveh were for the most part in agreement with those which were held by his predecessors. Yahveh had adopted Israel in Egypt, had cared for her as a husband cares for his wife or a man for an adopted child; as her responsibility in this covenant of adoption, He had expected faithfulness and loyalty from her. But her consistent refusal to accept His guidance, her manifold offenses both in the ritual sphere and in the sphere of social ethics, made it impossible for Him to continue any longer with this agreement. He was, therefore, about to discard her as His people, to bring destruction upon her through the agency of the Babylonian armies, final and complete punishment for her all too numerous sins against Him.

Im one essential point, however, Ezekiel differs from his predecessors. They had assumed that at the beginning of the relationship between Israel and Yahveh, the people had been a faithful one. Israel had been eager to follow Yahveh in that desert period long ago, when He had betrothed her

to Himself.[1] Ezekiel did not accept this assumption of the innocence of early Israel. To his mind, she had been a loathesome outcast from the beginning, when Yahveh had, through compassion and as an act of grace, chosen Her to be His people. Whatever glory and honor and reknown she had achieved, were only a reflection of His own splendor. And from the very beginning, she had been unfaithful to Him, had gone astray after many false gods, had even brought forth strange godswith her when she left Egypt. And through the years she had persisted in her rebellion against the covenant with Yahveh, playing the harlot as it were with many nations and many gods, and playing false with the God who had established her and given her a land and prosperity.[2]

This attitude of Ezekiel's towards Israel's past history, and the consequent characterization of Yahveh's treatment of Israel as one of grace, is not to be attributed to any pessimistic, sour outlook on life on the part of the prophet. It is, to the contrary, an attitude fully in agreement with Ezekiel's major contribution to prophetic thought, his doctrine of "for His name's sake," the discussion of which will form the bulk of this chapter. The establishment of the principle that when Yahveh had originally taken Israel to be His people, He

was fully cognizant of the fact that even then she was sinful and faithless, is a prerequisite to a full understanding of Ezekiel's answer to the paradox which Jeremiah's doctrine of the new covenant presented.

Ezekiel seems to have accepted Jeremiah's doctrine of the new covenant whole-heartedly after the disaster of 586, when the danger of a complete dissolution of Yahveh-worship had become apparent. We must assume that Ezekiel, too, like the leaders of the Babylonian Jewish Community who began, after the exile, to strengthen the separatistic ritual forms of the religion of Israel in their endeavor to preserve the national identity,[3] was concerned about the survival of his people, and that he too felt the need for giving some comfort and hope to them. Jeremiah's doctrine of the new covenant must have appealed to him as being just such a message. So he spoke of the new heart and spirit which Yahveh would give to His people, to replace their rebellious, stony heart which had refused to accept His way.[4] So too he spoke of the new covenant which Yahveh would establish with His people, an everlasting covenant, which would make Israel ashamed of her actions in the past, and would bring full regeneration to her.[5]

Yet, though Ezekiel accepted this doctrine, and though indeed it found general acceptance in the thought of those who followed Jeremiah, as we have pointed out in the previous chapter, still Ezekiel was enough of a realist to see that actual conditions did not bear out the expectations so gloriously held forth in this doctrine. The exiles in Babylonia and those who had fled to Egypt had become no more faithful to Yahveh, had not reformed their social ethics to any extent, did not in any way demonstrate the truth of the doctrine of the new covenant: there was no new heart or new spirit which could gladden the heart of the prophet. He could perceive no change in the nature of these people who had been brought nigh unto death, and still would not hearken unto the word of their God.[6]

Confronted, then, with conditions which contradicted the expectations held forth in the doctrine of the new covenant, but still believing that Yahveh not only would not abandon His people but that He had never <u>intended</u> to destroy them, Ezekiel was forced to formulate a new principle which whould explain this paradox: Israel still existed, and yet Yahveh, the world-god, was, of necessity, a God of absolute righteousness and justice. The answer which Ezekiel advanced to solve

the paradox was his doctrine of "for His name's sake." This doctrine presents the theory that Yahveh, the universal God, is most concerned for His reputation among the nations, whom He desires ultimately to acknowledge His universal power and sovereignty, so that in their eyes, too, He will be regarded as the Lord of all nations. But by what right can He expect them even to consider Him in this light, when even His own people Israel, a little people in a little land, cannot point to His glorious deeds in their behalf? How can it be possible, say the nations, that this god of Israel is in truth the God of the earth, when he cannot demonstrate this by His power and His might, when he cannot deliver the people of Israel from the invader, and cannot prevent their being carried into exile? In the eyes of the nations, far from being a world-god, Yahveh was only a provincial deity who had been defeated when His people was conquered by the Babylonian people and their gods.[7] So if it is true that Yahveh desires more than anything else the eventual recognition of His character as the world-god by the nations, He must demonstrate His power to them, by continuing to treat Israel as His people. For the sake of His reputation among the nations of the world, Yahveh must over-

look His people's disloyalty and faithlessness, must receive them back into His care and prosper them, so that the nations may perceive that He is actually the universal God.[8]

Ezekiel not only explained the contemporary predicament of his people by this doctrine, but he likewise read it back into the history of his people,[9] that history which, he was convinced, was one long tale of perfidy on the part of Israel. From the very beginning, Yahveh had consciously taken this people which, He knew, was faithless, as a means to an end: the acknowledgement of His godship by the nations of the world. And all through the years, whenever Israel had sinned grievously against Him, He refrained from discarding her solely because He desired to be accepted by the nations more than He desired to punish Israel. Every time the people had fallen away from His true worship, and there was ample justification for His casting them away -- it was only through His grace, through His ignoring their faithlessness, that they were permitted to survive.

Ezekiel, then, not only contributed his answer to the paradox which Jeremiah's doctrine of the new covenant presented, in answering the question, "how was it possible for God to continue

to treat Israel as His chosen people," but he likewise was the first to answer the unstated question, "why did God have to choose a people in the first place."[10]

Ezekiel was the first in the prophetic line to offer an idea embodying a purpose behind the choice of Israel by Yahveh. Ezekiel's answer was this: Yahveh was forced to choose a people because he had to begin somewhere. He had to bind a people to Himself so that He might bring other nations to acknowledge Him. Though He was the universal God, the Lord of all the world, He was forced by the nature of man and of his thinking, to adjust His actions and His movements to that nature, since He desired to be acknowledged by man as the supreme Being of the universe. This was the purpose behind His choice of a people. That this people He had chosen was Israel was an obvious fact, for all the peoples acknowledged that Yahveh was at least Israel's god. Why He had chosen Israel, rather than any other people, did not concern Ezekiel.

That Ezekiel's answer was not entirely satisfactory, that it had certain inherent weaknesses and that it ascribed to Yahveh a less than exalted character, need not concern us here, except that we must assume that it was because of those

weaknesses that other answers to Jeremiah's paradox were offered. Theological thinking continued after Ezekiel just because he had offered a solution which was not entirely satisfactory. Yet his answer did set the keynote for other answers and for other interpretations of the concept of the chosen people which will occupy our attention in later chapters of this thesis. Ezekiel's truest note of universalism is that in his attempt to answer the paradox and to discover a purpose behind Yahveh's choice of Israel, he established the need for a clarification of Israel's relationship to the other nations of the world, and of the relationship of those nations to Yahveh the world-god. With a profound perception, he realized that any purpose which might have determined Yahveh's choice of a people would have to be a world-purpose, would have to concern, somehow, the destinies of all the nations, not alone the destiny of Israel. It is obvious, to be sure, that every one of the later interpretations of the concept of the chosen people, Deutero-Isaiah's idea of Israel as the prophet-people of the nations, the nationalistic idea of Israel as ruler of the nations, the characterization of Israel as the servant suffering vicariously for the sins of the nations, and lastly,

the conception of Israel as the priest-people of the nations: every one of these is dependent upon the viewpoint of Ezekiel's answer to the paradox. Ezekiel's contribution to this development which we are tracing was, then, a highly significant one indeed.

CHAPTER VII DEUTERO-ISAIAH

From one viewpoint Deutero-Isaiah did not even admit that there was a paradox involved in Jeremiah's idea of the new covenant, when he accepted wholeheartedly the doctrine that Yahveh's relationship to Israel was an eternal one that could never be broken. For Deutero-Isaiah believed that the exile had served as Israel's atonement for her sins; he believed, indeed, that her punishment was even more stringent than that which she deserved.[1] So Israel has naught to fear for the future. The time has come for her restoration to the land of Palestine, and for her rehabilitation as a people. And as a counterpart to that restoration, the enemies of Israel, especially Babylonia, will be destroyed at the hands of the agent of God, Cyrus, who will also set about the task of fulfilling this promise to Israel. Cyrus, like other great conquerors, does not realize that he is but the agent who follows the directions of the world-god, and yet he is acting in His behalf, and in behalf of His people.[2] Actually, then, Deutero-Isaiah was not concerned as much as was Ezekiel,[3] for instance, with the problem of theodicy involved in Yahveh's forgiveness of Israel. More deeply was he concerned with the problem of the uni-

versal God's relationship to the nations of the world, and of Israel's place in that universal purpose, a problem closely bound up with his attitude towards the concept of the chosen people.

Deutero-Isaiah was the first prophet to carry the universalistic principle to its logical conclusion, by stating (positively) that the gods who were worshipped by the other nations were not actual gods, and that Yahveh alone was God, everlasting, creator of heaven and earth, the Being who directs the course of all human history.[4] One of the proofs which Deutero-Isaiah advances for absolute monotheism is the argument from prophecy.[5] The argument, in brief, is this: none of the other so-called "gods" can have any claim to divinity because they cannot announce from aforehand things not yet accomplished. Yahveh, on the other hand, has been able to do so time after time, and therefore must be acknowledged as the one universal God. (This argument, of course, is a logical expression of Deutero-Isaiah's attitude towards the problem of monotheism and idolatry which is presented in other forms, in the satires, for instance, on the process of the making of idols.) An important point in this whole argument is the role of Israel as the witnesses who bear testimony to Yahveh's divinity. Israel, the servant whom Yahveh has

chosen, is the prophetic witness who attests to His divine character.[6] Israel has been the audience to whom the prophets had spoken the word of Yahveh, the word which could not be matched by the worshippers of other "gods", and therefore Israel, as a people, is entrusted with the duty of bearing witness for Yahveh.

The designation of Israel as the witnesses for Yahveh is a key to the understanding of Deutero-Isaiah's conception of Israel's role in Yahveh's world-purpose. A counterpart to this conception is that of Israel as the נביא, the prophet-people,[7] chosen by Yahveh for the fulfillment of His world-purpose.[8] Just as the prophets had acted for Yahveh to bring the people of Israel back to the paths of righteousness, and to a full realization of His true character, so, in the mind of Deutero-Isaiah, was Israel to bring the message of the universal God to the nations. This was why Yahveh had chosen Israel: to act, as a people, as His servant, His prophet-folk, who would teach the other nations what they had learned of His timelessness, His universal power, His mercy and compassion for man.

The message which Israel was to bring was not only the attestation of His divinity, but likewise the message of His salvation, which reaches from

one end of the earth to the other. His covenant with Israel, new and eternal, was not for Israel alone, but for all the nations, who would be parties to His covenant. This salvation, this forgiveness of all the peoples for their sins against Him, was the message to be carried to mankind by the prophet-people Israel. This was God's world-purpose: that all men might be led to the acknowledgement and worship of Him, so that they might come to follow the paths of righteous living which He has given to His people Israel.[9]

A careful examination of Deutero-Isaiah's writings reveals that, far from envisaging a degraded, persecuted position for Israel among the nations, he actually believed that all of Israel's trials were over, and that Israel, thenceforth, with the constant protection of Yahveh, would be the chosen people, in fact as well as in theory. For Israel's sake, Yahveh is bringing His wrath upon Babylonia, who thought that it was her own might, and not the Lord's, that gave Israel into her hands.[10] Yahveh will make a way for her through the desert for her return to Palestine, even as he guided her through the desert at the time of the Exodus from Egypt.[11] No harm shall come to this people, who shall be protected on every side by the fullness of

Yahveh's power:

> When you pass through the waters
> I shall be with you;
> And through the rivers,
> They shall not flood you.
> When you walk through the fire,
> You shall not be burned;
> Nor shall the flame be kindled on you.[12]

Indeed, so precious in the sight of Yahveh is this people which He has taken for Himself, that He would sacrifice any people, any nation, for her welfare:

> I would give Egypt as your ransom,
> Cush and Seba rather than you.
> Because you are precious in My sight,
> To be prized,
> And because I have loved you,
> Therefore would I give mankind rather than you,
> And peoples to deliver your life.[13]

These are material privileges indeed for the people chosen by the universal God.[14]

Deutero-Isaiah's definition of the place of Israel in the world purpose of God, and his interpretation of the meaning of Israel's choice, was profoundly dependent upon the message of Ezekiel. Ezekiel had set the keyno e, as we have seen, of relating Israel to the nations through Yahveh's relationship to the nations. Because Yahveh wanted more than anything else to retain His reputation among the nations and, indeed, to raise Himself in their estimation, for that very reason, He was obliged

to treat Israel as the nations would conceive of a powerful world-deity's treatment of His own people. In his definition of Israel's type of existence, he gave a reason for that existence. He was the first to see that the universal deity had to be purposeful in His choice of a people; that choice, in his theology, was intended to convince the nations of His Godship.

Deutero-Isaiah accepted with whole heart Ezekiel's basic principles, and added one more which was absolutely necessary for the continued amplification of Israel's role in the world. Not only did he present Yahveh as the world-deity, and a deity who would control the activities of the nations, but he presented Yahveh as the only God of any kind, the only deity who could be regarded as a deity. He brought the universalistic principle to its logical climax: the negation of other deities, and the supremacy and absolute one-ness of deity. This further intensification of universalism, far beyond any absolutism which Ezekiel presented, demanded a refinement of Ezekiel's doctrine of "for His name's sake." We must assume, surely, that Deutero-Isaiah, theologically the most advanced thinker in Israel's prophetic line, perceived the weaknesses of Ezekiel's doctrine; he must have seen that actually the supremacy of Yahveh as the universal deity was negated in Eze-

kiel's doctrine which offered the idea that Yahveh was forced to act according to the misconceptions of the nations. Deutero-Isaiah could not stomach such a puerile characterization of the deity. So the emphasis in his conception of the Yahveh-Israel-nations relationship was shifted. He regarded Israel as the key figure in that relationship, not the nations and their ideas. It was not the nations who forced Yahveh to treat Israel as the chosen people: it was strictly in accordance with Israel's purpose in world-life, a purpose which Yahveh had assigned to her at the very beginning. And it was not His reputation about which Yahveh was concerned, but the acknowledgment of His true character as the only deity Whose way of life would bring forgiveness to the nations for their sins.

It was, then, inconceivable that Yahveh should ever have considered total destruction of His agent -- the prophet-people through whom He would bring forgiveness and truth to the other nations of the world. Punishment He had meted out to Israel, punishment for her own refusal to be faithful to Him, but never a complete repudiation, which would, in effect, be a repudiation of His supreme character, and of His ultimate purpose in choosing Israel.

Beyond all this, Deutero-Isaiah contribu-

ted one important factor to the evolution of the doctrine which we are tracing. He gave that concept its name. His prophetic predecessors, as we have seen, used many terms to express Yahveh's affection and sympathy and love for Israel, but none had given a name to that relationship which would serve as a definition. Deutero-Isaiah did just that: his use of the verb בחר to express Yahveh's choice of Israel.[15] And the significance of offering an enduring expression for that concept is, in a way, ample testimony that Deutero-Isaiah was more conscious in his utilization of that concept than his predecessors. That they had accepted it, that they had based some of their ideas upon it, that they had modified it and developed it from an unconsciously retained hangover from the past to a consciously affirmed principle -- all this we have seen and discussed. And yet, there is something so final and positive about Deutero-Isaiah's usage of that concept, that we believe it is not too homiletic a manner of regarding this matter to say that he actually established this concept in the theology of Israel -- that the expression which he gave to it, aside from being exalted and superbly poetic, was a definitive one, a normative one.

The development of this concept was, however, far from completion. There were other interpretations of the purpose of the choice of Israel, and one reason offered for the choice of Israel rather than of any other people. Yet, just as Jeremiah had established the principle of the new covenant so conclusively that there was never afterwards any question but of its assumption, so Deutero-Isaiah seems so to have established the concept of the choice itself that it becomes an assumption, an accepted doctrine.

CHAPTER VIII THE 516 TEMPLE AND PROSELYTISM

This chapter will differ from the preceding ones in that it will not discuss the theology of any particular prophet and the modifications which that theology wrought on the concept which we are engaged in tracing through Biblical thought. As we inferred at the conclusion of the chapter which directly precedes this one, Deutero-Isaiah seems to have given a definitive statement which established the concept in almost absolute terms. In this chapter we shall trace the amplification of Deutero-Isaiah's concept, not only in the writings of those who followed him, but in certain activities which actually took place. These historical occurences did not change the contours of the concept of the chosen people -- they put that concept into action.[1]

A preface to the building of the Second Temple, its dedication in 516, and the spirit of exalted universalism which prevailed for some time afterwards, was the abortive attempt, in 521, to crown Zerubabel king of Judah. Zechariah and Haggai supported this nationalistic fiasco in the main because they saw in the independence of Judah an opportunity to rebuild the Temple, and to renew

the religious life of the people. They believed that the promise of favor to Judah which had been part of the message of Deutero-Isaiah would be fulfilled in the success of Zerubabel's attempt to throw off the yoke of Persia. They believed that Yahveh would actually help His people attain her true station in international life, her station as His chosen people.[2] Just because Deutero-Isaiah's absolute monotheism had been so completely accepted, it came to be thought that Yahveh, the world-god, could not but give political independence to His people.[3] Zechariah was convinced that a new Temple was necessary for the world-worship of Yahveh; he believed that if Israel had a center for its worship of the world-god, then the nations would indeed come to acknowledge Yahveh as supreme, and worship with Israel at the Temple.[4] This anticipation by Zechariah of the proselyting movement which was to spring up a few years later, is indicative of the whole-hearted acceptance of Ezekiel's doctrine of "for His name's sake" and its modifications in the theology of Deutero-Isaiah, at the very beginning of this period.

Politically, conditions were changed after this fiasco of 521. Not until the time of Nehemiah was a Jew appointed governor for Persia of the Jew-

ish state. But religiously, Persia seems not to have disturbed any of the rights of the people. In fact, Darius followed the tradition established by his Persian predecessors, permitted the Jewish community to begin work upon a new temple shortly thereafter, and consented to have the religious leadership of the people placed in the hands of the chief priest of the sanctuary. This Temple was dedicated on New Year's Day, 516; the effect on the spirit of the little Jewish community was significant.

In the first place, the type of religious self-government which the political conditions implied gave rise to the belief in the theocratic form of government. The chief-priest was regarded as the representative of the deity on earth, since the deity was thought to be present in the Temple only on the New Year's Day, when He came to judge the nations. On the other hand, the fact that there was no Jewish king, and that it therefore appeared that Yahveh did not favor the sovereignty of a human being over His people, gave rise to the belief that Yahveh was King of Israel, and, correspondingly, the universal King.[5] This belief in Yahveh as King of Israel is obviously an outgrowth of the concept of the chosen people, one which takes for granted the doctrine that Yahveh, the

world-god, takes especial care of His people, Israel. Indeed, it can go beyond the concept of the chosen people, only, we must assume, because it is based on a deep-founded conviction in the truth of that concept.

Deutero-Isaiah's message of the conversion of the nations of the earth to the recognition of Yahveh as the world-god, found strong support during this period. Just because the liberal policy of the Persian government towards the religions of the peoples of the various provinces of the empire made it possible for the Temple to be rebuilt, just because Persia seemed again to be acting the part of the agent of Yahveh, the belief was upheld that soon all the kings of the nations would come to acknowledge Yahveh as the supreme deity of the universe, that Jerusalem would be the central sanctuary for all nations, who would come bearing gifts to the Temple.[6] This hope for a conversion of mankind to the worship of Yahveh found a consummate expression in the words of Zechariah, as he surveyed the prospect of the new Temple rising in Jerusalem:

> Thus saith Yahveh Sebaot:
> There shall yet be a time when peoples shall come,
> And the inhabitants of many cities.
> And the inhabitants of one city shall go to another city,

Saying,
Let us go speedily to entreat the favor
of Yahveh
And to seek Yahveh Sebaot.
Let me go, as well.
So many peoples and mighty nations
Shall come to seek Yahveh Sebaot in Jer-
usalem
And to entreat the favor of Yahveh.
Thus saith Yahveh Sebaot:
In those days it shall come to pass
That ten men, speaking the languages of
many nations,
Shall take hold, yes, take hold of the
hem of a Jew,
Saying,
Let us go with you,
For we have heard that God is with you.[7]

There are other expressions of the enthusiastic desire to see the fulfillment of Deutero-Isaiah's vision, and of Ezekiel's doctrine which, likewise, could be fulfilled only in a conversionist movement. I Kings 8:41-43, for instance, expresses the hope that the proselytes will find favor in the sight of Yahveh, so that their prayers, too, will be answered, so that the reputation of Yahveh may not suffer in the sight of the nations.[8] "That this was no vain dream but was actually realized in a significant measure is convincingly attested by Isaiah 56:1-7, a prophesy uttered some years later when, under the influence of a resurgent nationalism, beginning shortly after 500 B.C., the tide began to turn away from a thoroughgoing universalism, and the proselyte began to be regarded with antipathy and distrust. Then it was that the anony-

mous prophet bravely championed the now unpopular cause of the disfranchised proselyte to Judaism and declared it to be Yahveh's will that His house should continue to be called a house of prayer for all the peoples of the earth."[9] This proselyting movement which, incidentally, wrought profound effects on the character of Judaism through the infiltration of foreign ideas[10] was, per se, encouraging evidence for the truth of the cherished and confident belief of the people in the concept of the chosen people. What greater and more convincing sign could a people desire of their favored place in the world scheme than to witness the conversion of folk from far and near to their faith? What more exalted place in history could they attain than to have the nations come to them for the truth which they possessed, and had possessed for a long time. This was indeed the fulfillment of their mission, an indication of the truth of Deutero-Isaiah's perception of Israel's role in history.

Another indication of the confidence which was reposed in the message of Deutero-Isaiah was the widespread hope for world peace. The salvation of which Deutero-Isaiah had spoken could, most certainly, take no more beneficial course than the establishment of peace in the world, and

the abandonment of aggression, war, and world empire-building. Such was the realistic manner in which Deutero-Isaiah's message was applied in this period of universalistic thought. Yet Israel did not lose stature in this expression of universalism -- for the impetus to that peace and international amity would come from Zion, from the people which Yahveh had chosen to be his prophet of truth and righteousness to the nations.[11]

For the most part, the idea of Israel's place in this broad universalism was based upon the concept of the chosen people. In the midst of this enthusiastic expectation that Israel's worship would become a world heritage, Israel was not lost sight of, in the main.[12] On the other hand, some of the utterances of this period reflect a universalism which approaches a negation of Israel's favored position in the world scheme. Malachi 1: 11 is such a prophetic utterance, coming from the period between 500 and 490 B.C.[13] This passage identifies Yahveh with the gods of other nations and, in effect, places no distinction upon Israel for knowing Him more intimately than other nations:

> For from the rising of the sun even unto its going down
> My name is great among the nations;
> And in every sanctuary incense is burned to My name
> And a pure sacrifice is offered.

> For My name is great among the nations,
> Saith Yahveh Sebaot.

Many of the Psalms praising Yahveh as He reveals Himself in natural wonders, and in His treatment of man, or which give poetic expression to the ideals of ethical living, fail to mention Israel at all. An example of this type of utterance is Psalm 8, a glorious paean of praise to God for His universal bounty to man, and a thoughtful consideration of the place of mankind in the universe, where Israel, seemingly, fails to merit specific attention.[14] This trend, of course, was a logical outcome of universalism, a corollary of universalism carried to its extreme limits. As such, it constitutes an unconscious rejection of the concept of the chosen people, a trend which, however, found no great strength or support in the ideas of the following periods.

The events of this period, the last decades of the sixth century, B.C., offered compelling proof to the people of Israel that they actually were the people chosen by Yahveh, the world God, from among all the peoples of the earth.[15] It was possible, from this conviction in their lofty role in Yahveh's world plan, to proceed in two directions of thought. The one, to which we have already referred, was a self-effacing trend of thought which would

have set Israel in the background as the drive towards absolute universalism gathered strength. This trend, ultimately, in a religious and in a political application, would have resulted in the loss of the nationalistic identity of the people of Israel. As we have indicated, this trend did not grow in strength. The other was a nationalistic trend, which was inevitable, and which did gain the adherence of large groups and influential groups of the population. Consider: a people, convinced of its destiny as a leader of nations because it was the agent of the world-God. Events had already verified this conviction. Folk from far and wide were coming to them for the religious truth they possessed. Great empires were acting at the behest of their God, Who controlled the fates of all nations. What more logical philosophy could be achieved than to assume that Israel was destined not only for religious agression and supremacy and imperialism (we have designedly chosen these words to express the idea of "proselytism" because they undoubtedly express the meaning which lived in the minds of many), but also for political agression and supremacy and imperialism after the well-known pattern of earlier world-empires? What more logical reasoning that to expect -

that Yahveh would be their mighty leader in the conquest of the many nations which had not yet acknowledged His godship? So, from the premise of universalism, and the complete acceptance of the concept of the chosen people, did a certain theological philosophy arise, a philosophy which harked back, in effect, to the ideas of a primitive nationalistic religion, magnified and amplified because the whole world was now included in the sphere of thought. We shall now proceed to a fuller discussion of this nationalistic trend, and of its significance for our study.

CHAPTER IX "THE MERIT OF THE FATHERS" AND THE REVIVAL OF NATIONALISM

Two answers had been given to the paradox which presented itself in Jeremiah's doctrine of the new covenant; Ezekiel's doctrine of "for His name's sake" and Deutero-Isaiah's conception of Israel as the prophet-folk carrying the message of salvation to the nations. Neither proved to be entirely satisfactory; indeed, Deutero-Isaiah's answer was not so thorough-going or direct an answer as it might seem at first glance. So another answer was forthcoming, at about the turn of the sixth century into the fifth, an answer which advanced a new interpretation of the past history of the people of Israel, and which had very realistic effects on contemporaneous history and changed the complexion of the Jewish future.

The answer is presented primarily in the writings of J^2 and D^2 authors in this period. Exodus 32:11-14, a passage which includes the presentation of Ezekiel's doctrine of "for His name's sake" as an argument against the total destruction of Israel, also presents this third answer. It is the doctrine of "the merit of the fathers,"[1] and its reasoning is this: how can Yahveh intend

to destroy Israel when He had given His word, a word to be eternally effective, to the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that as the reward for their piety He would multiply their seed and prosper them and settle them in the land of Palestine. The writer agrees that Israel has no merit, that Yahveh would be fully justified in casting them off from His protection and favor, as Ezekiel had thought, but unlike Deutero-Isaiah who believed that Israel had been punished sufficiently, indeed more than enough, in exile. Nevertheless, He cannot reject Israel, whatever HER conduct -- He must continue to treat her as the chosen people, because He had made a covenant with the faithful fathers. This acknowledgement of Israel's lack of merit is likewise made in another one of the primary passages presenting this doctrine, Deuteronomy 9:1-6, where Israel is bidden to realize that it is not because of her own righteousness that she is to be brought into Palest ne, but partly because of the iniquity of the other peoples of the land, and partly, also, because Yahveh must fulfill the promise which He made to the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Again, Deuteronomy 9:25-29 insists that although Israel is a stubborn, unregenerate people, both for the sake of His reputation

among the nations, particularly Egypt, and because of the faithfulness of the patriarchs, He must not reject His people. II Kings 13:23, in a rapid generalization of Israelitish history, explains that Yahveh had never cast Israel off, but always had treated her with consideration because of this covenant with the patriarchs. Psalm 105:7-11 refers to this same covenant as the fundamental basis of Yahveh's treatment of Israel throughout the ages; Micah 7:20 asks for Yahveh's favor to Israel, the favor which He had promised to the patriarchs. Isaiah 51:2 refers to this promise as accomplished already, although the type of expression indicates that this verse is but an off-hand reference to the doctrine.

Now the pre-exilic prophets had never referred to a covenant with the patriarchs. For them, Yahveh had taken Israel to be His people in the desert, after the Exodus from Egypt and there had made His covenant with them. Obviously two covenants could not exist side by side: the idea of a mutually obligating covenant with an entire people, which could be severed because of the disloyalty and faithlessness of either party, is of course incompatible with the idea of a covenant in the nature of a promise, not to the whole people, but only to

certain individuals, as a reward for their faithfulness. Had the idea of the patriarchal promise or covenant existed in pre-exilic Israel, there could have been no possible reason for the prophets to believe that Yahveh would break that promise, for there was no obligation of faithfulness placed upon Israel in the promise-motif. Had this idea existed in the time of Jeremiah, that prophet's doctrine of the new covenant would have been superfluous, and Ezekiel would likewise have had no cause to announce his doctrine of "for His name's sake." So it is obvious that this was something new, something different, which could arise only in answer to the paradox already discussed; and likewise not until Deutero-Isaiah had announced his idea of universal salvation, as we shall see.

Since there had been no idea of such a promise previous to this time, that promise had to be read back into the history of Israel, and this is exactly what was done by the school of J^2 writers. We shall now examine this doctrine as presented in the actual narrative penned by those writers, examine it closely enough to be able to perceive each separate idea embodied in the doctrine as a whole.[2]

Abraham figures in the J^2 narrative as the prototype of Israel. This is the motif into which is woven the promise by Yahveh, made to him as a symbol of his posterity. The promise was made to him as a reward (15:1) for his faithfulness to Yahveh. Abraham had hearkened to Him (26:5); had believed in this promise, and this too was accounted to him for righteousness (15:6). Abraham, too, had even been willing to sacrifice his son at the bidding of Yahveh (22:18). This faithfulness and loyalty earned merit for Abraham in the sight of Yahveh.

The promise to Abraham embodies these various aspects:

1) A great nation would descend from Abraham (12:2;18:19), and exceedingly numerous people, numerous as the stars of the heavens, as the sand of the sea, and as the dust of the earth (13:16; 15:5; 22:17 -- cf. I Kings 3:8 and II Chronicles 1:9).

2) Abraham's posterity would be blessed by Yahveh (12:2; 22:17) as Abraham himself was blessed in fulfillment of Yahveh's promise to him (12:2; 22:17; 24:1; 35: 1f).

3) This nation descended from his loins would be safeguarded by the favour of Yahveh. Those nations

that treated her well, would receive blessing in return; those that treated her with enmity would receive punishment (12:3 -- cf. Numbers 24:9b). She would possess the gates of her enemies because Yahveh had blessed her and her efforts (22:17).[3]

4) Through this progeny, this great nation descended from Abraham, all of the families of the earth would be blessed (12:3; 18:18; 22:18).[4]

Isaac, patriarch and son of a patriarch, is at best a shadowy figure in the whole composite narrative. But he, too, is the recipient of the blessing which Yahveh had given to his father. Unlike his father, however, it is not on account of his own faithfulness to Yahveh that his seed is to be blessed. In both passages which convey the promise (26:3-5, and 24) it is expressly stated that the promise is continued with Isaac because of Abraham's faithfulness to Him.[5]

Jacob, too, is the recipient of this promise, Jacob whose original name and later name Israel were used to symbolize his people. The blessing which he receives from Esau contains a phrase (27:29b) similar to one in the blessing which Abraham received (12:3). The major passage

(28:13-15) in the pattern of "the merit of the fathers" contains two of the other three major elements of the Abraham promise: his posterity would be as numerous as the dust of the earth (and as the sand of the sea, 32:13); and the families of the earth would be blessed through him and his seed. This passage adds one provocative thought to the pattern (28:14): not that the gates of the enemies would be taken, or that punishment would be meted out by Yahveh to those who curse Israel, but that Israel would spread out her boundaries in all four directions.

This answer to the paradox, then, not only explains why Yahveh would not repudiate Israel, not only explains why He is forced to continue to treat Israel as His people, no matter how they might act, but also directs the conception of Israel's place among the nations into new channels. It gives a theological basis for nationalist hopes and aspirations, which, as we shall see, were very real.

But first we must discuss the significance of this doctrine of "the merit of the fathers" for the development which is our primary consideration. This doctrine gave a new interpretation to the concept of the chosen people. In the first place

it explained, for the first time in Biblical writing, why Yahveh had chosen Israel to be His people. None of the preceding writers and prophets who had given of their spirit to the establishment OF THIS CONCEPT had, it appears, been concerned with the problem of the original basis for the choice. They had not concerned themselves with finding an answer to the question: Why had Yahveh chosen Israel rather than any other people? The doctrine of "the merit of the fathers", in a new treatment of the early history of Israel, offered the theory that Yahveh had been so gratified by the faithfulness and loyalty of the patriarchs, primarily that of Abraham, that He had determined to treat their descendants with favor, as a reward. It is implied, then, that this universal God had appeared to other individuals at various times in history, but that they had been unwilling or unable to follow Him and His word and His way, much as the rabbis later conceived of Yahveh as having offered the Torah to many nations which refused, however, to accept it, before He finally offered it to Israel. Yahveh did not just pick Israel by accident, or choose her because she was an oppressed people -- there were many such peoples; nor because she was a great and numerous people -- indeed, she was a very small,

negligible folk;[6] He chose her because He wanted to display His appreciation for the faith the patriarchs had placed in Him. And that reward was a reward fully in consonance with His greatness and glory and power and love -- it was an eternally-abiding promise to measure out glory and honor and distinction to Israel, the descendents of those who had believed in Him.

In the second place, this doctrine set a new type of purpose in the background of the choice. Although, as we have seen, Deutero-Isaiah's doctrine of salvation was basic to this doctrine, inherent in the blessing which the descendants of Abraham would bring to the nations, actually that idea of the blessing and salvation was conventionalized by this time, not vital and living and moving as it had been in Deutero-Isaiah's thoughts. So, despite the fact that there was this tenuous relationship to the purpose which Deutero-Isaiah had seen in Israel's choice, actually the purpose which these writers perceived in Israel's choice was very different. It was Israel-centered, rather than Yahveh-centered. Ezekiel had seen Israel's place in the world as serving the glory of God; Deutero-Isaiah had envisioned a world of nations which, one and all, would acknowledge Yahveh, and

follow His way of life. Now these J^2 and D^2 writers looked to the world, too, but to a world which would be subservient to Israel. Israel, as the chosen one of God, was to be chief among nations, the great world political center which Assyria and Babylon and Persia had been. Israel was to be, politically and socially, the chosen people. The purpose, then, or the effect, of the choice of Israel, was world domination.[7]

World domination! This, indeed, was an idea expressive of their confidence in the concept of the chosen people. And yet, it was not so foolhardy a hope, if we grant the premise, which they accepted so whole-heartedly, that the world-God had chosen Israel to be His people, that He, as world-God, could accomplish anything in the realm of His universe, and that He had promised this to those patriarchs whom He had loved so deeply. It is indeed significant that the fundamental premise for this idea was the promise to the patriarchs, and not the past military achievements of the armies of Israel. One would have expected, in a completely realistic program, a harking back to the deeds of valor performed by the armies of David, or one of his sucessors who were able to increase the territory of Israel through warfare. But this was pri-

marily a theological movement, rather than primarily a political one, and disastrously so, as we shall see. Its theological logic was perfect, but it had no substance whatever, nor any possibility of realization.

The first pronouncement of this hope for world empire had been made by the prophet Haggai in 521 as he anticipated the success of Zerubabel's revolution against the Persian power:

> And the word of Yahveh came a second time
> to Haggai on the twenty-fourth of the
> month, saying:
> Say to Zerubabel, the peḥah of Judah, saying:
> I shall shake the heavens and the earth;
> And I shall overturn the throne of kingdoms;
> And I shall destroy the power of the
> kingdoms of the nations;
> And I shall overturn the chariots and
> their riders;
> Horses and their riders shall go down;
> Each man (shall fall) by the sword of
> his brother.
> On that day, saith Yahveh Sebaot,
> I shall take you, Zerubabel ben Shealtiel,
> my servant,
> Saith Yahveh,
> And I shall make you as a signet-ring;
> For you have I chosen,
> Saith Yahveh Sebaot. [8]

That Zerubabel's coup did not succeed, and that political independence was not forthcoming, seems not to have deterred certain sections of the population from continued hopes in this direction. A very significant feature of Haggai's words is the fact that Israel is to achieve her military and

political supremacy in a period of international upheaval, when kingdoms are falling and royal houses are overthrown. This international confusion had been present in the two years previous to the attempt of Zerubabel to seize the throne: Cambyses had died, the Egyptians had revolted and gained their independence, and a struggle for Persia's royal throne was in the process of settlement. Just at the time of the rebellion, however, Darius ascended the throne, and order was restored. The timing had been a little off schedule. But the strategy was well founded, and the nationalists remembered Haggai's words: the next time there was international chaos was in 486-5 B.C., when the same pattern was followed, as we shall see. Haggai's words were not the only ones they remembered; the promise of the eternal covenant with the Davidic house, which we have already commented upon, also acted as a bolster to the nationalist confidence in the political destiny of the people of Israel.

Speaking in terms with which we of today are all too familiar, there seems to have been a consistent and persistent campaign of propaganda on the part of the nationalistically-minded, from about 500 B.C.. on for a decade and a half, de-

signed to impress upon the entire people the belief that Yahveh had destined the people of Israel for military and political supremacy, that Israel would supplant Persia in the international scene with Yahveh as their bulwark of strength and power and victory. One part of this propaganda drive has already been revealed: the interpretation of the early history of Israel in terms of the doctrine of זכות אבות , "the merit of the fathers", which set forth the theory that Israel would become a great and mighty nation because Yahveh had promised this to the patriarchs.

Another part of this campaign of words and ideas is embodied in the Deuteronomic war-legislation, dating from this period.[9] The underlying idea of this legislation is that Israel will have an easy time in battle, because Yahveh will always be fighting for her. Yahveh will be the deciding factor in her battles. And because Israel may rely upon Him, she may indulge in very un-military-like practices. Any man newly-married may return home to his wife. A man who has built a new home within the year, or has planted a vineyard but not yet used its fruit -- he, too, is free to depart from the army. Or a coward who has no stomach for war may depart freely. This outlandish way of acting

when blood and death and destruction in war are close at hand is not, as Dr. Morgenstern has pointed out in class lectures, motivated by an anti-militaristic ethic, but by purely theological considerations, by the superhuman confidence which the writers of these passages had in Yahveh and in His ability to win battles for Israel. The expectation revealed in these laws is, they that victory will come without the usual hardship involved in war and aggression.[10]

There are several parallels both in spirit and in specific word to this war-legislation of Deuteronomy 20-21 in the first eleven chapters of the book of Joshua, the chapters which trace the story of the rapid conquest of Palestine by the armies of Israel under Joshua's command. The major contention of the Deuteronomic legislation was, as we have seen, that Israel could not fail in military endeavor because Yahveh would always fight for them and with them. The whole attitude of the book of Joshua, that the conquest of Palestine proved an easy task, seems to be predicated upon the same assumption.[11] One of the more important provisions of the Deuteronomic legislation is that if a city that is about to be beseiged is willing to surrender, then they shall become a tributary people and serve

as menials in Israel. The story of the men of Gibeon illustrates this legislation: since they have come offering to make a covenant and Joshua makes *pide* with them, they cannot be attacked even when their perfidy is discovered, but must become menial laborers, "hewers of wood and drawers of water for the congregation of Israel."[12] The provision that a city which does not offer peace must be destroyed is expressly referred to: "there was not a city which offered to make peace with the children of Israel except for the Hivites, the inhabitants of Gibeon; they took all in battle. For it was from Yahveh to harden their heart, to meet battle with Israel, so that they might be destroyed; that they might have no favor whatever, but that they might be destroyed, as Yahveh commanded Moses."[13] It is our belief that a Deuteronomic edition of the book of Joshua was circulated at this time, as another part of the propaganda campaign designed to stimulate support for this nationalistic philosophy. Although this is an extremely difficult thesis to prove conclusively, partly because the points of reference between the legislation in Deuteronomy and Joshua are so few, it is rendered more tenable by the realization that this was the only time in the post-exilic period that such a spirit was rife, and

that the Book of Joshua, more than any other book in the Bible fits so perfectly into the spirit of the war legislation.[14] If we are correct, then, in fitting this edition of Joshua into this nationalist trend,[15] it must be apparent how powerful a weapon it was to quiet opposition. Here was absolute proof of the efficacy of the Deuteronomic war-legislation, and, in addition, proof of the truth of the belief that Yahveh fights for Israel. An object lesson from history could serve better than all the talk in the world!

This propaganda campaign[16] was not the only force which impelled Israel towards her bid for power in the arena of world politics. As Dr. Morgenstern has pointed out, in class lectures, the defeat of Persia by the Athenians at the Battle of Marathon in 490 was convincing proof of the belief already held by the leaders of the nationalistic faction in Israel that Persia was not invincible. The defeat alone would have been significant, but the fact that Athens was so a small state, comparable in size to Judah at this time, gave even greater cause for hopes among the Judeans. Certainly, they must have thought if Athens could accomplish this, without the help of Yahveh, how much easier would it be for Judah to do the same thing, with even more disastrous results for Persia, with Yah-

veh's aid, and under His leadership, as He had promised to the patriarchs!

Darius died in 486-5. The setting was perfect. Internal disorders could well be expected, attendant upon the usual struggle by claimants to the royal throne. A Davidic pretender to the throne of Judah, Menachem by name, began negotiations with Tyre to form an alliance; this attempt to gain outside help fell through. He was, nevertheless, crowned king, by his supporters. Several sallies seem to have been made into neighboring kingdoms, seemingly to test their power. Persia, too busy with her own more important matters to attend to this minor rebellion, suggested to Judah's neighbors, Edom, Moab, Ammon, Tyre, Philistia, that they settle this matter for themselves, although Persia appears to have rendered some military assistance. Judah was invaded, her armies fell; Menachem seems to have met a sorrowful death, the walls OF JERUSALEM and the Temple were burned, and thousands upon thousands of the inhabitants of Judah were sold into slavery throughout the slave markets of the Mediterranean basin by the Tyrian slave-dealers. The land was left thoroughly devastated and depopulated; and only a few meager groups of inhabitants were left behind, to survey the fate of a small nation which dared to challenge

the power of a great empire.[17]

Thus were the militaristic, imperialistic expectations of the nationalist clique rudely shattered. They had thought that Menachem would in truth find success in his ventures, that his dominions would spread from sea to sea, that he would be the recipient of gifts from the many nations who would serve him.[18] But disaster and death were the only dominions which these nationalists achieved. Obviously this was a shattering blow, not only to those specific hopes, but to the whole theological realm of the thinking of Israel. Innumerable questions crowded in upon the minds of those who survived, those who had to live on the same land which had faced the future so optimistically. Where was their God? Why had the promise to the patriarchs not been kept? How could He so desert Israel in their hour of need and permit them so to be shamed in the sight of the nations? How, now, could they conceive of Israel's place among the nations? How could they still be considered the chosen people?

CHAPTER X REACTIONS TO THE DISASTER OF 486-5

The havoc which the coalition of neighboring countries wrought upon the physical being of Israel, the land and the people, found its counterpart in the spiritual havoc wrought upon their minds and hearts. There was no one consistent reaction to this disaster; from every quarter came an explanation of why it had taken place, or a different interpretation of its significance. The author of Isaiah 59, for instance, lays the blame upon Israel, asserting that the people had again provoked Yahveh to punish them for their perfidy against Him, for their rampant sinfulness and their ethical iniquity; it was not Yahveh who had deserted Israel, but Israel who had deserted Yahveh. Other writers were not so quick to advance any reasons; they felt helpless in the face of this overwhelming tragedy, and just cried out to Yahveh to show Himself before them. They would not, in the midst of this suffering, abandon their belief in Him, but why, why had He permitted their land to be over-run and their sons sold AS SLAVES ? Here they were like sheep at the place of slaughtering. Would He not rise again to do mighty things for them as of old?[1] These and many other reactions were manifest as the people who

thought and wrote contemplated the devastation of their people and land. None of these reactions questioned the truth of the conviction, now firmly established in the philosophy of Israel and basic to all of the thinking of Israel, that Israel was the chosen people of God, chosen eternally. No one advanced the theory that God had abandoned His people permanently, annulling the relationship which He had established. All of their thinking was in terms of reconciling the physical fact of the disaster with their conviction in Jeremiah's doctrine of the new covenant and in the concept of the chosen people. And out of this thinking there came ideas which will concern us in this chapter, ideas which reinterpret and at the same time reaffirm the concept which we are tracing through Biblical thought.

The anonymous writer who penned the so-called "songs of the suffering servant" which are inserted into the writings of Deutero-Isaiah, his spiritual master, advanced a very significant theory of the disaster. Adhering firmly to Deutero-Isaiah's doctrine of Israel as the chosen servant of God, the prophet-people whose mission it was to bring the way of godly living to the nations and thus to achieve salvation for the entire human

race, he refused to admit that the disaster constituted a demonstration of the falseness of Deutero-Isaiah's doctrine. Instead, he reinterpreted that doctrine to fit these new conditions. Israel, to him, is still the chosen prophet-people. But now she has become a suffering prophet-people, oppressed and persecuted, despised and trampled upon by the nations. This suffering, however, is essential to her mission, part and parcel of the purpose for which she was chosen. Her suffering and her agony and her misery are part of Yahveh's world plan; they are not the cruelty cast upon her by a purposeless world fate. Nor is this suffering the result of her own sins; it is not her punishment for faithlessness to Yahveh. It is the punishment of the nations for their manifold sins and transgressions, which Israel bears, for the greater glory of God. Israel, the light of the nations, the exponent of righteousness and faith, is carrying on her mission to the nations by bearing their punishment and eventually the nations must realize this and acknowledge the error of their ways and come to perceive the greatness of Israel and of God. This is the doctrine of vicarious atonement, which became so essential to Christian thought, though Judaism, in normative formulation, eventually

discarded it.[2]

This doctrine presented by one who might be designated a Trito-Isaiah was an extreme in universalism which has never since been equalled. So to see in Israel's suffering the ultimate salvation of mankind, so to sublimate the natural inclination of a people to strive for its own comfort and safety and political exaltation, so to consider the future of the other nations before the present of one's own people--this was indeed a height to be achieved, albeit one too rarified for life and survival. And yet even in this exalted stage of self-abnegation and altruism, this Trito-Isaiah found a place for Israel as the chosen people, chosen not for glory as the nationalists had believed but for suffering and poverty and disgrace. So this thinker added another aspect to the picture of Israel as the prophet-people which Deutero-Isaiah had depicted for all time.

One reaction to the disaster which we could fully expect was the reaction of rage and anger, the reaction which called imprecations down upon the invaders and destroyers, and begged God to take revenge upon these nations for their cruelty to Israel. Biblical literature is shot through and through with passages which reflect this reaction.

One of the most horrible appeals for revenge was against Edom which seems to have been a primary leader of the coalition:

> Remember, O Yahveh, against the children
> of Edom,
> The (Battle-) Day of Jerusalem;
> Those who said,
> "Rase it, rase it,
> To its very foundations."
> O satellite of Babylon (Persia),
> Destroyed, (once before):
> Happy shall He be
> Who will pay you back your deserts
> As you have treated us.
> Happy shall He be
> Who seizes and dashes against the rock
> Your children.[3]

Psalm 83, which lists the various members of the coalition, calls upon God to rise from His peacefulness, to take revenge upon those nations which have sought to cut Israel's name off from the tablet of nations:

> O my God, make them like the whirling
> dust;
> As stubble before the wind.
> As the fire that burns the forest,
> As the flame that sets the mountains
> afire.
> So pursue them with your tempest,
> And set them atrembling with your storm.
> Fill their faces with shame.....[4]

Those who cleaved to the imperialist hope were confident that Yahveh would soon take up His sword and reclaim Israel from the nations:

> See, now, that I, yea I, am He,
> And there is no god with me;
> I kill and I make live;
> I have wounded and I shall heal;
> And there is none that can deliver from
> my hand.

For I lift up my hand to heaven
And say, as I live forever,
I shall surely sharpen my glittering
sword
And my hand take hold of judgment,
I shall take revenge upon my enemies,
And I shall pay back those that hate me.
I will make my arrows drunk with blood,
And my sword will devour flesh;
With the blood of the fallen and the cap-
tives,
From the long-haired heads of the enemy.5

Actually then, despite the suffering and death and destruction that had been visited upon them, despite the physical facts that proved the impossibility of their accession to world supremacy, certain groups of the population would not abandon their belief in the program of the nationalists. Their appeals to Yahveh for revenge upon the nations that made up the coalition betray their adherence to the belief that because He had chosen them to be His people, He had thereby destined them to be a ruler of nations. The concept of the chosen people had been imbedded deep in their consciousness, and so long as they could not divorce that concept from the ideas of their time, they could not abandon their faith in their own destiny. Those whose ideas were in tune with universalism, like the author of the songs of the suffering servant, could spiritualize that concept so that there was no contradiction between it and the physical realities which surrounded them. But the very

people who believed in that concept of the choice so firmly that they could set out on a hopelessly unrealistic program for world hegemony, could not spiritualize the concept in that way. So long as they believed that Yahveh had chosen them to be His people, so long had they to follow the idea to its logical (for them) conclusions. It was an inescapable sequitur for them: chosen people = physical and political supremacy. They could say in answer to the facts of 485 only that Yahveh had not yet taken His stand, that the nations had disobeyed Him, that one day soon, it would be obvious what His plan for Israel was to be.

So they hoped for revenge. And that revenge did come--soon and disastrously, in two ways. The first is described eloquently in Psalm 48:

> For, behold, the kings assembled themselves,
> They passed over together.
> They saw, and at the same time were amazed,
> They were affrighted, they trembled.
> Fright seized hold of them there,
> Pangs, as of a woman in childbirth.
> With an east wind didst Thou shatter the
> ships of Tarshish.[6]

In 480 B.C. the armies of Xerxes and those of his subject-states crossed the Hellespont as the prelude to another invasion of Greece. Just before the Battle of Artemesium, a severe storm arose which destroyed large sections of the Persian navy, which

lay at anchor along the coast of Magnesia, with a terrible loss of life and equipment. A large number of those who sailed THE SHIPS were Phoenicians; and contingents of Ammonites and Edomites and Philistines must have been among the armies which had been transported across the Hellespont; and it is not difficult to see why, as in this fragment of what must have been a longer poem, the survivors of the disaster of 485 in Judah rejoiced over the revenge which their God had taken upon His enemies. The battles which followed likewise brought death and disaster to the armies of the Persians and their satellites, additional cause for the rejoicing of Judah. So the inhabitants of Judah felt that in the decimation of the populations of her enemies, in the failure f the schemes of Persia to rule the whole world, Yahveh was at last showing His hand in history; their hopes had not been in vain -- the nations could not for long oppose His world-plans. Israel was the chosen people!

The other reflection of the answer to their prayers for revenge which they saw in world events was in the invasion of Edom by the Nabataean hosts from the Arabian desert. For some time these nomads had been pressing in upon the peripheral states of Palestine, gradually pushing them towards Judah. But now that the Edomites and the others had been

forced to send quotas of their soldiers to fight with the Persians, many of whom undoubtedly did not return, and these states were weakened immeasurably, the Nabateans and other kindred Arab nomads fell to with a vengeance that seemed to come from Yahveh. Malachi 1:1-6, Isaiah 63:1-6 and Ezekiel 25 are dramatic expressions of this belief that the invasion and destruction of Edom were the vengeance of Yahveh for the destruction of Jerusalem. Yahveh is pictured as a God of might who takes His own revenge and satisfies His own anger, Yahveh striding forth in blood-stained garments from a blood-bath in Bozrah. So Judah felt reassured that her God was still the universal God whose dominion reached to the ends of the earth; and likewise that Yahveh was taking vengeance not only for the affront to His own dignity but also for the affront to His people. These events were proof to the nations that He had chosen Israel, that Israel was His people:

> Thus saith Yahveh (to Ammon):
> Because you clapped your hand
> And stamped your feet,
> And rejoiced with all the disdain of your soul
> Against the land of Israel,
> Therefore, behold, I stretch out my hand against you,
> And give you for a spoil to the nations
> .....
> And you shall know that I am Yahveh.
> Thus saith Yahveh:
> Because Moab and Seir say:
> Behold the house of Judah is the same as all the nations,
> Therefore I open up the flank of Moab.
> .....

Thus saith Yahveh:
Because Edom hath dealt against the house
of Judah
With spite
And hath greatly offended
And taken vengeance,
Therefore.....I will make her desolate.[7]

So, because the Judeans were confident that Yahveh had taken vengeance upon Persia and upon Judah's neighbors,[8] a new feeling of security arose, a feeling of confidence that the exiles who had been sold in the slave markets of the world would soon be returned, that the very nations which had so despised Israel would soon voluntarily submit to Israel's domination of the world, without the need of any military conquest. In Yahveh's taking revenge upon Persia and the coalition, they would see their own doom and come to acknowledge Him. So these nations would come to Israel to serve her, and to become menials in the service of Yahveh. Isaiah 60-61, written probably about 457,[9] the work of another Trito-Isaiah, reveal this increasing sense of reliance upon Yahveh to bring wealth and power to Israel. In a way, this whole adherence to the notion that that choice implied a physical supremacy, was a conscious rejection of the idea of Israel as a suffering servant for the nations:

Whereas you were like a deserted woman,
Hated and solitary,
I will make you an eternal excellence,
A joy for the many generations.[10]

So, likewise, the implications of the doctrine of "the merit of the fathers" were not abandoned. Although the military part of that picture had been obliterated, since it was obvious that Israel could never gain supremacy that way, the promise to the patriarchs was still held fast to, by those who persisted in hoping that Israel would become a dominant political power.[11]

The one consistent characteristic of these various reactions to the destruction of Jerusalem in 485, as we have noted, was the adherence to Jeremiah's doctrine of the new covenant. Although very different interpretations were placed upon the cause of the disaster, and different ideas came in its wake, none can be thought of as in any way independent of that doctrine which Jeremiah propounded, and of its corollary, the concept of the chosen people. Whether the writers of this period chose to see in the disaster a sign of Israel's choice for suffering, or merely a postponement of Israel's domination of the nations, basically they all reaffirmed the doctrine that Yahveh had chosen Israel to be His people forever, and that He would never repudiate her, but, in His own wisdom and in His own time, would use her as His agent and instrument in achieving His aims and His purposes. As we shall

see, the concept of the chosen people continued to be fundamental to every new theological and philosophical movement in Biblical thought. Whatever the interpretation of Israel's place among the nations, whatever the interpretation of Israel's relationship to Yahveh, this thought was basic: that Yahveh, the God of the universe and the Lord of the nations, had chosen Israel to be His own people. The disaster of 485, terrible and catastrophic though it was, could not dislodge this faith from the minds and hearts of the people of Israel.

CHAPTER XI EZRA AND NEHEMIAH, AND THE IMPACT OF PARTICULARISM.[1]

When Ezra returned to Palestine in 458 B.C., as the unofficial emissary of the Babylonian Jewish community, and the official agent of the Persian government appointed to supervise the task of rebuilding the Temple in Jerusalem, one of the tasks which he took upon himself was the reinstitution of the Zadokite priesthood in the Temple, and another unadvertised task was the introduction of the survival institutions which had been evolved in the Babylonian Jewish community, into the life of the Palestinian Jews. The major survival institutions which made Judaism in the Babylonian exile an exclusivistic, particularistic religion, were, in brief, abstinence from intermarriage, circumcision, the dietary taboos, and the celebration of the Sabbath and festivals.

This separatistic philosophy of Jewish life which had enabled the Jewish community in Babylonia to survive through the more than a century long exile, was, in one way, the epitomization of the concept of the chosen people. Just as the militaristic program of 500-485 B.C., had been a result of carrying this concept to its logical conclusions

in one direction, so was this particularistic program a logical derivative of that concept. For if Yahveh had chosen Israel to be His own people, then He had rejected all other peoples. They were outside the limits of His relationship with men; they were excluded from any contact with Him. So the authors of the D4 strata in Deuteronomy conceived of Yahveh as having ordered the total destruction, final and complete, of the seven nations which dwelled in Canaan previous to the Israelitish invasion.[2] Logically, they should have been totally destroyed: they were idolators, outside the realm of the truth. There was no reason why they should have been permitted to survive side by side with Israel. This conception of the total destruction of the seven nations was a natural concomitant of Ezra's program and that of his successor, Nehemiah. So, too, aliens, who were not the chosen people and could therefore have no relationship to Yahveh were forbidden to enter the Temple, under any circumstances. The suggestions which Ezra brought back for the conduct of the Temple ritual, contained in the late chapters of the book of Ezekiel, include this prohibition of aliens in the Temple.[3] Logically, then, from one viewpoint, this exclusivism which characterized the attitude of Ezra and Nehemiah was an out-

growth of the concept of the chosen people.

On the other hand, in actual practice, this exclusivism consituted a negation of all that had been woven into the concept of the chosen people throughout the previous centuries. For the concept of the chosen people becomes a living reality only when coupled with a universalistic religious outlook. If, in practice, God has no relations with other peoples, and prohibits His people from having any relationship with them, then He becomes, pure and simple, the God of that people, a national God. All the previous theological movements had given to this concept their own flavor, but each proceeded from the basis of universalism, and each had something, too, of the missionary outlook. If the worship of God, the universal God, be true, then what more natural inclination than to propagandize, to bring that truth to the other nations, and so render homage, in truth, to the world-God. So Ezekiel had seen the actions of God in the light of His desire to have the nations acknowledge Him as supreme; and Deutero-Isaiah had characterized Israel's whole raison d'etre in history as a continuing mission to the nations in His behalf; so the prophets and singers of the universalistic age had hoped for the conversion of many nations to His worship; and so, even the nationalists

had intended to force conversion upon the nations which they hoped to overcome in their imperialistic agression. But now Ezra and his school denied that the other peoples had any relations with Him, denied that He had chosen Israel for any purpose other than to worship Him, and so acted as though He had chosen them to keep themselves aloof from the nations. The concept of the chosen people lost its significance in an age like this; we can expect no specific light to be thrown upon its development in the age which produced the Samaritan schism.[4]

This attitude which defines Yahveh, in action, as Israel's god, is reflected in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. In Ezra 7:27-28, normally designated a part of Ezra's biography, Ezra blesses Yahveh for influencing the ruler of Persia to look favorable upon the needs of Palestinian Jewry, and to give him permission to rebuild the Temple. It is only when Israel contacts the other peoples that Yahveh has any interest whatever in them. His concern is for His people -- not for all the peoples, and certainly not to influence them so that they may acknowledge Him as the supreme deity of the world. Ezra 8:21-23 tells of an interesting episode:

the fast which Ezra and his band observed at the river Ahava, before setting out on their journey to Palestine. This fast was proclaimed to emphasize the plea which they made to Yahveh for a safe journey. Ordinarily, it is STATED, Ezra would have asked the king for a troop of soldiers to guard the travelers, but he had already committed Yahveh to their safe-guarding by telling the king that "the hand of our God is upon those who seek Him, for good." The spirit of this passage is an extremely narrow one, compared with the utterances of any of the previous leaders of thought: Yahveh, it is true, is not limited to Palestine; He is the god of the Jews wherever they are; but He is only the god of the Jews -- "our God", not the God who moves heaven and earth, who directs the destiny of nations, who desires earnestly that the nations may come to accept His way of life.

The memoirs of Nehemiah, who forced through the new marriage program, with which Ezra had been unsuccessful, who inaugurated the institution of חרם, and who set into motion the events which brought on the Samaritan schism, reflect this same attitude, even carrying it one step further. Not only is Yahveh the god of Israel, but He is Nehemiah's special god, the god to whom he appeals for recognition for

his work in Jerusalem,[5] the god to whom he appeals for revenge against his enemies[6] and against the foreigners who mock his work.[7] This god is a warrior god, also, who fights with his people in defending their city, much like the warrior god whom the nationalists had believed would guide them to world-conquest.[8] This god is good to him, Nehemiah, perspnally, as well as to his people Israel.[9] Indeed, this god of Nehemiah's instructs him to collect the genealogies and census, much as Moses was so instructed.[10] Nehemiah was an organizer, and a fanatical believer in principles into which he had been born and which, so far as he was concerned, represented the only true form of the religion of Yahveh. His was not a prophetic spirit achieved in moments of ecstasy and fervor wherein he felt the call of Yahveh within himself. The words of Yahveh did not burn within him like a fire that could not be quenched but must burst forth from the confines of one man, nor was it like a flaming coal that touched his mouth and made him a spokesman for Yahveh. The indications of his intimate relationship with the deity do not stem from the call of God to prophet; nor are they symbolic, in this writer's opinion, of a personalized type of religious expression, like the writings of the author of Job.

To the contrary, all of these references to Yahveh's nearness to Nehemiah are a reflection of his own conception of the deity. Though He might be, abstractly, the Lord of the Universe,[11] in action, so far as Nehemiah reveals himself, He is interested only in the Jewish people, and not only that, but He is primarily interested in Nehemiah and in his particularistic ideas and program, because they are, according to Nehemiah, Yahveh's own ideas and program too.

Such attitudes as these could never have arisen once the principles of universalistic religion had been proclaimed, had it not been for the establishment of the concept of the chosen people. Ezra and Nehemiah and their followers would have had to negate universalism in principle, as they did in action, had the long line of development which we have traced not made this concept an integral part of the thinking of Israel.

The exponents of this particularistic philosophy took the results of previous thinkers and used them to their own ends. Psalm 106, a typical expression dating from the period 458-444 B.C.,[12] which gives no indication of Yahveh's character as the universal deity, and implies that His only interest is in His people Israel, contains a reference to

Ezekiel's doctrine of "for His name's sake," but in so conventional and so loose a fashion, that one would never feel that there had been a universalistic import to that doctrine as originally conceived by Ezekiel and developed by later writers:

> Our fathers in Egypt gave no heed to
> your wonders;
> They remembered not the multitude of your
> mercies;
> But rebelled at the Red Sea.
> Nevertheless He delivered them for the
> sake of His name,
> That He might make known His power.[13]

So far as those who accepted this separatistic ideology were concerned, Yahveh had no desire whatever to achieve recognition as God by the other nations of His world.

But the universalistic spirit had not been quenched in this wave of particularism. An idea was to be evolved which was to preserve that spirit in this new milieu of separatism and ritualism: the conception of Israel as the priest-people; and its very inception was at the beginning of this period of Ezra and Nehemiah. They brought with them a renewed emphasis on the part of the priesthood in the life of the national religion so that in time the idea came into being that Israel could well be thought of as the priest of Yahveh, as a people, who fulfilled the same functions for the nations

which the individual priest did for the laymen of Israel. Isaiah 61:6, part of the address which Dr. Morgenstern has dated some time early in the period of Ezra, strikes the first note in this doctrine, in a crude and rather materialistic sense, it is true, but nevertheless it is the first note:

> And you shall be called "the priests of Yahveh",
> Men shall address you as "ministers of our God";
> You shall eat the stores of the nations,
> And with their wealth shall you adorn yourselves.

From this beginning the Priestly conception of Israel as the priest-people was to evolve, as we shall see in the following chapter.

CHAPTER XII THE PRIESTLY CODE

The particularistic, separatistic philosophy of Judaism which Ezra and Nehemiah carried back with them from their Babylonian Jewish environment became the basis of that stratum of narrative and law which has been labeled "the Priestly Code." Into that code the priestly writers incorporated all of the conditions which their leaders gradually imposed upon Jewish life: the intricate systems of purification and sacrifice for priests and laymen and nation, the fixed holidays and festivals for national celebration, the civil ordinances which governed the theocratic community of Israel, the organization of Temple life and its support. Behind this vast complex of ritualism and legalism was the principle that this life had been ordained for Israel by God, that every iota of every prescription was given by Him to Israel: the sacrifices were fines and dues to be paid to Him, as well as atonement mechanisms for sin; the priest belonged to Him, in body as well as in mind and heart and soul; the very land on which the people lived belonged to Him. Every act which they performed in accordance with His law, every ceremony which they followed because He had ordained it, was symbolic

of His Godship of Israel.[1] Had the development of the Priestly Code and its incorporation into the official life of Jewry, occurred in the days before Amos first broached the principle that Yahveh was not only the national god of Israel, but that he was also a world-god, the Priestly writers would have been better able to offer a consistent theology than they were now. But Deutero-Isaiah's broad statement of universalism, and his denial of the existence of deities other than the One God, had become part and parcel of the theology of Israel. So the Priestly writers had ultimately to accept universalism in principle, though they did not accept it in practice. They acknowledged that Yahveh was God of the world, creator of the whole universe, Lord of all mankind. Their narration of the early history of the world, of the creation of the universe and of man, though later revised with the object of establishing the eternality of Jewish observances like the Sabbath -- were the expression of their affirmation of universalism. Yet, logically, their philosophy was utterly at variance with the meaning of universalism and monotheism. To all intents and purposes the God who was ruler of Israel, to whom they offered their sacrifices, whose priests officiated in the Temple, was only the God of Israel,

nothing more. Indeed, they even conceived of God as dwelling in the sanctuary which they had erected for His worship. No longer were they content to call that sanctuary the אהל מועד , the tent where the deity took counsel with the leaders of the people; they called it the משכן , the actual residence of the deity: "And there I shall meet (ונועדתי) with the children of Israel, and it shall be made holy with my 'radiant presence'. And I shall make the tent of meeting (אהל מועד) holy to Me, and the altar; and Aaron and his sons I shall make holy to serve as My priests. And I shall dwell (ושכנתי) in the midst of the children of Israel, and I shall be God to them. And they shall know that I am the Lord their God who brought them out of the land of Egypt, so that I might dwell (לשכני) in their midst. I am the Lord their God."[2] But was not this God who took up residence in the midst of His people the God who created the heaven and the earth, who set the stars in their orbits, who brought life out of the earth, and gave breath to man? How, how could He live with one people? How could He limit Himself so that He was only Israel's God, when by all logic and truth, such a thing should be inconceivable?

This paradox between universalism and

particularism was as vexing to the Priestly writers as it had been to every universalistic philosophy before their time. And the concept of the chosen people which we have been tracing through Biblical thought again became the means of harmonizing the conceptions of God as universal Lord and as God of Israel.

The Priestly writers reaffirmed Ezekiel's doctrine of "for His name's sake," through which that prophet had explained the paradox inherent in Jeremiah's idea of the new covenant. These writers agreed that Yahveh had treated Israel with favor because He wanted the Egyptians to realize His full power in the world. So the plagues in Egypt were, in part, the expression of this desire of the Deity, to get honor in the eyes of those who would not believe in Him. And so, too, did He get honor when the armies of Pharaoh perished in the waters of the Red Sea.[3] But this use of the doctrine of "for His name's sake," was not, for them, a primary solution of the problem of universalism and particularism. It had become conventional to speak of God's name;[4] and Ezekiel's doctrine had nothing of a Priestly flavor about it.

The doctrine of "the merit of the fathers" likewise influenced these writers. A whole series

of passages[5] was inserted into the narrative of the patriarchs, which were intedded, fundamentally, to establish the fact that God had not revealed Himself fully to the patriarchs, that He had not even made known to them His true name, יהוה, but had appeared to them as אל שדי. Yahveh could not have been known to the patriarchs in truth because He had not given them the ritual prescriptions for His worship, had not commanded them to build His dwelling place in Jerusalem, had not ordained His sacrifices for them, nor set between them and Himself the priestly caste. But he had made a covenant with them (as the nationalists of 500 B.C. had proclaimed); He had promised that:

1) Abraham's seed would multiply exceedingly, that he would be the progenitor of many nations, that a great company of peoples would be descended from him. (Genesis 17:2,4,5,6,16,20; 28:3; 35:11; 48:4)
2) Kings would be descended from his loins. (Genesis 17:6,20; 35:11)
3) This would be an everlasting covenant. (17:7,20; 48:4)
4) His seed would inherit Palestine as an eternal possession. (17:9; 28:4; 35:12; 48:4)

And upon Abraham and his descendants was placed the responsibility of holding their part of the covenant: circumcision.[6] The earlier writers who had first set forth the doctrine of "the merit of the fathers" had given in that doctrine their idea of the reason for the choice of Israel. They had said that Yahveh had chosen Israel as a reward to Israel for the loyalty and faithfulness of the patriarchs. These Priestly writers apparently had some objection to that thesis, because they did not repeat it in their narrative. There is only one reference to this idea in the P narrative, and that a very attenuated one:

> I am El Shaddai.
> Walk before Me,
> And be whole-hearted;
> And I shall make My covenant
> Between Me and you.[7]

Actually, however, there is no thorough explanation by the Priestly writers of the reason for the choice of Israel. They accept it as a fact: Yahveh is Israel's God; He lives among His people, and, to all intents and purposes, ignores the rest of mankind.

The P scheme of the successive covenants which Yahveh made throughout history is a clear reflection of the belief of the P writers that, although Yahveh was the God of all men, He had determined to limit His interests to His people Israel.

His first covenant with men was with all of mankind, after the Flood, when He promised that never again would man be threatened with total extinction, and when He put the sigh of his covenant, the rainbow, in the heavens. All mankind was bound by this covenant to the observance of the laws which Yahveh gave at that time.[8] The next covenant was not with all of mankind, but only with one man, who was to be the progenitor of Israel, the Abrahamitic covenant, which involved the rite of circumcision. Israel became, according to P, Yahveh's one interest among all of humanity, with that covenant which likewise distinguished Israel, the chosen people, from all of the other peoples of the earth, through a specific ritual institution. The covenant with Israel at Sinai reinforced the act of choice inherent in the Abrahamitic covenant, and linked that act of choice to the Priestly organization of the life, religious and secular, of the people of Israel, which was revealed in all its complexity, according to P, to Moses during the years in the desert. Thus the choice of Israel was not alone with Israel as a people, but with Israel as a people whose life was to be moulded by the Priestly ideas. This is narrowed down even more in the final covenant which Yahveh made: the covenant of the בריתעולם,[9]

made with Aaron and his descendants. Israel's distinction, henceforth, was only based upon the fact that the priests whom Yahveh had chosen were her priests. So Israel's purpose in history came to be regarded in the light of this priestly character of her life, as we shall see.

This was undoubtedly as far as the early P writers went in their affirmation of the concept of the chosen people. Their particularism blotted out almost every sign of universalism. Their history of Israel was like a spiral, beginning with the scope of the whole universe, gradually circling closer and closer towards the center until Israel was their only theological interest -- and there was no relationship between God and the nations, no universal purpose in the choice of Israel as the people of God.

But that particularism could not completely blot out the universalistic spirit and content of Judaism. Sometime in the fourth century, the doctrine which had first been broached by an anonymous prophet early in the period when separatism and particularism began to hold sway, was formulated in full, the doctrine of Israel as the "priest-people." Logically, this doctrine could not be developed in all its its aspects until the complex idea of priesthood was

well along to completion, nor until the idea of the Day of Atonement as an occasion for national repentance had been fully institutionalized; because it is so thoroughly dependent upon both. This doctrine is fully stated in an addition to a P passage which speaks of Israel's choice: "You have seen what I did to the Egyptians, and how I carried you on eagles' wings and brought you to Myself. Now, therefore, if you will hearken to My voice indeed and keep My covenant, then you shall be My treasure from among all peoples; for the whole earth is Mine. And you shall be to Me a kingdom of priests and a holy (devoted) nation."[10]

Deutero-Isaiah had envisioned Israel as the prophet-people, living the role of prophet to the nations. As the prophets of Israel had been the spokesmen of God to the people, as they had strived to keep the worship of God pure from idolatrous taint, as they had attempted to raise the ethical standards of the people so that, in reality, justice and righteousness would be the worship of God, so Israel was to bring the true God and the true Godly life to the nations, a way of life that would bring forgiveness to them for all their trangressions against God. This was Israel's role in history, the messenger of God to the nations.

Obviously, then, Deutero-Isaiah's doctrine of Israel as the prophet-people provided the framework for the Priestly doctrine of Israel as the "priest-people": Israel enacting a divine role in history, providing the link between God who had first revealed Himself and His way of life to Israel, and the nations who had not acknowledged Him nor accepted His way of life. Deutero-Isaiah had thought of Israel in terms of his own purpose in life; so too the Priestly writers thought of Israel in terms of their purpose in life.

The priest was mediator between God and Jew. He was the one who effected divine forgiveness of the people through his carrying out the ritual performances which were ordained for him. Through the agency of the priest, the people attained atonement and remission for their sins -- as individuals and as a nation. And just because he was that mediator, he was especially devoted to God: his days were constantly influenced by the restrictions on his activities; his special character was always guarded by taboos which separated him from the very people in whose behalf he was acting. Just as the prophet had no life of his own, but was always at the beck and call of the deity, so the priest was especially sanctified, and had to be at the disposal of the ritual and of the deity. Such was the place of the priest in the life of Israel.

If, then, Israel was to play the role of priest for the nations, Israel would achieve atonement and forgiveness for the nations' sins through her own ministrations to God in their behalf. She was to be holy and devoted to Him, removed and separated from the life of the nations round about her so that she might be worthy to minister before Him. So the nations would achieve that Salvation and forgiveness of which Deutero-Isaiah had spoken.

As the priest was required to observe many more taboos than the layman so that his sacred character might be preserved from taint, so was Israel, as the priest-people, obliged to observe more commandments than the nations. The Priestly Code offered various ideas of just what were to be the laws which the nations were obliged to follow. The P account of Genesis, culminating in the establishments of the institution of the Sabbath, implies that the Sabbath is to be observed by all mankind, as does the fourth commandment. "In a very positive sense the Decalogue too in its final, expanded Priestly form, as recorded in Exodus 20: 1-17, was intended by God to become, through Israel's ministrations, the way of life for all mankind."[11] The so-called Noachidian laws, embodied in Genesis 9:1-7, including the prohibition against the shed-

ding of blood and against the eating of the blood of animals, and the principle of capital punishment for murder, are likewise a set of universal injunctions.[12] We must assume that these Priestly writers believed that all of the nations were obliged to follow the ethical dictates of Judaism, whether it is expressly stated or not; because in no way does the Priestly Code indicate that in the sphere of ethics there should be any differentiation between priest and layman, so likewise, WE MUST INFER, should there be none between priest-people and lay-peoples. So Judaism provided a via vitae for all of mankind, as it did for the Jewish layman. And the Jewish people as a whole, in order to qualify for the functions which it was to fulfill for mankind, had to conform to many injunctions of a ritual nature which were not imposed upon the other nations. Israel had to observe the dietary laws, had to adhere to an extensive sacrificial system. The prohibition of intermarriage was a counterpart of the legal restrictions on the relations a priest might have with laymen. Circumcision, too, distinguished Israel from the nations, as did the celebration of the various festivals and holy days. The observance of these laws kept Israel different from the nations, qualified her to act as the mediator

between God and the nations.

Had Judaism fostered a belief in complete and final salvation achieved once and for all at one particular moment, Israel would have lost its function as the priest people. But Judaism conceived of a constant process of atonement and forgiveness, parallel to a constant process of transgression and sinning. So Israel's sins were atoned for by the annual national Day of Atonement, when the whole people was purged of its sins through priestly ministration.[13] But one Day of Atonement did not serve to purge Israel forever. Israel had to renew or restore its purity every year, as it gradually strove to attain sinlessness through its own self-perfection, rather than through any divine act of grace. So, mankind, too, must be purged of sin through the constant service of Israel at the altar of God; and until mankind has achieved perfection through its own deeds, Israel must perforce remain the priest people seeking redemption and forgiveness for the nations; and since man would never become absolutely pure and sinless, Israel's role as a priest people was eternal.

These were the implications of the Priestly doctrine which pictured Israel as the priest people for the nations, indeed a unique com-

bination of separatism and universalism.[14] And this was the last interpretation of the chosen people which was offered in Biblical theology, the last contribution to the development which we have been engaged in tracing through Biblical thought.[15]

CHAPTER XIII CONCLUSION.

The concept of the chosen people, as we have seen, did not spring forth, fully developed, from the mind of any one person or any one group of persons, at any one time. From the moment that universalism became established in the theological thinking of Israel, through the centuries to the last great readjustment of that theological thinking, which is recorded in the Bible, this concept grew and evolved and changed, as external conditions changed, and as the subsequent attitudes of the thinkers of Israel changed.

At first, after Amos announced his doctrine of Yahveh as more than a national deity, this concept appeared only as an unconsciously retained corollary of nationalistic religious thinking. Amos and Isaiah, and even Jeremiah and Ezekiel in the first periods of their prophetic ministry, as prophets who envisioned the destruction of Israel, total or in part, founded their messages on the premise that Yahveh, though a world-God, was more intimately concerned with His people Israel than He was with any of the other peoples which, logically, were under His control. They felt no need for a harmonization between their knowledge

that Yahveh was a world-deity and their deep-seated conviction that He had taken Israel for Himself and therefore demanded from her a more righteous national life. Amos, in the first stage of transition from nationalistic religious thinking towards universalism, by his qualifications of universalism and his belief that Yahveh, after rejecting Israel, might well choose another people as His own, as He had once taken Israel to be His people, set the stage for the development of the concept of the chosen people. Isaiah, by rejecting the idea that Yahveh would take another people and affirming that Israel would always be His people, preserved through a righteous remnant, added another thought to the development of this concept, the thought that Yahveh would always bind Himself to Israel. This was as far as pre-exilic prophetic thinking carried this concept.

The exile of 597, however, wrought profound changes in the thinking of the prophet Jeremiah, and, therefore, in the concept of the chosen people. Through a fusion of Hosea's doctrine of Yahveh's betrothal to a repentant Israel with Isaiah's doctrine of

the righteous remnant, Jeremiah formulated the doctrine of the new, eternal covenant, in which he boldly affirmed that Yahveh would never reject Israel, but that she would be, for all time, His own people, His chosen people. And this future Israel, regenerate and repentant after the discipline of exile and hardship, would be the entire people, not just a small remnant. Israel would come to achieve the new heart through her own spontaneous repentance, and Yahveh, on His part, would help her to achieve that new heart. This new heart and this new covenant would be everlastingly effective, would never be broken.

This doctrine of the new covenant which found whole-hearted acceptance in the minds and hearts of the people of Israel had profound influences upon the subsequent theological thinking of Israel. Never again was the idea advanced that Yahveh would, for any reason, cast off His people Israel. When He had chosen her at Sinai, it came to be believed, He had chosen her for all eternity.

But if this doctrine of the new covenant found willing acceptance, it also brought in its train a host of questions inherent in the

doctrine itself. These questions revolved around the paradox which Jeremiah had not realized, how the universal God, a God, certainly, of justice could continue to have relations with a people which was never wholly righteous, which, in fact, refused to follow the way of life which He desired. Each of the answers to this paradox, offered during the subsequent centuries, ~~offered~~ also a new interpretation of some phase of the concept of the chosen people.

The prophet Ezekiel's answer to that paradox was contained in his doctrine of "for His name's sake," which affirmed that Yahveh was willing to continue to treat Israel as His chosen people not so much because He was satisfied with her actions, ritual and moral, but because He desired, more than anything else, the acknowledgement of His divine supremacy by the nations of the world. Because the nations would only regard Him as the World-God if He acted in accordance with their own immature theological reasoning, He was forced to treat Israel as His people, though she deserved to be cast off. This answer which Ezekiel advanced did not only offer a solution to the problem of theodicy, but it likewise contributed a genuine harmonization of the antithetical

principles of universalism and particularism to the contents of the concept of the chosen people. Ezekiel was the first to see a purpose behind Israel's choice as Yahveh's own people, the first to see a need to fit Israel into a world-scheme which Yahveh was engaged in effecting. Each of the subsequent interpretations of the concept of the chosen people was dependent upon this viewpoint of the prophet Ezekiel; each one, in turn, strove to define Israel's place in Yahveh's world-plan.

Deutero-Isaiah advanced the second answer to Ezekiel's paradox: the doctrine of Israel as the prophet-people, bringing to the nations of the world Yahveh's message of salvation and Israel's conviction in His universality. Deutero-Isaiah agreed with Ezekiel that Yahveh had chosen Israel for a world-purpose, but not so much because He was forced by the misconceptions of the nations to proceed along certain lines; rather, He had chosen Israel, from the first, as His servant, His messenger to the nations, who would convert them to the acknowledgement of His divinity and to the acceptance of His way of life. With Deutero-Isaiah, the concept of the chosen people became an integral and consciously affirmed part of the theology of Israel.

The proselyting movement which followed the building of the Temple of 516 B.C. was an attempt to implement this idea of the mission of Israel, and a very real support for the belief of Israel in the concept of the chosen people. The political conditions imposed upon Judah after the failure of the Zerubabel rebellion brought about the belief in theocracy, another expression of the concept of the chosen people. The exalted confidence of the period of the 516 Temple, expressed in the abundant hope for world peace and amity, was another phase of the strengthened acceptance of this concept.

One result of this fullsome optimism of this period was the neo-nationalistic program which led up to the bitter disaster of 485 B.C. For some groups of the population, the concept of the chosen people could only be interpreted as reason for Israel's supremacy in the international sphere of politics and armies. If Israel had indeed been chosen by the one world-God, what more logical inference could be drawn from this belief than the expectation that God would give Israel the strength to dominate the whole world and force the nations to acknowledge His supremacy. One part of this program, and a

highly significant one for the evolution of the concept of the chosen people, was the doctrine of "the merit of the fathers," which affirmed the belief that Yahveh would achieve great things for Israel because He had promised this to the patriarchs who had been so faithful to Him. This was the first attempt to find a reason for the choice of Israel. Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah had seen a cause for Yahveh's desire to have a people, but had advanced no specific reason for His choice of Israel. The neo-nationalists of 500-485 B.C. offered the idea that Yahveh had chosen Israel because she was the people descended from the patriarchs, who, in that time long before the covenant at Sinai, had followed His word when, it is implied, the progenitors of other peoples had not done so. This answer to the paradox implicit in Jeremiah's doctrine affirmed, then, that Yahveh was forced to live up to His promise to the patriarchs, whether or not Israel's present life merited such glorious treatment.

The nationalistic-revival culminated in the attempt in 485 B.C. of Judah to gain independence from Persia, and to implement her confident expectations of world-empire. A coalition of neighboring nations, angered at Israel's dan-

gerous designs, invaded Jerusalem, burned the Temple, and sold thousands of the population into slavery.

Did this disaster mean that Israel would now abandon her confident acceptance of the concept of the chosen people? Not by any means. In all of the reactions to this disaster which have been preserved in the Bible, there is no hint of the belief that Yahveh had rejected Israel. Jeremiah's doctrine of the new covenant had been deeply imbedded, indeed, in the thinking of Israel's prophets and teachers. Some did not even betray disillusionment with the idea that Yahveh would give political supremacy to His chosen people, but persisted in the belief that this would, one day, come to pass -- voluntarily they thought, on the part of the nations. When the Persian fleet was destroyed by storm in an abortive attempt to conquer Greece, and when the neighbors of Israel, who had been parties of the coalition which had wreaked such havoc on her land and people, were invaded by the Arab tribes pressing in from the desert, some saw in these events signs of Yahveh's revenge for the invasion of 485. One voice raised after the calamity saw in that event an indication of the choice of Israel not only as a

prophet-people, a servant, but also as a suffering servant, who must bear punishment for the sins of the nations which will, thereafter, come to recognize Israel's exalted purpose in Yahveh's world plan. Whatever these reactions were, none questioned the fundamental basis of Israel's special relationship to Yahveh, the act of choice.

With the return of Ezra and Nehemiah, and the reinterpretation of the Yahveh religion as a specifically national one, the concept of the chosen people lost its importance. Israel was to be isolated from the other nations, as Yahveh isolated Himself from them -- Israel was His only people, not His chosen people. The Samaritan schism brought in its wake the even narrower idea that Yahveh had long ago rejected the Northern Kingdom, and that, consequently, His chosen people was only the Southern Kingdom.

The P code made particularism real in the lives of the people of Israel, and treated the principle of universalism as though it were non-existent. The P writers even conceived of Yahveh as dwelling in the Temple of His people, and having no relations with other peoples. But the universalistic principle could not be completely forgotten. Later P writers came to conceive of

this particularistic, exclusivistic life which Israel was ordained to lead as part of Yahveh's world scheme: Israel was the priest people, serving the same purpose for the nations of the world which the priest served for the people of Israel. Israel had to observe the stringent regulations which distinguished her from other nations to qualify as the priest-people who could obtain forgiveness from the universal God for the sins of the nations. The process of atonement was a continuous one, as the nations strove to perfect their ways through the example of Israel's achievements. Part of this doctrine of Israel as the priest-people was the fourth answer advanced to the paradox inherent in Jeremiah's doctrine of the new covenant, the establishment of Yom Kippur, through which an unrighteous people could obtain forgiveness from the God of righteousness.

These, then, were the various stages through which the concept of the chosen people evolved in the Bible. That concept achieved new meanings and new implications with each changing conception of Israel's relationship to God and to the peoples of the earth. That concept continuously provided a means for the harmonization of the antithetical poles of

theological thinking: universalism and particularism, through which this people which first achieved the exalted idea that there was but one God in the world of men and matter and space was enabled, at the same time, to retain its conviction in its own role in history. The concept of the chosen people was the mechanism through which Israel preserved its own identity in the realm of ideas, as well as in the world of nations.

But we must not assume that once the final Biblical interpretation of this concept had been achieved, the previous ones were discarded. Each contribution to the development of this concept left a deep impression on its texture, and the Biblical concept of the chosen people, upon which later developments were founded, was a composite picture compounded of a mixture of all of the interpretations which we have discussed: Israel, the people chosen by God at Sinai and joined to Him by an eternal covenant, but also the people descended from the patriarchs who had earned, by their loyalty to Him, His promise of greatness for their progeny; Israel the chosen people destined to serve as both prophet and priest to the nations, to bring

them to the worship of the true God, to serve as an example of the life which He desired, to minister to Him for their transgressions against His moral law, and even to suffer in this mission to the world. This is the concept of the chosen people which the rabbis found in the Bible and upon which they based their own harmonizations of universalism and particularism.

APPENDIX I

It is our purpose in this appendix to consider the phrase ואולכי יהוה לנגד אלהים which, with variations, occurs so many times in the Bible as to become a cliche in Biblical style. We are not concerned with the variations as such, for they point only to a free statement of an habitual thought. We are concerned with the authors of the passages in which this formula is contained, and with the periods in which those passages were written.

Actually the formula implies neither a universal outlook, nor a particularistic one. Taken out of context, it could be an expression of the nationalistic religious outlook of Israel before the time of Amos, or of the particularism of later periods, or, on the other hand, it could signify the harmonization which various thinkers constructed when they were confronted by the apparent contradiction between universalism and particularism. Our object, then, is to attempt to discover whether it has one meaning always, or another always, or whether it takes its theological significance from each passage of which it is a part.

The prophet Jeremiah used this expression quite frequently. In his earlier period, as we have noted, it is very likely that he was a universalist only in theory, but a nationalist in fact. 7:23, 11:4, and 13:11 (which is only a fraction of the formula) would be expressions of that nationalistic religious philosophy, then. Passages, however, which come from his period of more mature universalism, on the other hand, would reveal his harmonization of particularism with a dominant universalism. 31:~~33~~ 32 and 32:38, expressions of this formula embodied in the presentation of the doctrine of the new covenant, are certainly of this type, as is 24:7, part of the passage dealing with the prophet's attitude towards the first deportation.

The prophet Ezekiel likewise utilized this formula, in the passage setting forth his most universalistic doctrine, the doctrine of "for His name's sake." 36:28 must, then, be regarded in the light of Ezekiel's adherence to universalism, as an expression of his harmonization of universalism and particularism. Other appearances of this formula in the book of Ezekiel, though probably not written by Ezekiel himself, seem to spring from this same type of harmonization of universalism and particularism: 11:20, 34:24, 30. 14:11, on the other

hand, although probably not by Ezekiel, appears to have a particularistic meaning.

This principle is utilized several times in the Holiness Code, although each instance is of secondary authorship: Leviticus 11:45; 22:33; 25:38; 26:12,45. The Holiness Code did not itself have anything of a universalistic outlook;[1] one would assume then that these secondary passages were a reaffirmation of the particularistic thought of the first writers. Yet it is, of course, possible that secondary writers were more in favor of the universalistic principle, and used this opportunity to soften the particularism of their predecessors. But since there is no conclusive evidence other than that which we shall consider in the following appendix it is more probable that the formula, as used in the Holiness Code, was another indication of particularistic thought.

II Samuel 7:24, in a passage which we have already dated at the time of the Zerubabel rebellion in 521, a very definitely universalistic context, must be regarded as another instance of harmonization.

Zachariah 13:9 may possibly be related to the period following the 485 fiasco, although this is not at all definite. But at any rate the

spirit of the passage 13:7-9 is one of particularism. Deuteronomy 29:12, part of a passage which obviously springs from the spirit of the period following Ezra, likewise has a particularistic intent.

Exodus 6:7; 29:45; and Numbers 15:41, the three appearances of this formula in the P Code all spring from a particularistic outlook. Exodus 29:45, especially, part of the passage setting forth the doctrine that God dwells in the Temple at Jerusalem, is obviously anti-universalistic.

If we date Zachariah 8:8 with 8:3, in the spirit of the P Code, this passage, too, belongs to the particularistic trend.

This survey of the passages containing the formula and its variations makes our conclusions as to the implications of the formula self-evident. Though originally it may have had absolute particularistic implications, it came to be used at various times to express either a harmonization of particularistic thought with a dominant universalism, or a reaffirmation of particularism in a period when universalistic thought was in the decline. Its relation to the concept of the chosen people is only that it reveals

in another way the need, in periods of universalistic thought, of finding a satisfactory place for Israel in the world-scheme. In periods of particularism, however, the concept of the chosen people lost much of its meaning, whereas this formula could and did express the absolute particularism of those periods.

APPENDIX II THE HOLINESS CODE

The basic principle of the Holiness Code legislation, embodied in the text of Leviticus 17-26, is that the relationship of Israel and Yahveh is one of holiness, a principle derived ultimately from the prophet Ezekiel. This principle is stated succinctly in the opening verse of the H Decalogue:[1] Ye shall be holy, for I, Yahveh, thy God, am Holy.[2] According to Dr. Morgenstern, the precise meaning of this verse is: Holy shall ye be (unto me; i.e., ye shall have relations with Me alone, and with no other God), for I, Yahveh, your God, am holy (unto you, i.e., I am your God alone, and have and will have no relations whatever with any other people). This translation of the verse would imply a completely non-universalistic outlook on the part of the authors of the Holiness Code, despite the fact that, according to Dr. Morgenstern, the Holiness legislation dates at the earliest from 525;[3] parts are even later because they refer to a Temple that is already rebuilt, for instance, Leviticus 17:1-7. Had the Holiness Code been written earlier than Deutero-Isaiah, earlier than the universalistic spirit of the 516 Temple, we would be justified in calling this

principle of the Holiness Code, non-universalistic. Coming as it does after Deutero-Isaiah had proclaimed a thorough-going universalism, and from the very period during which the broadest universalism was preached in utterances such as Malachi 1:11, and when proselytism was a sign of high universalism, we must regard this principle of the Holiness Code as anti-universalistic. Although it is conceivable that we ought to regard this principle as the epitome of expression of the concept of the chosen people, since it regards Israel as so privileged that God has relations with no other people, it is more logical to regard this as a <u>denial</u> of universalism. Not even the P Code, with its intense particularism, denied that God had relations with the other people, in principle, though in practice the P Code delimited Him as Israel's God. The high militarism of 500-485 B.C., too, had a universalistic aspect, of a sort, though it envisioned Israel as given supreme control of the nations by Yahveh. The conclusion that the Holiness Code, in effect, is anti-universalistic, is substantiated by a consideration of other passages from the legislation proper.

Leviticus 20:22-26, part of the homiletical

section of the H Code, seems to mean this: Yahveh's relationship to men is limited to the inhabitants of Palestine. Because the previous inhabitants of the land would not worship him in the manner which he desired and followed customs which he abhorred, he cast those nations out of his land. Now he is bringing in the people of Israel whom he expects to keep the statutes and ordinances which he is giving to them.[4] By giving them his land and taking them to be his people, he has distinguished them from all other peoples. He has promised to have relations with them alone, thereby separating them from mankind; therefore they must separate themselves from things which he considers to be unclean. There is no universalism here: Yahveh is limited to Palestine, and to the people which inhabits that land.[5] There is no indication whatever that Yahveh has any type of relationship with any people other than that which at one time or another inhabits his land. Here is not even the budding universalism of the eighth century when Amos announced that Yahveh had a relationship with the Philistines and the Ethiopians and Aram. Yahveh, according to this passage, has no plans for other peoples, does not desire that his way of life, either ritual or ethical, be transmitted to them, nor does

he even desire to have them worship him and acknowledge his reputation and name. This is, to be sure, a denial of universalism, and a return to the principle of nationalistic religious belief.

Leviticus 25:39-46 sets forth the prohibition against the enslavement of Israelites. They may not be enslaved because they are Yahveh's servants, whom he brought out of Egypt.[6] Since Yahveh is Israel's God, every Israelite is protected by him. But, since he is not the God of other peoples, and they are not his servants, and he has no relationship with them, they may be enslaved, and become hereditary chattel. The basis, then, of the prohibition of slavery is that Yahveh's people, because they are his people, may not be enslaved. This denial of universalism results, in effect, in the application of ethical ideas to the people of Israel only and not to the other peoples, who are outside the realm of his relationship.

Thus did the writers of the Holiness Code deny universalism not only in practice, but likewise in principle. For them, God was not the Universal Deity, but only the God of Israel, the God of Palestine -- a thorough retrogression from the advance of the theological thinking of Israel, and

a tangential development from the line of universalistic thinking, even farther afield than the deepest particularism (not nationalistic religion) of the period immediately following the return of Ezra.

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. Morgenstern, "The Oldest Document in the Hexateuch", HUCA (1927), The background material for this chapter is derived, also, from Morgenstern, "The Book of the Covenant", Parts I and II, HUCA (1928, 1930); Amos Studies, Part III; "Decalogue" in UJE, Vol. III, pp. 510-14; and Bible 1 and 8 lectures.

2. The Religion of Israel to the Exile, pp. 35-38.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. Obviously, in this henotheistic pattern of the necessity of a deity's maintaining his reputation are the roots of Ezekiel's principle, "for His name's sake." Cf. Chapter VI.

2. Cf. especially the indignation of Hosea, who was not a universalist, at Israel's unfaithfulness to Yahveh, and his comparison of that faithlessness to harlotry.

3. Morgenstern, Amos Studies, pp. 40-41.

4. Amos 9:7.

5. Amos 1:3 - 2:3.

6. Amos 3:2.

7. Amos 4:6-11.

8. Amos Studies, pp. 37-38.

9. A harmonization would necessitate some explanation of the reasoning whereby the principles of universalism and nationalism could be accepted together, without being regarded as mutually exclusive. Dr. Morgenstern's reconstruction of the Amos text (unpublished as yet) connects the statement of both prin-

ciples in close proximity: 3:1a, 9:7, 3:2. Accepting this reconstruction, we are forced to admit that, far from perceiving the contradiction and paradox and explaining it, Amos did not even see the need for a harmonization, but agreed fully, in effect, with the viewpoint held by his contemporaries, that Yahveh had been only Israel's god. We translate the passage in this way:

3:1a Hearken to this message against you, O children of Israel:

9:7 Are you not the same to me as the children of Cush, saith Yahveh?
It is true that I brought Israel up out of the land of Egypt,
But did I not also bring the Philistines up from Kaftor, and Aram from Kir?

3:2 Nevertheless (despite the fact that I am their God too) only you have I known intimately, among all the families of the earth.
Therefore shall I punish you for all your transgressions.

We do not, it must be noted, accept Buttenwieser's claim (The Prophets of Israel, p. 307-8, note 1.) that רק in 3:2, coupled with אכן , implies: "Verily I have taken more care of you than of any

other race of the earth." This translation would infer a genuine attempt towards harmonization, but one too finely wrought, we are convinced, for Amos to have intended. Actually, of course, Amos only intended that the reference to Israel's distinctive place in Yahveh's affections make his listeners realize how much more heinous was Israel's sin against Yahveh than if Yahveh had only been a national deity, forced to have relations with Israel because she was his people.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. Hosea 2:16-22 (omitting v. 19 as an interpolation; see Morgenstern, Amos Studies, p. 419, note 350).

2. Hosea 2:4-14.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. Israel in the larger sense, of course, including both Israel and Judah, as we intend in this entire chapter.

2. See especially Isaiah 1:10-17.

3. Isaiah 6:3; 5:26-29; 7:18-20; 31:3; 14:29, 30b-31: 20:1, 3-4, 6; 10:7-11, 13-15.

4. Isaiah 6:11-12.

5. Isaiah 5:5-7a; 7:23-25a.

6. Isaiah 30:13-14.

7. Isaiah 22:1-14.

8. Isaiah 30:13-14.

9. Isaiah 10:5-6.

10. Isaiah 5:1-6. v. 7, as Pfeiffer (Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 431) suggests, is undoubtedly an explanatory gloss, giving the explicit meaning of the parable. Yet it is undoubtedly in the spirit of Isaiah and by no means is it contrary to his intention in the passage.

11. Undoubtedly the pre-exilic prophets had some

consciousness of their distinctiveness in religious thinking. Cf. Amos Studies, pp. 30-46, for a full discussion of Amos' realization of his uniqueness as a prophet. This theme, of course, received its ultimate development in Deutero-Isaiah's proof for monotheism from prophecy; cf. Blank, "Studies in Deutero-Isaiah", HUCA, XV (1940), pp. 1-18.

12. Isaiah 6:10. This is Dr. Morgenstern's translation of the passage, Amos Studies, p. 423.

13. Isaiah 8:16-18; 30:8. Cf. Amos Studies, pp. 423-425. Dr. Morgenstern believes that the symbolic name שאר ישוב (Isaiah 7:3) is to be connected with this doctrine of the saved, righteous remnant of the people.

14. This doctrine of the righteous remnant was amplified by later writers in such passages as Exodus 32:9-14 and Numbers 14:11-20, where Moses is depicted as the one about whom Yahveh would build the new and greater nation, more righteous and more loyal to Him. Significantly, however, both passages reflect, also, Ezekiel's doctrine of "for His name's sake," from which we may infer that it was not until events themselves proved that more than a remnant of the people was to survive the disasters of 597-586,

that Isaiah's doctrine was abandoned, and not completely, even then, as the story of Noah, a universalization of the doctrine of the righteous remnant, attests.

It is interesting to note that this doctrine of the righteous remnant includes the first traces of individualism. Amos, the first universalist, had still clung to the idea of nationalistic religion that only the nation is the unit in relation with the deity. One wonders if he never thought of himself as being distinct from the people, or if he did not have some disciples, disciples for whom, perhaps, he wrote down the text of his address. Perhaps his silence on this matter of the righteous individual is to be attributed to the fact that he spoke as a prophet only for a half hour, that he delivered but one address. Isaiah, on the other hand, was a prophet for at least forty years, perhaps longer. During that time it became obvious how he was set apart from the people by his prophetic character, and how, also, those who believed in him and followed his ideas, set themselves apart. Perhaps, too, Isaiah became aware of the righteousness of some others, not necessarily among his disciples. This close connection of the doctrine of the saved remnant and the development of the principle of

individualism is most clearly seen in another passage which amplifies Isaiah's doctrine, Genesis 18:23ff, where Abraham pleads for the deliverance of Sodom and Gomorrah because of those righteous ones who might be found in the midst of the wicked. This passage more than likely is to be dated before the time of Ezekiel, because there is no indication that any number of righteous men less than ten would be sufficient to deliver the cities, although Lot and his family are permitted to survive, as a remnant, certainly less than ten. The passage, on the other hand, contains an indication of the idea of vicarious salvation (not atonement) which could hardly have been pre-exilic, and reflects a late type of universalism (Cf. Morgenstern, Moses with the Shining Face, p. 23.)

It is also interesting to note the foreshadowing of Deutero-Isaiah's mission idea in this doctrine of the first Isaiah. Impliedly, this righteous remnant would preserve Isaiah's writings not only to study them themselves, but likewise to transmit the message of the righteous life to other peoples. We must infer that they were not to become a new and mighty people purely through biological processes, but that the writings of

their prophet would become an instrument for gaining new adherents to the worship of Yahveh.

(Most of the material included in this note has been treated by Dr. Morgenstern in his lectures in Bible 8, in Amos Studies, p. 424, and in "Moses with the Shining Face", HUCA, II (1925), pp. 13-16.)

NOTES TO CHAPTER V

1. See especially 23:23f.

2. Jeremiah 2:2.

3. Jeremiah 13:11.

4. Jeremiah 2:3.

5. Jeremiah 2:21.

6. Jeremiah 3:19. Emend בבנים to בכוים.

7. Jeremiah 12.7.

8. Jeremiah 5:3; 6:8; 7:28; 35:13.

9. Jeremiah 8:3, 9:15; 13:17-19; etc.

10. This attitude towards the exiles is embodied, too, in Jeremiah 29:4-7 and 29:16-20. In 4-7, the exiles are advised by the prophet to prepare for a rather lengthy exile, to settle down as though they were to remain for many years, and to go through the normal functions of living rather than wait for a speedy return (in opposition to the belief of some of the leaders both in Babylonia and in Judah, that the exile was only a temporary set-back, and not part of the doom which Jeremiah had announced as coming from the universal God who was repudiating

Israel). Such a message may be a reflection of Jeremiah's belief that the exiles had already undergone their punishment, in the very fact of exile, and that they would be regarded very favorably by Yahveh. In 16-20 those exiles are told that the brethren they had left behind in Judah were yet to feel the full extent of Yahveh's wrath. Dr. Morgenstern has suggested that 29:16-20 are probably a unit with chapter 24, but have somehow been misplaced from their original position.

Significant is the fact that in 29:7 we find the broadest expression of universalism to be enunciated by a pre-exilic prophet: Yahveh is no longer bound to the land of Palestine. Although the verse does not expressly state that Yahveh may be worshipped in Babylonia, the prophet is profoundly convinced that Yahveh will hearken to prayers offered to him by those of his people who reside there. This is a great advance upon the thought of Amos and of Hosea (Hosea 3:4) who believed that Yahveh might not be found in a land other than Palestine, an unclean land. At the same time, then, that he announces a new doctrine which forms a limitation of full universalism, the prophet takes another step in the

direction of a fully-realized universalistic doctrine.

11. For convincing proof that Jeremiah's doctrine of the new covenant applied not only to those who had gone into exile in 597, but also those who suffered through the later events of 586, and even those who remained behind in Judah and who were not exiled in the second deportation, cf. Jeremiah 42:9-12; and indeed, the whole narrative of Jeremiah's unwillingness to flee to Egypt, and of his desire to remain in Judah, offers profound testimony to his own active and positive acceptance of the doctrine of the new covenant, as does the story of his purchase of the land of his cousin in chapter 32.

12. Jeremiah 31:31-34. See Morgenstern, Psalm 48, p. 27, note 100, for convincing proof that this is indeed a genuine part of Jeremiah's message. But see the amplification of Jeremiah's doctrine in later additions to that same chapter, for instance vv. 3, 9, 20, and especially 35-36.

12a. Dr. Blank has pointed out, in class discussions in Bible 3, the irony of this change in Jeremiah's theological thinking which forms a dividing line, as it were, between the pre-exilic and post-exilic

prophets. The prophets after the period 597-586 became the exponents of concepts which the prophets previous to that period had opposed. The popular conception had been of an everlasting relationship between Yahveh and Israel, but the earlier prophets had repudiated this conception. Now, beginning with Jeremiah, the prophets adopt that idea, in terms of universalism, and it becomes an inseparable note in the thinking of Israel. It is possible, of course, to explain this change in the tenor of prophetic thinking purely on the basis of external events -- to say that events prior to 597-586 demanded a stern, critical prophetic policy, whereas after those years, the people needed consolation. Yet, this is not the whole story. It is wrong to think of the pre-exilic prophets as men who were pessimists, who had no love for Israel, who could see no hope. Undoubtedly, Amos' insistence upon the fact that Yahveh had tried to warn Israel, had tried to bring Israel back to the right path, is indicative of his own love for Israel and his unconscious desire to see her live. As we have already pointed out, Isaiah's doctrine of the righteous remnant was an optimistic note, one likewise indicative of the prophet's love for his people and of his desire to see her survive. And Hosea's

doctrine of Yahveh's betrothal of a repentant Israel was obviously a hopeful doctrine, predicated upon a faith in Israel's survival. Jeremiah's doctrine of the new covenant, then, was not antithetical to prophetic character, nor was it, indeed, so antithetical to prophetic thought as some would have us believe. Jeremiah's doctrine was linked to the prophetic thinking of the past as much as it became the starting point for prophetic thinking following him.

13. One of those effects was undoubtedly the full realization of the part of the individual in relation to Yahveh. The doctrine of individualism had only been hinted at previous to this: Amos and Hosea actually had no place for the individual in their religious thinking. Isaiah's doctrine of the righteous remnant and the amplification of that doctrine, especially in Genesis 18:23ff, had formed an opening wedge in individualistic thinking (Cf. Chapter IV, note 14 of this thesis). Jeremiah carried the idea even further with his special dispensation of life to Baruch and Ebed-melech, (39:15-18; 45:1-5), who would survive because they had been faithful to Yahveh. The full import of individualism could not be developed by Ezekiel, however, until Jeremiah had pronounced the doctrine

of the new covenant with its implication of a future. This is strictly logical, for it stands to reason that so long as the threat of complete destruction hung over the entire people, no one would concern himself too much about the question of the justice meted out to the individual. Once, however, the assured conviction was established that Yahveh would never destroy the entire people for its communal sins, then the way was open for speculation regarding the place of the individual member of that group. We are justified, then, in concluding that all of Biblical literature which considers the place of the individual in relationship to Yahveh, the individualistic Psalms, for instance, and especially the book of Job, was rendered possible by Jeremiah's doctrine of the new covenant and so was later in date of composition than Jeremiah, or even than Ezekiel.

14. Robert H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 333.

15. Judges 2:1. Cf. also Judges 2:11-23 for a generalization of the philosophy of the entire book; and Judges 10:9-16 for a typical example of this rhythmic pattern succinctly stated.

16. Cf. also psalm 78, dated by Dr. Morgenstern at about 521, for another interpretation of the history of Israel from the viewpoint of an eternal covenant which cannot be repudiated, and for a reflection of the Deuteronomic framework of the book of Judges, especially vv. 34-35, 37-38.

17. Psalm 48, p. 29.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

1. Isaiah 1:21; 5:2; Jeremiah 2:2; 3:4; Hosea 2:17b; 9:10. Cf. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 545.

2. For this wholesale indictment of Israel's past, see Ezekiel 16:1-52, especially vv. 6, 8, and 14; 20:1-26, especially vv. 5-8; and 23. Chapter 20 must, of course, come from the same period as chapter 36, some time after 586, since it, too, presents the doctrine of "for His name's sake" -- and thus forms a connecting link between the two periods of Ezekiel's prophecy, since it reflects the same viewpoint as chapter 16.

3. Morgenstern, Psalm 48, p. 28.

4. Ezekiel 11:19-20; 36:26-27.

5. Ezekiel 16:59-63. This passage is obviously an addition which was inserted after the destruction of Jerusalem in 586. But there is no reason to suppose that it was not written by Ezekiel himself during the fifteen years or so that he lived beyond that date. It is altogether in keeping with 36:24-27, for instance, which we know was written by Ezekiel. It is essential, whether or not Ezekiel

wrote this particular passage, that he should have accepted this doctrine of the new covenant before he could have enunciated the doctrine of "for His name's sake."

6. Cf., for instance, Jeremiah 44, for the ritual faithlessness of those who were in Egypt after 586. Cf. also Deuteronomy 9:5, an example of another answer to the paradox which we shall discuss in Chapter IX, wherein we are told explicitly that there was no merit to be found in the people to justify their deliverance and survival. Yet Ezekiel did not abandon this idea, though it forced him to reconsider the whole problem of the reason for Yahveh's continuing relationship with Israel. An important corollary to the doctrine of "for His name's sake" is the new heart which Yahveh will give to Israel, a heart cleansed of all taint, a heart of flesh and not of stone, (Ezekiel 36:25-27). This new heart and spirit will bring the people back to Yahveh, and they will be faithful to His word from thenceforth. One might jump to the conclusion that this reaffirmation on the part of Ezekiel of the idea of the new heart would invalidate the theory expounded by Dr. Morgenstern that the consciousness of the paradox involved in Jeremiah's doctrine of the new covenant brought

Ezekiel to his own doctrine of "for His name's sake." But this much is certain: Ezekiel explained, now, why Yahveh was willing to cleanse the people's heart, whereas Jeremiah had not explained that. In addition, Jeremiah's doctrine had carried the implication that the people of Israel would, spontaneously, become faithful after the experience of discipline in exile and with the establishment of the new covenant. In keeping with his idea of grace, however, Ezekiel holds no such hope: if there is to be any change on the part of the people, it will be brought about by Yahveh and not by the people themselves; Yahveh must change their nature Himself (36:31-32). Ezekiel, then, still holds to those same glorious expectations of the regeneration of Israel, that had not yet come to pass, implying, however, that the change of heart will be brought about by Yahveh in His own good time, and that there is no hope of the people's return to Yahveh of their own accord.

7. As we have already pointed out in chapter II, note 1, this conception of a deity's need to maintain his reputation among the nations is a principle of nationalistic religion transmuted into universal terms. Actually, as interpreted by Ezekiel, this misconception on the part of the nations, forces

Yahveh, against His will, to conform to their ideas; this in itself is the greatest weakness of Ezekiel's doctrine.

8. This doctrine is expounded in Ezekiel 36, and is also treated in 20:9, 22, 44; 35:16-36; 39:7, 23-29. Dr. Morgenstern has discussed these passages in full in section 4 of Psalm 48, pp. 26-38. He has also treated most of the references to this doctrine in later Biblical passages in so full a manner that we consider it hardly necessary to attempt to duplicate his work here. It will suffice, then, herein to list the appearance of the doctrine in other Biblical passages, with the understanding that practically all of them have been discussed in that section of Psalm 48 or in Moses with the Shining Face, pp. 18-20. Exodus 9:14-16; 32:11-12; Numbers 14:13-20; Joshua 7:9; II Samuel 7:23; I Kings 8:41-43 (II Chronicles 6:32-33); II Kings 19:15-19; Isaiah 48:9-11; 63:12; Jeremiah 14:7-9, 19-21; 32:16ff; Joel 2:17b; Psalms 23:3; 25:11; 31:4; 48:11; 66:1-4; 79:9-10; 98:2-4; 106:8; 109:21; 115:1ff; 143:11.

9. Ezekiel 20 (see also note 2 above). This was also done by later writers in several of the

passages enumerated in the preceding note: Exodus 9:14-19; 32:11-12; Numbers 14:13-20; Joshua 7:9; II Samuel 7:23.

10. It must be carefully noted that Ezekiel did not explain why Yahveh had chosen Israel, but only why He had chosen a people. Ezekiel had no more been able to detach himself from the interests of his own people and from their traditional ideas, than had his predecessors been able to do so. No prophet, including Ezekiel, thus far, had been able to objectify his thinking enough to be in a position to ask the question, "why had Yahveh chosen Israel rather than any other people?" We may anticipate a later chapter by saying that it was not until the doctrine of the merit of the fathers was formulated about 500-490 B.C., that an answer was offered to this question, and that answer, strangely enough, by THE most intensely nationalistic group of thinkers in the post-exilic period.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VII

1. Isaiah 40:1-2.

2. Isaiah 41:1-5; 44:24-28; 45:1-6; 48:14-15.

3. Yet see Isaiah 48:9-11 for Deutero-Isaiah's acceptance of Ezekiel's doctrine of "for His name's sake" as the climax of the passage 4-8 berating Israel for her faithlessness and obstinacy. Cf. Isaiah 43:22-28.

4. See, for instance, Isaiah 40:12-28.

5. For a complete presentation of this argument, and of the passages involved, see Professor Blank's Studies in Deutero-Isaiah, HUCA, XV (1940), pp. 1-8.

6. Isaiah 43:9-10, 12; 44:8-9, 25-26a; 48:6.

7. Isaiah 41:8f; 43:10; 44:1, 2, 21, 26; 45:4. We do not here consider the passages known as "the songs of the suffering servant" which for conclusive reasons advanced by Dr. Morgenstern, but not yet published by him, we assign to another period. These passages and the reason for assigning them to a later date, will be discussed in Chapter X.

8. See Blank, op. cit., pp. 21-27 for convincing

proof that the use of the term עבד implies the role of the prophet, who serves as the mouthpiece of the deity, and acts only in accordance with His pre-ordained plan.

9. Isaiah 45:8, 22-24a; 46:12-13. This interpretation of Deutero-Isaiah's use of צדקה, ישועה, AND תשועה is that one utilized by Dr. Morgenstern in his lectures in Bible 8. This salvation is the blessing which a later J^2 school meant by the blessing which Abraham and Israel would bring to the families of the earth (see Chapter IX)

10. Isaiah 43:14-15; 45:1-6; 47:1-15.

11. Isaiah 40:3-5, 11; 41:17-20; 43:16-21, etc.

12. Isaiah 43:2.

13. Isaiah 43:3b-4.

14. See also the Deutero-Isaianic additions in Jeremiah 30:10-11 and 46:27-28. In passing, we may mention again the problem of the "songs of the suffering servant", and note the violent contradiction which would be implied if we were to regard Deutero-Isaiah as the author both of these passages cited above and of those songs. There is nought but

the greatest optimism concerning Israel and her future; time after time she is told not to fear for the days to come; Israel the worm, the people few in number, insignificant in the eyes of the nations (41:14-16) will indeed be triumphant at the last, shaming those who strove against her (43:8-13). This is anything but the picture of a people who will atone for the sins of the nations by enduring every shame and suffering which they (the nations) deserve! Again we must refer to a fuller discussion of the "suffering servant" theme in Chapter X.

15. Isaiah 41:8-9; 43:10; 44:1, 2. These in addition, of course, to Deutero-Isaiah's use of עַבְדִּי , בָּחַר , קָרָא , and other terms which convey the same sense.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VIII

1. The events which occurred during this period to which we shall refer in this and the following two chapters, are those which Dr. Morgenstern has traced for his students in Bible 8. It is, of course, not within the scope of this thesis to enter into the manifold evidence for these facts. Such digressions would make of this thesis, actually, a history of post-exilic Jewry. We have, therefore, accepted Dr. Morgenstern's finely delineated characterization of this period, and concentrate on that characterization only insofar as it offers a lucid portrayal of the meaning of the concept of the chosen people. Some of this material is referred to, however, in Section V of Psalm 48, pp. 38-47.

2. Zechariah 1:17; 2:12-13, 16; Haggai 2:20-23. This latter passage is an early expression of a belief which we shall discuss in the following chapter.

3. See II Samuel 7, which Dr. Morgenstern relates to this abortive revolution by Zerubabel, especially vv. 22-24. Significant in this same chapter, likewise, is the expression of the

belief in a divine covenant with the House of David -- a belief which grew dominant in this post-exilic period. Although it is actually the choice of David, and not of Israel, it is obvious that such a belief could not but be based upon the assumption of the choice of Israel. So deeply was the concept of the chosen people established that it was taken for granted that Yahveh had likewise made an eternal covenant with the House of David (and even with the House of Levi, the levitical priests, also -- cf. Jeremiah 33:14-26). It is interesting to note, however, that this idea of the choice of David is in nowise dependent upon the universalistic principle as is the idea of the choice of Israel, although in many cases, when the idea of the Davidic choice was dominant, it did not necessarily connote an anti-universalistic trend, as we might expect from a nationalistic revival. Indeed, Zechariah anticipated the proselyting movement in 521 , and the Menachem revolution was characterized by a certain type of universalism, as we shall see in the following chapter. Further passages dealing with the Davidic covenant are: I Kings 11:12-13, 33-36; 15:4-5; II Kings 8:19 (II Chronicles 21:7); Jeremiah 33; Psalms

89:4-5, 20-38; 132.

4. Zechariah 6:15a

5. Cf. Morgenstern, Psalm 48, pp. 38-47, the section on "Yahveh as Universal King", for an extensive presentation of the growth of this concept and a discussion of the Biblical passages involved. See particularly the theocratic Psalms: 93, 95, 96, 97, 98, 100, 112, 117, and the anti-royalistic passages which date from a few years later, listed in note 131, p. 42 of Psalm 48.

6. See, for instance, Psalms 68:25-31; 89:2-3, 6-19; 117; 138:4-6, for expressions of this glorious universalistic hope.

7. Zechariah 8:20-23. For the dating of this passage see Morgenstern, Psalm 48, p. 43, and note 138. In verse 21 we emend יהוה את יהוה צבאות to יהוה צבאות את יהוה אלהינו.

8. See also Psalms 67; 96:2 and I Kings 8:59-60 for a similar reaffirmation of Ezekiel's doctrine in this period.

9. Morgenstern, ibid.

10. See Morgenstern, op. cit., pp. 47-87; "The Mythological Background of Psalm 82", HUCA, XIV

(1939).

11. Micah 4:1-4 (Isaiah 2:2-4). See also Psalms 46:7, 9-12; 68:31.

12. See, for instance, Psalms 29:11; 67.

13. Morgenstern, Psalm 48, pp. 44-5. We translate as emended there by Dr. Morgenstern.

14. Other passages which reveal this trend are:

Psalm 15. Whether or not גור in v. 1 is to be taken to mean "be a proselyte", the doctrine conveyed by this Psalm is that ethical living is the finest way of demonstrating one's adherence to the religion of Yahveh. This is a universal God, whose worshippers, it is to be inferred, may live anywhere and be members of any nation or race. That one may be an Israelite, and not be considered a genuine believer in the principles of Yahveh's faith, is likewise implied. If we take גור to mean proselyte, which it may well mean in this period of active proselytism, then it is undoubtedly to be linked to Isaiah 56:1-8, the eloquent plea for tolerance for the alien who has become a worshipper of Yahveh. It is not difficult to perceive that this type of thinking is in a different chain of theology from that

which we are tracing -- albeit a parallel chain, as we have pointed out heretofore (cf. Chapter IV, note 14, and Chapter V, note 13). The concentration upon the relationship between the individual and his life and God, revealed in this Psalm, carried to its logical limits, would have ended the development of the concept of the chosen people.

Psalm 24:3-6. The typical Hasidic insistence in this passage upon moral purity and righteousness places it in the same category as Psalm 15. Dr. Morgenstern has suggested (in his unpublished notes on the Psalms) that these passages have a controversial spirit about them, as if they were written to oppose, perhaps, the Priestly doctrines of sacrifice.

Psalm 65. Although the earlier verses of this Psalm do speak of Zion and of the Temple, the attitude of those verses is not of Israel as a people, but rather of individual members of the people of Israel. The praise spoken of in v. 1 is praise for God's natural bounties (vv. 6-14) which constitutes the burden of the Psalm. This glorification of Yahveh as God of nature is a trend which likewise is a concept of universalism which runs counter to the concept of the chosen

people. Logically considered, God's natural bounty is visited upon all peoples, and Israel is the recipient of His gifts no more than any other people. Although the writer of this Psalm undoubtedly thought of Yahveh as being especially generous to Israel, this is the type of thinking which ultimately renders the concept of the chosen people unnecessary. (Cf. below, Psalm 104)

Psalm 101. This Psalm is in the same category as Psalms 15 and 24:3-6, with its emphasis on the ethical life. Again, as in those Psalms, Israel receives no recognition as a people.

Psalm 104. This Psalm is a hymn to God the Creator and Lord of Nature. It pictures Him, even more explicitly than Psalm 65, as the God who is generous to man, simply as man. This type of universalistic thinking, of course, leaves no place for Israel as anything but the people which praises God for His natural gifts to all mankind.

Psalm 108:2-6. The praise of God as transcendent over nature and man appears in this Psalm as the mission of Israel. The influences of Ezekiel's doctrine of "for His name's sake" and Deutero-Isaiah's conception of Israel as the prophet-people are obvious. Significantly, Israel's place in this Psalm is only that of the speaker of

praises to God -- not a place given to her by God. (That vv. 7-14 disturb the sense of the earlier verses and refer to the events of 485 is self-evident.)

Psalm 138:4-6. This is a fragment of a Psalm envisaging the attainment of Ezekiel's doctrine of "for His name's sake" and Deutero-Isaiah's mission idea. This type of universalism, too, leads to a conception of Israel as the instrument for the deity, which must eventually come to the end of its usefulness. Once the nations acknowledge Yahveh as God and live the life He desires, it must be inferred, Israel ceases to hold a privileged place among the nations.

Isaiah 19:23-25. Pfeiffer (Introduction to the Old Testament, pp. 445-6) states that this passage could be dated either in the third century as an allusion to the Jewish community in Alexandria, or in the period of the Elephantine Temple (525-411). If the latter supposition be true, then it would best be dated in the period of universalistic thought which we are discussing, and Asshur would be Persia. This passage equates God's interest in Israel with his interest in the other nations, who are likewise His peoples and the instruments for the working out of His plan. (Cf. Amos 9:7 and the discussion of that verse in Chapter II of this thesis).

It is not difficult to see how this type of thinking would result in a gradual disappearance of the concept of the chosen people, if carried to its logical conclusions.

The various indications in these passages of a full-blown universalism: a consideration of the Godly life for the individual, without national identifications or restrictions; praise of God who gives all His natural bounties to man, likewise without national restrictions; and the equation of Israel with the other nations which are likewise His peoples -- are a trend of thought counter to the concept of the chosen people. At the same time that that concept was developing, we must realize, parallel developments were taking place which actually were consciously or unconsciously antithetical to that concept.

15. From this period must come some of the Deuteronomic expressions of the belief in the concept of the chosen people -- undoubtedly to be assigned to the D2 strata, because they reflect the absolute universalism of Deutero-Isaiah and therefore must come from after 539. These passages are earlier, no doubt, than the "merit of the fathers" passages which we shall discuss in the following chapter, and therefore must be dated earlier than about 500 B.C. Deuteronomy 4:37, for

instance, assumes that the generation which Yahveh chose and loved was the generation of the Exodus, not that of the Patriarchs. Deuteronomy 4:34 expresses this same emphasis on the significance of the Exodus. Cf. II Samuel 7:22-24 for this same thought, also to be assigned to about 521 (see note 3 of this chapter). Deuteronomy 26:16-19, although not so explicit, contains no reference to the "merit of the fathers" theme which, as we shall see, is a constant source of authority in the other Deuteronomic passages which refer to the concept which we are discussing. v. 19 of that passage seems to refer to the proselyting movement, in that Yahveh receives honor from Israel's activities. The supremacy of Israel is not, as in many of the other Deuteronomic passages, one which includes military success, but rather the religious one which was dominant in the thought of the period which we have considered. Also note the use of the word סגלה which cannot be dated earlier than this period, (cf. note 5 of the following chapter).

NOTES TO CHAPTER IX

1. Discussed by Dr. Morgenstern at some length in Bible 8 lectures, and treated briefly, in his article "Moses with the Shining Face", HUCA, II (1925), pp. 20-21.

2. All verses referred to in the following discussion, unless otherwise noted, are from Genesis.

3. Cf. 24:60, where Rebecca is blessed by her family before her departure with Abraham's servant, in the same phraseology. (If we read וזרעו instead of וזרעך with two manuscripts of the Hebrew-Samaritan text (Kittel, 3rd ed.), we have almost an exact parallel to 22:17b). Herein, then, we would have this aspect of the blessing which is missing for Isaac's generation. See, below, the discussion of Isaac.

4. This concept is seemingly broached for the first time, briefly, in Zechariah 8:13, but without the mention of Abraham. As Dr. Morgenstern has pointed out in Bible 8 lectures, this concept of blessing is obviously dependent upon Deutero-Isaiah's doctrine of Israel's mission to the nations, the families of the earth. That this must be the case, although there is no specific mention of it in these passages we are considering, is readily

apparent after a realization of the fact that actually in the Genesis narrative, Abraham brought blessing to none of the nations he contacted, but, to the contrary, only misfortune befell them: plagues to Abimelech and Pharaoh, destruction to Sodom and Gomorrah. In addition, as we shall see, the writers of the age with which we are dealing gave to their imperialist notions the character of something approaching a holy war, another way of accomplishing what Deutero-Isaiah had envisioned for the future. This strange, perverted use of Deutero-Isaiah's concept, applying the nationalistic note of the age to his universalistic ideas, became a type of rationalization, then, for nationalism. It served to place emphasis on Deutero-Isaiah's characterization of Israel as the missionary without at the same time carrying on, in full measure, his conception of the mission. That we of today find it difficult to conceive of Deutero-Isaiah's ideas being utilized for so anti-universalistic a purpose should not blind us to the fact that this doctrine which served the cause of the militarists was profoundly dependent upon Deutero-Isaiah. As an example of the dilemma in which critics find themselves, critics who do not realize that Deutero-Isaiah's idea of salvation is implicit in this conception of Israel's blessing to the nations, we may quote Pfeiffer, (Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 444) who regards

Joseph's deliverance of the Egyptians from starvation as the blessing to the nations -- a desperate answer at best, when we consider how isolated the Joseph stories are from the well-knit motif of this promise in the other patriarchal stories.

The idea of Yahveh's vengeance upon Pharaoh and Abimelech for the impending adultery with Sarah may be another reflection of the spirit of this age. That great plagues (12:17) and sterility (20:17-18) should be visited upon these two royal houses seems not so bizarre if we perceive that Abraham and Sarah are not regarded so much as individuals, as they are as the progenitors of Israel; and that the authors intended to demonstrate in this narrative the inviolability of Israel. For so, as we shall see, was Israel as a people, in a military way, thought to be inviolable.

5. It is interesting to note how conventionalized and formula-like (as if it had something of a legal, contract character) this promise is, in most of these passages, how the same phrases are repeated as though they had been copied into one after another convenient portion of the narrative, to establish the authenticity of the theme.

In 26:24, it may be wise to emend זרע to זרעי with the Septuagint, although, on the other

hand, עבדי gives the verse a striking resemblance to many passages in Deutero-Isaiah, where the phrase אל תירא כי אתך אנכי.... עבדי... becomes almost a cliche: Isaiah 41:10a,13,14; 43:1; 44:2.

6. Deuteronomy 7:6-11. Cf. I Samuel 16:1-13, especially v.7. The similarity makes one pause to wonder whether the Samuel narrative of the choice of David might not have been seen as symbolic of the choice of Israel, or as providing in parallel manner the basis for the covenant with David. As we have already had occasion to state (note 15 of the preceding chapter), practically all of the Deuteronomic references to the concept of the chosen people are founded upon the doctrine of "the merit of the fathers", dating them, certainly, no earlier than about 500 B.C.

It may be well to consider here those passages which we have not already noted, together with a brief discussion of other pertinent points.

Deuteronomy 7:6-11. This passage could not be dated later than the period of Ezra, because it speaks of adherence and obedience to all of the laws, whereas the D2c strata, from the period of Ezra, places the major emphasis upon abstinence from idolatrous worship, especially that of the seven pre-Israelitish Canaanitish nations. Nor could it be dated earlier than about 500 B.C., because of the reference to the motif of the pro-

mise to the patriarchs. Yet, actually, it limits the aspects of that promise. With its very insistence upon the fact that Israel now is not a numerous people, but is few in number, it is inferred that Israel will not become a great and mighty and numerous people, unlike the primary expressions of the promise to the patriarchs (v. 7). This may indicate that the passage comes from the period after the events of 485 when Israel was decimated in population, and when there was, as we shall see, some disillusionment with the program of the war legislation and the hopes for a great empire which that program upheld. In v. 10, the ואלה may be the nations which attacked Israel in 485 and thereafter despised her and her God, the enemies who, as we shall see, were to find death and destruction their own lot. On the other hand, the ואלה may possibly refer to those who led the people into the disaster, who were responsible for the whole affair. Perhaps, then, this is to be correlated with Isaiah 59, which regards Israel's sins as the cause of that disaster. v. 8 may imply that the return of the exiles has already begun, in which case the passage may be dated with Isaiah 60-61, which Dr. Morgenstern believes were delivered as a New Year's Day address in the Temple some

short time after Ezra's return in 458 B.C.; the only real point of correlation with Isaiah 60-61, however, would be the hope for the return of those who were enslaved in 485. In this passage there is nothing of the expectancy of world-power, nor of the idea of the voluntary submission of the nations to Israel. There seems, indeed, to be, in this passage, no conception of a purpose behind the choice of Israel.

The word סגלה (see above, Chapter VIII, note 15), according to Gesenius (Dictionary of the Old Testament, Leipzig, 1921) is derived from an obsolete root meaning, to get, to acquire. The noun סגלה carries the meaning of wealth, of treasure of a private nature, as in Ecclesiastes 2:8 and I Chronicles 29:3. Used in reference to Israel, as in this passage and Deuteronomy 14:2; 28:18; Exodus 19:5; Malachi 3:17; and Psalm 135:14, it characterizes Israel as the treasure, the private property, of Yahveh. The meaning which we usually ascribe to this word, "peculiar treasure" is not actually inherent in the word, then, and is derived from the concept of the chosen people with which it has come to be associated. As the private property of Yahveh, Israel is peculiar, but no more so than any kind of private possession.

The verb חשק , in v. 7, seems to convey the meaning of a reason-less love, an affection which cannot be ascribed to any particular cause, in contrast to the idea expressed in v. 8, which ascribes His love for Israel to His appreciation of the faith in Him manifested by the patriarchs. Genesis 43:8 and Deuteronomy 21:11 are examples of the use of חשק to refer to man's love for a woman, an emotional love.

Deuteronomy 7:12-14. This passage, though hardly a continuation of the preceding passage, has the same characteristic insistence upon "the merit of the fathers"; and 14a specifies the firm faith in Israel's supremacy over the nations typical of the war-legislation in Deuteronomy 20, which we shall presently consider.

Deuteronomy 10:12-22. Not only the statement of "the merit of the fathers" theme, but likewise the universalistic spirit of the passage, the friendliness to aliens, (v. 19), the general ethical rather than ritual tone of the passage, and especially v. 16 with its reaffirmation of Jeremiah's dictum which obviously could not come from a period later than that during which the returning exiles brought with them their emphasis on the separatistic nature of circumcision -- all these characteristics are

typical of the high universalistic spirit of the period after the building of the Second Temple. Like 7:6-11, there is in this passage no implication whatever that Yahveh had chosen Israel for any particular purpose. V. 22b would carry the startling implication that part of the promise to the patriarchs had already been realized, though greatness of numbers could be no truer of the period which we are considering than of any other period of post-exilic Judaism. Interesting is the fact that clear indication is given of the harmonistic intent of the concept of the chosen people in the juxtaposition of universalism and particularism in vv. 14-15.

Deuteronomy 28:1b, 9-10. These verses, which Dr. Morgenstern has ascribed to the D4 strata in his unpublished analysis of this difficult chapter, have a pronounced affinity with the spirit of the universalistic period, and 1b certainly with the spirit of the war-legislation. v. 10 appears to be a direct reference to the expectations of the people that the fulfillment of Ezekiel's doctrine of "for His name's sake" would come speedily -- which was a dominant thought during this period. VV. 3-8a, which Dr. Morgenstern has tentatively ascribed to the D1 strata, especially v. 7,

fit in with the spirit of the 500-485 B.C. period very well, although they were written long before.

7. This is undoubtedly the significance of those parts of the promise to the patriarchs which guarantee that Israel shall possess the gates of her enemies, and especially of Genesis 28:14, wherein Jacob is promised that the people of Israel will spread out her boundaries to the four corners of the earth. This latter verse betrays the idea which was really in the minds of this school of writers, but which they thought best, perhaps, not to specify in such direct terms. The writers of the earlier portions of Deuteronomy were not quite so cautious. Deuteronomy 1:6-8, for instance, actually specifies the hope that the whole Davidic empire will be restored to Israel.

8. Haggai 2:20-23. In v. 22, the suggestion of Biblia Hebraica (Kittel, 3rd ed.) to insert לְךָ seems acceptable. Our emphasis on the "you" in v. 23 is because of the similarity of the phraseology of the verse to many verses in Deutero-Isaiah. Although at first blush, it might be thought to infer that Haggai limits Yahveh's choice to the leader, rather than to include the entire people as did Deutero-Isaiah, actually we believe that this verse

is to be compared with the passages in Deutero-Isaiah which regard Cyrus as the agent of Yahveh (Isaiah 41:1-5,25; 44:24-28; 45:1-6, 13; 46:11; 48:14b-15). The point which Haggai appears to emphasize in this verse, fully in consonance with the intention of the entire passage, is that Yahveh has made Zerubabel his agent, withdrawing His support from the Persians, and that this change of agent-ship signifies the return of sovereignty to Israel.

9. Found chiefly in chapters 20 and 21 of Deuteronomy, omitting 20:15-18 as a later interpolation from the period of Ezra and Nehemiah, 21:1-9 and 15-17 as out of context.

10. Dr. Morgenstern, in treating these chapters in Bible 8, revealed a very significant aspect of this legislation, contained in 20:10-12. He sees in the repeated use of the word שלם a parallel to the Moslem phrase, "aslim, taslam," if you will accept Islam it will be well with you, used from 632 on in the Holy wars of the Mohammedans. This would indicate that not only were the besieged cities to be asked to surrender without a struggle, but that they were likewise expected to be converted en masse to the religion of Israel, to acknowledge that Yahveh, not alone Israel, had conquered them. This aspect gives

ample testimony of the truly universalistic character of this nationalistic revival, which we have already had occasion to mention -- a perverted reflection of Deutero-Isaiah's idea of the mission of Israel, perverted but nevertheless a universalism of a sort. Dr. Morgenstern will undoubtedly treat this specific aspect of the nationalist revival at greater length when he publishes his work on this whole historical action.

11. Cf. Deuteronomy 20:4 with Joshua 10:14,42; 23:3,10.

12. Cf. Deuteronomy 20:10-11 with Joshua 9:15, 21, 23, 27. (But cf. also Deuteronomy 20:16-18, which undoubtedly is to be dated after the time of Ezra and Nehemiah.)

13. Cf. Deuteronomy 20:12-13 with Joshua 11:19-20. Cf. also Deuteronomy 20:16-18 and note 15 below.

14. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine how there could be many more parallels, since the legislation in Deuteronomy is not so elaborate as to contain more than a few other specific items.

In regard to the dating of this edition of Joshua, Pfeiffer (Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 305) asserts that a Deuteronomic edition of

Joshua was published about 550, including the following sections: 1-4; 6:1-8:29; 9:1-16; 9:22-13:12; 14:6-14; 16:1-3; (18:2-10); 21:41-43; 22:1-6; 23; 24:28-31. His assignment of the date, it appears to us, is purely arbitrary, based on the dependence of Joshua 1 and 23 upon the framework of Deuteronomy, and the triteness of style -- signs, to his way of thinking, of secondary Deuteronomic redaction. We have already shown, conclusively, that many of the passages in the hortatory fromework section of Deuteronomy must be dated in this same period because they present the doctrine of "the merit of the fathers". Triteness of style is indeed an arbitrary type of reasoning. By dating the edition in this period we have been able to link it to a specific historical type of thinking -- which Pfeiffer is unable to do.

15. "However, this D2 edition of Joshua was later expanded and reinterpreted after Ezra and Nehemiah in the spirit of the 7 nations legislation; perhaps by P writers." --a note by Dr. Morgenstern.

16. Two other passages which may possibly be dated at this period, as reflections of this nationalistic spirit, are Exodus 15 and Isaiah 55:1-5. Exodus 15: 1-8 reveals the same impractical attitude towards the

ease with which military success is achieved. The Isaiah passage is more than likely non-Deutero-Isaianic because, particularly, of the description of Israel as נגיד ומצוה לאמים in v. 4 and the reference to the Davidic covenant in v. 3. These would fit better in this period. See also II Chronicles 20 (no parallel in Kings), especially vv. 5-7, 8-9, 12, 15, 17 -- revealing the same attitude towards Yahveh's part in Israel's wars as does the Deuteronomic war legislation; and showing practically how they imagined Yahveh would destroy their enemies by Himself.

17. This is a precis of Dr. Morgenstern's reconstruction of the events of 486-5 B.C., based upon an interpretation of hundreds of Biblical passages massed in extremely convincing array. This ingenious reconstruction answers a great number of problems and questions which have disturbed Biblical scholars for generations, and relates passages to this event which have never before been satisfactorily explained on any basis. To take only one outstanding example it was always thought that the anti-nations passages in the prophetic books, and other passages ranting against the enemies of Israel: Edom, Moab, Philistia, Tyre, were to be dated at the time of the 586

disaster. But Babylon was the only enemy then, and the surrounding nations were indeed friendly to Israel, as is demonstrated, for instance, by Jeremiah 40. This reconstruction of events locates those passages in their true historical milieu. It likewise explains the book of Lamentations, always linked to the destruction of 586, for no other reason than that it was the only possible event with which it could be connected. For us here to attempt to offer Dr. Morgenstern's proofs, fact for fact, passage for passage, would be not only fool-hardy, but it likewise would be tangential to the purpose of this thesis. We must, therefore, await the publication of this material by Dr. Morgenstern himself, an occasion which will indeed be significant in the field of Biblical studies.

18. See Psalms 2, 21, 72.

NOTES TO CHAPTER X

1. Psalm 44, Isaiah 63:15-64:11. These passages are not exactly in the same vein. The Isaiah passage reveals a spirit of disillusionment with the program which led up to the fiasco of 485. 63:16, for instance, constitutes, in a broad way, a rejection of the doctrine of "the merit of the fathers". 63:17, seems to mean that Yahveh had led them astray into false kinds of reasoning. The whole passage is written in a spirit of reliance upon Yahveh now that the leaders and their philosophies have brought destruction down upon the people. Psalm 44, on the other hand, though a similar affirmation of steadfastness in faith and a similar exposition of the helpless condition of Israel shows no disillusionment with the program of 500-485; to the contrary, it reveals chagrin that Yahveh had not carried through His responsibility, that He had not brought success to them, vv 10-27.

2. This is Dr. Morgenstern's theory of the dating of these songs, as advanced in his classes in Bible 8 and in his unpublished notes which he permitted this student to utilize. These passages have of course been the subject of much scholarly controversy for years, both as to the identification of

the suffering servant himself, and as to their dating in the history of Israel. (See Sheldon Blank, "Studies in Deutero-Isaiah", pp. 27-30 for an exposition of the theory that the suffering servant is a personification of Israel modeled on the figure of Jeremiah the prophet, and that these songs are an integral part of Deutero-Isaiah's writings.) Dr. Morgenstern's theory resolves two of the very complicated problems involved in any explanation of the songs. First, if the suffering servant is Israel, and not a single individual, as has been the traditional Jewish explanation and the more recent explanation of Christian scholars, how are we to interpret Isaiah 49:5-6 which speaks of the servant's mission to Israel itself? That mission can be interpreted in this way: that the survivors in Palestine after the disaster--they, not all of Israel, are the suffering servant--must still redeem their brethren who are scattered throughout the Mediterranean world. This redemption, this raising up of all the tribes of Jacob, must be conceived of in a real, physical sense, although it is likewise possible that there is herein a reference to the disillusion which many must have felt in Yahveh's ability to protect Israel (else why the protestation in the passages mentioned at the beginning of this chapter that the writers

have not abandoned faith in Him) and a subsequent loss of faith in Him altogether. Secondly, why a suffering servant? As we have already pointed out, (Chapter VIII, note 14) Deutero-Isaiah believed that Israel's punishment had been ended and that Israel was destined for the physical greatness of a real agent of Yahveh. By dating the songs of the suffering servant immediately after the disaster of 485, we can connect the actual physical conditions with this spiritual and literary interpretation of them. The songs are not a prognostication of suffering, but a post facto interpretation of that suffering, giving meaning and significance and purpose to it.

Dr. Morgenstern has tentatively arranged these song in a form which he thinks must be somewhat close to that in which they were originally written: a dialogue in which God, Israel and the nations participate; and it will certainly be suitable to include this reconstruction of the songs here, although he has not published this material:

God addresses His servant: 42:1-4

The servant addresses the nations: 49:1-7
42:6-7
49:9a

The servant soliloquizes: 50:4-9a

Challenge of the servant to the nations:
50:10
52:13-14 aα,15
53:2-3
52:14aβb

Acknowledgment of the nations: 53:3-12

Fragments: 42:18-19; 59:13a; 42:22-25; 51:14.

Possible fragments: 41:8-10; 44:1-5,21; 51:4-6.

Another piece of writing which ought to be connected with these songs of the suffering servant is Psalm 22, which seems to be an early exposition of the idea, or at least a similar personification of Israel as a suffering man. There is, however, in this Psalm, nothing of the idea of vicarious atonement, although there is the same trustfulness in God. The result of the suffering is the same, however, because (vv. 28-30) the nations shall at last turn to God. No explanation is offered for this conversion of the nations, or for the role of Israel's suffering in that conversion. (It is interesting to note, incidentally, that the fathers referred to in vv. 5-6 seem not to be the patriarchs, but the forebears who were led

out of Egypt. This will indicate that this writer placed no faith in the doctrine of "the merit of the fathers" or even that he opposed that doctrine.) Psalm 69 also ought to be linked to these passages as a reflection of their content and spirit, although, according to Dr. Morgenstern, this psalm should be dated about 400 B.C.

3. Psalm 137:7-9.

4. Psalm 83:14-17a.

5. Deuteronomy 32:39-42. Other cries for revenge are to be found in the "anti-nations" passages in prophetic literature, Ezekiel 25, 34, 35, Isaiah 34, 35, for instance. Psalm 129:5-8 is likewise to be dated at about this time as are the books of Lamentations and Obadiah. Psalm 118 reflects the persistent belief of the Hasidim that Yahveh would fight for them, and give help that princes and arms could not offer (vv. 6,7,8,9,13,16). This is additional testimony that various sections of the population had still not given up their belief in the theological program of Deuteronomy 20, despite the fact that that program had seemingly been discredited in the fiasco of 485.

6. Psalm 48:5-8. Cf. Ezekiel 27. See Morgenstern, Psalm 48, pp. 1-18

7. Ezekiel 25:6-7, 8-9a, 12 (omissions for the sake of brevity).

8. For other reflections of the belief that these events were a sign of Yahveh's anger with the nations, see Psalms 9; 60:8-11,14; 66:1-12; 124; 126.

9. Dr Morgenstern believes these passages were delivered in the Temple on Rosh Hashanah shortly after Ezra's return.

10. Isaiah 60:15. Cf. Isaiah 49:14; 54:6; 62:4.

11. Isaiah 60:21-22. This eschatological picture refers, in part, to that phase of the promise to the patriarchs which looked forward to a great and numerous people springing from the loins of the patriarchs.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XI

1. The factual background of this chapter is derived from Dr. Morgenstern's Lectures in Bible 8.

2. Deuteronomy 7:1-5; 20:15-18.

3. Ezekiel 44:4-9, assuming that this is from Ezra or his school.

4. A further narrowing down of the concept of the chosen people was, however, brought about by the Samaritan schism. Ever since the day of Ezekiel, it had been believed that the political restoration of Israel was to include both Judah and Israel. The well known passage, Ezekiel 37:15-28, though probably not by Ezekiel, is, perhaps, the best example of this belief. Both kingdoms are to be restored, not separately, but together, as one, ruled over by ONE king. Passages amplifying Jeremiah's doctrine of the new covenant specifically stated that this covenant was to be made with both Judah and Israel (Jeremiah 31:1,27,31.) Zechariah, about 516, spoke of the restored Judah and Israel that would become a blessing among the nations (8:13). Other passages inserted into prophetic writing express this same belief that the restoration would include both kingdoms: Isaiah 10:20; 11:12;

Jeremiah 30:3,4; 33:7,14ff; 50:4-5,17-20,33; Ezekiel 39:25; Hosea 2:2; Zechariah 10:6-12. Both Judah and Israel, together, were considered to be the chosen people. Indeed, the plans which Ezra brought back from Babylon for the new Temple ritual and the geographical location of the tribes, embodied in Ezekiel 40-48 (as Dr. Morgenstern believes), included the location of all the tribes (Ezekiel 45:8; 47:13,21-23; 48:1,19,23,28,31). This may indicate that the Babylonian Jewish formulaters of these plans had no idea whatever of the impending split between the Samaritans and the Judeans, that they had not determined in advance that the northern Jews were not to be admitted to the worship of Yahveh in the Temple at Jerusalem.

Whatever the direct cause of the Samaritan schism, concerning which there has been so much speculation and argumentation, this belief was abandoned, and the subsequent writers and preachers of Judah became firmly convinced that Yahveh had forsaken the Northern tribes, and that He had chosen only Judah to be His people. So the writer of Zechariah 11:14 spoke of the cutting of the bond of brotherhood between Judah and Israel. So the Chronicler was convinced that Yahveh had rejected Israel long before the destruction of Samaria in

722, and read his antipathy of the Samaritans back into his history: II Chronicles 13:3-12; 25:7-10; 28:9-15; 30:8. Psalm 78 is a frank expression of the rejection of Israel:

> And He despised the tent of Joseph,
> And would not choose the tribe of Ephriam;
> But He did choose the tribe of Judah,
> And Mount Zion which He loved. (vv. 67-8)

5. Nehemiah 5:19; 13:14, 22, 29, 31.

6. Nehemiah 6:14.

7. Nehemiah 3:36-37, as bitter and vituperous and hateful as the most denunciatory of the post-485 passages calling for revenge upon Edom and the coalition.

8. Nehemiah 4:8, 14.

9. Nehemiah 2:18, 20. The implication of v. 20 is that since the enemies will have no relations with Yahveh in Jerusalem, they will be utterly divorced from contact with him. Yahveh has no relations with man except through His temple in Jerusalem. Soon the doctrine was formulated that Yahveh dwelled in the Temple all year round, instead of merely coming there to judge the nations on Rosh Hashanah. And what greater sign, at the same time, of the choice of Israel, and likewise of extreme

particularism, could there be than this: that the world God took up His dwelling with His own people on their land in their sanctuary.

10. Nehemiah 7:5. "The picture of the Mosaic census in Numbers was no doubt a projection of this historic census into pre-historic times,"-- Dr. Morgenstern.

NEHEMIAH
11. ✓ 2:20

12. The opposition to intermarriage and the references to the seven Israelitish nations of Canaan, typical of the D2 strata (vv. 34-40) restrict the dating in the one direction, and the mention of Aaron as still secondary to Moses (v. 16) dates the Psalm as earlier than P (considering vv. 18, 28-31 as RP interpolations -- Dr. Morgenstern's unpublished notes on the Psalms.)

13. Psalm 106:7-8.

14. Reading תתהפרו for תתמרו (with Biblia Hebraica 3rd ed.)

NOTES TO CHAPTER XII

1. See, for instance, Numbers 15:37-41, the commandment to wear the blue fringe on the corner of the garment as symbol of the relationship between God and Israel. ".....So that you may remember and perform all of my commandments and be holy unto your God (have relations with no other god). I am the Lord your God who brought you out of the land of Egypt to be to you God. I am the Lord your God." (Undoubtedly יהוה is to be translated "God" rather than "Yahveh" by the time of the Priestly code. See Sheldon H. Blank, "Studies in Deutero-Isaiah", pp. 14-18, for a discussion of this problem in the writings of Deutero-Isaiah.)

2. Exodus 29: 43-46.

3. Exodus 7:5; 8:18; 11:7; 14:17-18. Cf. also, Exodus 16:12 and Numbers 20:12

4. Cf., for instance, I Samuel 12:22, dating, probably, from about 485, and Psalm 106:7-8, from the time of Ezra.

5. The passages are: Genesis 17:1-14,16,19-21; 28:3-4; 35:9-12; 48:3-4; Exodus 2:24; 6:2-4.

6. A comparison of the various items in this promise-motif with those in the motif of the original "merit of the fathers" passages, discussed in detail in Chapter IX, will reveal the fact that these promises, one from the J^2 writers, the other from P, are essentially the same, except for one important aspect, the most important for that first group of passages: that aspect which related Israel to the nations. (The nations that are friendly to Israel shall be blessed; those that are inimical shall be cursed; Israel shall possess the gates of her enemies. And Israel shall be for blessing to all the nations of the world, the Salvation which she shall bring to them.) This Priestly statement of the promise casts no light upon the Priestly idea of Israel's relationship to the nations; or rather, the very failure to mention the nations is a reflection of the Priestly idea about them. Firstly, it is obvious that to these Priestly writers the idea of world-empire which was so thoroughly a part of the doctrine of "the merit of the fathers" had no significance whatever. They were not interested in making Israel the ruler of the nations; they were interested in keeping Israel distinct from the nations. Secondly, the omission of any reference in these passages to the

idea of Israel as the priest people, which we shall presently discuss, is ample testimony of the fact that that doctrine was later than the primary strata of P, which were intensely particularistic. Had they adhered to that doctrine so early the P writers would most certainly have mentioned it in these passages, since they had the example of the J2 passages of the promise to the patriarchs before them. In fact, it is more than likely that if the P writers had had their own choice in the matter, they would have altogether rejected the idea of a covenant with the patriarchs. The only purpose that covenant served in their hands was that it acted as a vehicle for the idea of circumcision. And surely this idea could have been just as effectively introduced in other parts of the narrative, for instance, with the exodus from Egypt. But they could not neglect the patriarchs, because the tradition had been so thoroughly ingrained in the theology of Israel by this time; the best they could do, then, under the circumstances, was to adopt the tradition, in general, though not in entirety, and reinterpret it as they saw fit, emphasizing the circumcision aspect, and the El Shaddai-Yahveh motif, to establish their theological claims. The J2 writers, on the other hand, had regarded

this patriarchal covenant as a promise, without any responsibility on Israel's part such as the adherence to the institution of circumcision which is enjoined by the P writers.

7. Genesis 17:1b-2a.

8. Dr. Morgenstern has pointed out, in Bible 8 lectures, the dependence of this conception of eternal covenant with all of mankind upon Jeremiah's doctrine of the eternal covenant with Israel.

9. Numbers 25:13

10. Exodus 19:4-6a. For a discussion of the meaning of קדש in connection with the Holiness Code, see Appendix II.

11. Dr. Morgenstern's essay on Universalism, prepared for the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, to which we are deeply indebted for the clarification of this whole doctrine of Israel as the priest-people.

12. The Priestly account of the Flood and of the Covenant with mankind after the Flood is typical of the universalistic outlook of the Priestly accounts of the early history of the world. The covenant of the rainbow is a universalization of Jeremiah's

doctrine of the new covenant with Israel, and the symbol of the rainbow itself is a counterpart of the sign of circumcision which was part of the eternal covenant with Israel, through Abraham.

13. The institution of יום כפור (Leviticus 16), according to Dr. Morgenstern, was the final answer to the paradox presented by Jeremiah's idea of the new covenant. Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah had offered doctrines which inferred that God would overlook Israel's sins because there was a higher purpose in Israel's existence. The nationalists about 500 B.C. had said that God had to overlook those sins because He could not break His promise to the patriarchs. These Priestly writers offer the doctrine that there is no problem of theodicy: God forgives the sins of Israel because He wants to, and because theoretically He can have relations only with a pure people, and He has ordained a particular day of the year dedicated to that purpose, a sabbath of solemn rest when the affliction of soul and searching of heart and offering of sacrifice serve to obtain forgiveness for man.

14. Dr. Morgenstern has suggested that the P legislation designed to preserve the sanctity of the Temple in the midst of Israel is to be linked to the

doctrine of Israel as the priest-people. The whole logical equation of the doctrine: as the priest is to Israel, so Israel is to the world, is carried out in the measures taken to isolate the altar and the Temple from defilement. Just as the most sacred part of the sanctuary, the holy of holies, is guarded from contact with any priest or Levite or ordinary Israelite, and may only be entered once a year by one priest, so the Temple itself is guarded from contact with aliens at all times. And just as, in Numbers 2 and Ezekiel 48, the sacred locale of the sanctuary itself is segregated from contact with Israel, so, too, is Israel guarded from contact with the other peoples of the world. As the sanctuary is guarded by the presence of the priests, so the Temple itself is guarded by the presence of the people of Israel. And as the sanctuary is conceived to be at the very center of the physical being of the people of Israel (especially in Ezekiel 48) so the Temple Mount and Jerusalem were conceived of as being at the very center of the world. (cf. Morgenstern, Psalm 48, section VI on "Ṣafon"). Whether this elaborate set-up was actually the basis of the doctrine of Israel as the priest-people, or, on the other hand, it gradually unfolded as the implications of that

doctrine became manifest, we cannot say, but it is obvious that in a very real physical sense, this complicated organization is a counterpart of that doctrine.

15. The Chronicler, who wrote about 250-200 B.C. made no contribution to the theological thought of Israel. He seems not to have been concerned at all by the inconsistency of regarding the one universal God as only the God of the Jews, at the same time. So the Chronicler's God is exalted above everything (I 29:11), rules over all kingdoms, (II 20:5), owns everything in the world (I 29:11f); His eyes "run to and fro throughout the whole earth" (II 16:9), He searches all hearts (I 28:9; 29:17); to Him are to be ascribed the greatness and the power and the glory (I 29:11f; II 20:6). And yet this same God is merely the father of Israel (I 29:10) and seemingly god of the Jews only (I 17:14; 28:4f; 29:23; II 13:8); whoever fights against Israel fights against Him (II 13:12); SHE IS His people (II 23:16). Psalm 136 which may possibly come from this same period reveals a similar ignoring of the need for harmonization between universalism and particularism (1928 in v. 22 strikes this writer as being

a purely conventional epithet without any consciousness of its deeper significance). I Chronicles 29:10-19 is the one passage which reveals a more mature universalism in the Chronicler's writings, where one feels that a new consciousness of the concept of the chosen people is reflected in the thought that Israel has chosen the true universal God as her God, rather than that He delimits Himself by choosing Israel. The spirit of this passage is very late, and undoubtedly springs from a Hasidic milieu rather than from a Priestly one.

Nehemiah 9:6-37, D^2 in the main, is another indication of the Chronicler's failure to see any contradiction between universalism and particularism. V. 6 praises God as the Universal Creator, and vv. 7-8 proceed to praise Him for His choice of Abraham. The choice here seems to be merely a manner of speaking, a conventional reference, which does not reveal any deep-seated concern with the problem of harmonizing universalism and particularism.

NOTES TO APPENDIX I

1. We have not heretofore discussed the Holiness Code, just because it offered no contribution to the historical development of the concept of the chosen people. To the contrary, it seems to us, the Holiness Code was a complete negation of universalism. We shall consider this problem in Appendix II.

NOTES TO APPENDIX II

1. Decalogue in Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. III, pp. 511-512, by Dr. Morgenstern.

2. Leviticus 19:2; cf. 20:7-8, 26.

3. Ibid., p. 511, and Bible 8 lectures.

4. Cf. Leviticus 18:2-5; 18:37.

5. Cf. Chapter IV, note 10, for a discussion of Jeremiah's doctrine that Yahveh can be worshipped in any land.

6. Cf. Leviticus 25:55.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Sheldon H. Blank, "Studies in Deutero-Isaiah" in HUCA, XV (1940). Outlines of prophetic ideas (mimeographed but not published).

Karl Budde, Religion of Israel to the Exile, 1899.

Moses Buttenwieser, The Prophets of Israel, 1914.

The Psalms, 1938.

J. Estlin Carpenter, The Composition of the Hexateuch, 1902.

S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, 1916.

Heinrich Gesenius, Dictionary of the Old Testament, 1921.

Nelson Glueck, "Chosen People in the Bible" in IDB, Vol. III, 1941.

Das Wort Hesed im Alttestamentlichen Sprachgebrauche als Menschliche und Göttliche Gemeinschaftgemässe Verhaltungsweise, 1927.

Charles Foster Kent, The Sermons, Epistles, and Apocalypses of Israel's Prophets, 1910.

Rudolf Kittel, Biblia Hebraica, 3rd ed., 1937.

Julian Morgenstern, Amos Studies, 1941.

"Decalogue", in IDB, Vol. III, 1941.

The Book of Genesis, 1920.

"Moses with the Shining Face" in HUCA, II (1925).

"Psalm 48" in HUCA, XVI (1941).

"The Book of the Covenant", Parts I and II, in HUCA, V and VII (1928, 1930).

"The Mythological Background of Psalm 82", in HUCA, XVI, (1939).

"The Oldest Document in the Hexateuch", in HUCA, IV (1927).

"The Sources of the Creation Story -- Genesis 1:1-2:4" in AJSL, Vol. XXXVI, No. 3.

Unpublished notes and articles:

Reconstruction of the Text of Amos.

Deuteronomy.

Psalms.

Trito-Isaiah.

Universalism.

Robert H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, 1941.

William Rosenau, "Ezekiel 37:15-28. What Happened to the Ten Tribes" in HUC Jubilee Volume, 1925.

Charles C. Torrey, Ezra Studies, 1910.

Gerhard Von Rad, Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch, 1936.