

THE TERM H^ASIDIM, ITS SYNONYMS AND ANTONYMS,
IN THE BOOK OF PSALMS.

submitted to the faculty of the Hebrew Union
College in partial fulfillment of the require-
ments for the degrees of Rabbi and Master of
Hebrew Letters.

Dr. Julian Morgenstern

Referee

Mordecai I. Soloff

April 5, 1940

Acknowledgement

This study was undertaken at the suggestion of Dr. Julian Morgenstern, who kindly gave many of his valuable hours to help guide the writer through a multitude of problems that beset himⁱⁿ the performance of this task. Furthermore, Dr. Morgenstern generously placed at the writer's disposal much of his unpublished material.

The writer is deeply grateful for all the help, guidance, and inspiration he received from his teacher and sponsor, Dr. Julian Morgenstern, President of the Hebrew Union College.

M. I. S.

In appreciation of his guidance, inspiration
and friendship, this study is respectfully

dedicated to

Dr. Julian Morgenstern, President
Hebrew Union College

Contents

	Page
I Statement of the Problem	1
II Dating of the Psalms	6
III "Hasid" in Pre-Exilic Times	11
IV Identification of the H ^a sidim	15
V Hasidic Parties	38
VI The Hasidic Concept of Yahweh	47
VII Hasidic Worship	71
VIII Hasidic Doctrines and Beliefs	88
IX Universalism and Particularism	104
X Conclusions	125
Bibliography	
Appendix I	
Appendix II	

Note: Footnotes are found at the end of each section

I.
Statement of the Problem

Even the cursory reader of the Book of Psalms must have observed that it is filled with references to the $\text{h}^{\text{a}}\text{sidim}$, $\text{r}^{\text{o}}\text{sa'im}$, and their synonyms. Now it has been generally assumed that the $\text{h}^{\text{a}}\text{sidim}$ were simply pious people while the $\text{r}^{\text{o}}\text{sa'im}$ were the wicked ones. But quite obviously hasid and raśa' , as thus translated, are not antonyms. Yet, these terms are so used in the Book of Psalms. Thus, we find:

כִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי מִלְכָּם וְלֹא יִצְבֵּה אֶת חֲסִידָיו
אֶת־נִלְמָדָם וְלֹדֵד רָעִים לִכְרֹת

(Ps. 37.28)

Furthermore there is apparently active strife between the $\text{h}^{\text{a}}\text{sidim}$ and the $\text{r}^{\text{o}}\text{sa'im}$:

אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה לִנְאֻם רַע לֹא יִכְלֹת חֲסִידָיו
מִיָּד רָעִים יִגְזֹף

(Ps. 97.10)

Evidently the $\text{r}^{\text{o}}\text{sa'im}$ try to destroy the $\text{h}^{\text{a}}\text{sidim}$ and it is only because Yahweh protects them, that the $\text{r}^{\text{o}}\text{sa'im}$ cannot succeed.

But we must consider: why should "pious" people necessarily be victimized by the wicked? Would we not rather expect the simple and the weak to be the prey of the wicked?

In Ps. 148.14, we have a use of the word $\text{h}^{\text{a}}\text{sidim}$ which even the casual reader will observe does not mean "pious," but is rather a term covering all Israel. It reads as follows:

וְיִרְמֵ קֶן לִזְמוֹ תְהִלָּה לְכָל חֲסִידָיו
לְבֵן יִשְׂרָאֵל עַם קְרוֹבָה בְּעַלְלוֹיָהּ

The parallelism of 'am with $\text{h}^{\text{a}}\text{sidim}$ is clear enough, but the psalmist makes this doubly clear by pointing out that

אֵם כָּל חֲסִידָיו
בֵּן יִשְׂרָאֵל עַם קְרוֹבָה

In Ps. 145.17 God Himself is declared a hasid!

יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ

says the Psalmist. Certainly "pious" is a strange attribute for God!

What, then, is the meaning of the term? Brown, Driver, and Briggs define יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה as "adj; kind, pious, godly...^sSubstantive--a pious man, the godly....pl. the pious, godly, those of the people who were faithful, devoted to God's service, only in Psalter, and chiefly, if not entirely, in late Psalms ^y 149.1,5; 30.5; 31.24; 37.28; 85.9; 97.10; 116.15; 148.14; 149.9; 52.11; 79.2; 89.20; 132.9; 2 Ch. 6.41 (= 132.9); ¹145.10; 50.5; 132.16"

But the few instances cited above, already indicate that the definition is unsatisfactory. A clearer and more exact definition of the term hasid is provided by Dr. Nelson Glueck who, in 1927, published his doctor's thesis on the word Hased. Translated from the German, Dr. Glueck's definition is as follows: " יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה --is the manner of behavior suited to a legal-duty-relationship."

It is further "the manner of behavior of all men conformable to society. Hased represents the ethical religious duty of all men to practise human friendship and to help one's neighbor."

"God's יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה is the manner of behavior suited to the partnership (elements in common) between Him and His faithful ones."

"A striking confirmation of the basic characteristic of יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה, namely that of mutual readiness to render assistance and the rendering of assistance on the part of the member of a community, we find in the Arabic. Schulthess says: 'If one might substitute o for q (which is stiff-necked cecography) then the Arabic ^أ would be parallel:

to get together to help some one.' Brugsch translates **דָּמָד** --
 'to assemble hastily in order to hurry to the aid of some one.' Lane
 translates **דָּמָד** -- 'they collected themselves together and came round
 about aiding one another.'

דָּמָד וְעָלִיָּה, they collected themselves together, aiding one another
 against him;

אֶדְתָּשָׁה -- he exerted himself for the entertainment of guests.

Brugsch translated **דָּמָד** -- to gather to help one another; to
 deal unitedly against an enemy.

אֶדְתָּמָה -- to be prepared (for helping)

דָּמָד -- one ready to help

דָּמָד וְעָלִיָּה -- rendering of aid.²

Accordingly, the word **אֱוֹה** is defined as follows: "Versteht man
 den **אֱוֹה** Gottes als eine solche Verhaltungsweise, so erklärt sich die
 festgestellte Tatsache, dass nur diejenigen, die in einem sittlich
 religiösen Gemeinschaftsverhältnis mit Gott stehen, (i.e. **אֱוֹה**) seinen
אֱוֹה erhalten können und erwarten dürfen."

But now we wonder: Who stands in an ethical religious partnership
 relationship with God? Is it Israel as a whole as intimated in Ps. 148.14?
 Is it a group in Israel as in Ps. 37.28 and 97.10? Is it a party with a
 definite philosophy? If so, what is its nature? What is the nature of
 its organization? Were they perhaps the forerunners of the **h^asidim** who
 so bravely supported the Maccabees? Or is it only a group of individuals?
 How do the **h^asidim** maintain their relationship with God. What do they
 expect of Him? A clearer concept of the **h^asidim** may be gathered by
 noting the meaning of this term each time it occurs by comparing it

with its synonyms and antonyms, and by studying the utterances of the \dot{h}^a sidim.

Such a study must reckon with the element of time. The likelihood is that the \dot{h}^a sidim were not exactly the same at all times. Consequently it is proposed to study the Book of Psalms, determine the date of each psalm as clearly as possible, and study its content. It is hoped that this study will not only clarify the meaning of the term " \dot{h}^a sidim" but will throw considerable light on the history of the period of their activity which seems to have extended from the time of the exile or earlier up to the rise of the Pharisees and Sadducees.

Notes to Section I

1 B D B p. 339

2 Glueck, N.: "Das Wort Hessed," 1927., pp. 67f.

3 Glueck, N.: op.cit., p. 66

II

Dating of the Psalms

It is generally accepted that the Psalms have been written during a long period of time, extending over hundreds of years. However, there is unfortunately no unanimity of opinion as to the particular date of any psalm. But as it is impossible to observe progress in thought and ideology without the time element, an effort must be made to determine at least the approximate date of each. The present writer lacks the knowledge requisite for this task, if it were to be done on independent grounds. He has, therefore, adopted the unpublished as well as published notes of his teacher, Dr. Julian Morgenstern, as a general guide. From Dr. Morgenstern's conclusions, the writer deviated only when he felt there was sufficient warrant for his so doing. Below is a table listing each psalm or fragment in the regular order. Alongside of each psalm, the probable date is indicated. If a psalm is subdivided, the verses belonging to each part are noted. Whenever the writer set a date that varied from Dr. Morgenstern's, he indicated the latter's opinion in square brackets []. Certain of the psalms are marked P or U, indicating whether their general tone, in the opinion of this writer, is particularistic or universalistic.

<u>Psalm</u>	<u>Period of Composition</u>	<u>Date (when possible)</u>	<u>Class</u>
1	400-200	250	P
2		5/10/486	
3	516-200 [400-350]	400	
4	516-200 [400-300]	400	
5	516-486 or after 440 [400-200]		

<u>Psalm</u>	<u>Period of Composition</u>	<u>Date (when possible)</u>	<u>Class</u>
6	400-300		
7	521-200 [400-200]		
8	516-500		U
9		479	
10.	[458-400]	479	
11	[458-400]	486	
12		460	
13	500-200		
14	485-458		
15	516-485		
16	444-400 or 200-170		
17	200-170		
18	500-458		P
19 A (1-2, 5b-7)	Before 500		
19 B (8-15)	Shortly before 400		
19C (3-5a fragment)	After 300		
20 A (1-5, 8b)	458-350		
20 B (6a, 7-10)	500-485		P
21	500-485		P
22	485-479		
23	516-200 [516-500]		
24 A (1-2, 7-10)	516-485		U
24 B (3-6)		411 or 458 (?)	
25	485-400		
26	400-350		
27	458-400		
28	500-485	486	P
29	516-500	516	U
30	400-200		
31	400-300		
32	478-458 or 350-200		
33 A (1-4, 10-22)	479-458		P
33 B (5-9)	400-300		U
34	458-400		
35	458-400		
36	516-485		
37	350-200		
38	516-485		
39	300-250		
40	350-200 [516-485] (cf. Ps. 70)		
41	300-250		
42	516-485 (Perhaps 350-250)		
43	516-485 (Perhaps 350-250)		
44	485-478		P
45	Before 516	521	
46 A (1-6, 8)	516-500		
46 B		479	

<u>Psalm</u>	<u>Period of Composition</u>	<u>Date (when possible)</u>	<u>Class</u>
47	500-485		
48 A (1-4, 9-15)	500-485		
48 B (5-8)		479	
49	200-170	170	
50	516-485		
51 A (1-19)	516-485		
51 B (20-21)	584-444		
52	516-485		U
53	485-458 [485-478]		
54	458-400		
55	250-165 [458-350]		
56	400-250		
57	400 or 516-485		
58	500-250 [400-200]		
59	400-200		
60	485-480 [A (1-7, 12-13)--485-480 B (8-11, 14)-- 478-]		P
61	500-485	486	P
62	300-200		
63	486 [300-200]		P
64	500-200 [300-200]		
65	516-500		U
66 A (1-12)	479-458	475	U
66 B (13-20)	516-486		
67	516-500		U
68	516-486		P
69		400	
70	350-200 (cf. Ps. 40)		
71	350-200		
72	500-485	486	P
73	400-200		
74 A (1-12, 18-23)	486-479		
74 B (13-17)	516-500 [?]		U
75	500-485	486	
76	516-486		P
77	485-479	481	
78	Before 516		P
79	485-479		P
80	479-456		P
81	516-486		P
82 A (1, 5b-7)		500	
82 B (2-5a)	350-200		
83	485-479	486	P
84	500-485	486	
85	470-460		P
86 A (1-7, 11-17)	400-350		
86 B (8-10)	516-486		U
87	516-486		
88	350-250		
89 A (1-3, 6-19)	516-486		U
89 B (4-5, 20-38)		486	P
89 C (39-52)	486-479		

<u>Psalm</u>	<u>Period of Composition</u>	<u>Date (when possible)</u>	<u>Class</u>
90	350-200		
91	516-486		
92	400-335		
93	516-486		U
94 A (1-7,14)	486-479		P
94 B (8-13,15-23)	400-335		
95	516-486		U
96	516-486		U
97	516-486		U
98	516-486		
99	444-411		P
100	516-500		U
101	516-486		
102 A (1-12,24-25a)	400-250		
102 B (14-23,25b-28)	486-458		P
102 C (13,25b-28)	540-486		U
103 A (1-5,22b)	400-350		
103 B (6-22a)	516-486		
104	516-486		U
105	516-486		P
106	458-400		P
107	470-460		
108	485-480 [500-485]		
109	400-250		
110		486	P
111	516-486 [516-500]		
112	516-500		
113	485-478		U
114		500	P
115 A (1-8)	Before 516		P
115 B (9-18)	411-350		
116	400-250		
117	516-486		U
118 A (1-4)	411-350		
118 B (5-28)	486-479		P
119		400	
120	350-250		
121	486-458		
122	516-500		
123	485-480		
124		479-478	
125 A (1-2,5b)		478	
125 B (3-5a)	350-250		
126		479	
127	350-200		
128	350-200		

<u>Psalm</u>	<u>Period of Composition</u>	<u>Date (when possible)</u>	<u>Class</u>
129	485-478		P
130	350-250		
131	350-250		
132 A (1-5, 10-18)		521	P
132 B (6-9)		516	
133	400-170		
134	350-250		
135	400-300		
136	250-200		
137 A (1-6)		597	P
137 B (7-9)		479	P
138 [A (1-3, 7-8) -- 400-250 B (4-6) -- 516-486]		478	
139 A (1-6, 13-24)	350-250		
139 B (7-12)	516-486		U
140	400-200		
141	400-250		
142	400-250		
143	400-250		
144 A (1-8, 10-11)	521-486 [?]		
B (9, 12-15)	516-490		
145	350-200		
146	350-200		
147	350-200 or 444-400		
148	350-200		U
149 A (1-6a, 9b)	500-486		P
149 B (6b-9a)		478	P
150	350-200		

"Hasid" in Pre-Exilic Times

Outside the Book of Psalms, the term hasid occurs seven times, viz.: Dt. 33.8; I Sam. 2.9; II Sam. 22.26; Mi. 7.2; Jer. 3.12; Pr. 3.12; II Ch. 6.41. Of these, II Ch. 6.41 is a mere repetition of Ps. 132.9 and II Sam. 22.26 is the same as Ps. 18.26. Since the h^asidim as presented in the Psalter will be discussed in detail, they need not detain us at present. The same applies to the term hasid in I Sam. 2.9. This verse is part of a very late psalm which could not have been composed much earlier than the Book of Daniel. This ^{can} readily _A be deduced from v. 6 which reads:

יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ
יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ

It is as clear a statement of the belief in life after death as any that may be found in the Bible, and points to a period no earlier than the second century B. C.

Pr. 2.8 according to Eissfeldt was written no earlier than the ¹ 4th century. The meaning of hasid in that verse will therefore be clarified by a study of the h^asidim during that period. There remain, therefore: Dt. 33.8; Mi. 7.2 and Jer. 3.12.

Each of the above-mentioned references is generally regarded by critics as genuine and pre-exilic. The earliest occurrence of the term is in Dt. 33.8, where we find: תְּהִי שִׁמְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ
The date of the song of which this verse is a part, is regarded as quite early. Carpenter regards the song as Ephraimitic in origin, composed in the period of either Jeroboam or early in the reign of Jeroboam II. ² Dr. Morgenstern sets the date between 865 and 842. ³ This date indicates the term אֱלֹהֵינוּ is ancient. Nor is its occurrence in pre-exilic literature limited to this one instance.

In Mi. 7.2, written in the last quarter of the 8th century, ⁴

we have $\text{הַחֲסִידִים} \text{ מִן} \text{ אֵלֹהֵינוּ}$. Authorities such as Eissfeldt in his "Eileitung" and J. M. P. Smith in the "International Critical Commentary" feel that there is no ground for assuming the verse is corrupt or that it does not belong to Micah.

Finally, we have in Jer. 3.12 $\text{הַחֲסִידִים} \text{ מִן} \text{ אֵלֹהֵינוּ}$. These three, undoubtedly pre-exilic, instances of the use of indicate the word is very old. However, it is important to observe that in the three pre-exilic references to הַחֲסִידִים , we find no occurrence of the plural. In the early period, "hasid" seems to have been meant as a description of an individual who, like Moses in Dt. 33.8, was regarded as being especially close to Yahweh and as having more intimate relations with Him than the average Israelite; by virtue of the fact, he was enabled to act as mediator between the people and their God. ⁵ This theory fits well with the use of the term in Mi. 7.2, which reads:

$\text{הַחֲסִידִים} \text{ מִן} \text{ אֵלֹהֵינוּ}$
 $\text{הַחֲסִידִים} \text{ מִן} \text{ אֵלֹהֵינוּ}$

Who the hasid was, is answered in the next verse:

$\text{הַחֲסִידִים} \text{ מִן} \text{ אֵלֹהֵינוּ}$

The "prince" and "judge" were expected to be h^asidim, but were not. As leaders of the people, they might indeed have been expected to have the hasid relationship with God, and, by virtue thereof, to have helped Israel. But unhappily, both the הַחֲסִידִים and the הַחֲסִידִים have failed to maintain their relationship with Yahweh. "The prince asketh and the judge is ready for a reward," declares the prophet.

Another and even simpler explanation of "hasid" as used in Deuteronomy and Micah commends itself. In the first case, it might well mean

that Moses is conceived as having "hasid" relationships with the tribe of Levi, of which he was an honored member. In the second instance, the לוי and לוי must have been pictured as having the hasid relationship to the people for whose destinies they were responsible. It should be noted that unlike the b^orit, hasid was not a contractual relationship that might be dissolved, any more than one might dissolve a family relationship.

In Jeremiah, however, we get the first hint that the people as a whole are conceived as having this relationship with their God, and not merely with fellow human beings. Yahweh Himself is represented as the "hasid." Hence it is more than likely that Jeremiah conceived of Him as having the hasid relationship with Israel as a whole, and that those of the people who recognized Yahweh as their God, might properly be termed h^asidim.

However, it is reasonable to suppose that a considerable period of time must have elapsed before the people began to think of themselves as h^asidim. We can, nevertheless, be certain of the fact that the realization finally dawned upon some of the Israelites, who then adopted the name. The fact is indicated by the use of the term h^asidim to describe certain Jews during the post-exilic period. Exactly who the h^asidim were is the subject of our next chapter.

Notes to Section III

- 1 Eissfeldt, Otto: "Einleitung in das Alte Testament," p. 524
- 2 Carpenter and Harford: Composition of the Hexateuch - p. 313
- 3 Morgenstern, J.: "Book of the Covenant," II, H. U. C. Annual, Vol. VII, 1930, p. 220
- 4 Eissfeldt, O.: op.cit., p. 452
- 5 Morgenstern, J.: "Book of the Covenant," III, p. 71

IV

Identification of the Ḥāsīdīm

To learn who the Ḥāsīdīm were, we must study the Book of Psalms, as it is the vehicle of their expression and the repository of their beliefs and doctrines. As was already mentioned, the term, Ḥāsīdīm, or an inflection thereof, occurs with some frequency in the Psalter. We find twenty-five uses of the term, seven of which are in the singular and eighteen in the plural. Of these seven, one refers to a group. Ps. 43.1 states:

יְהוָה רִיבִי מִן־מַלְאֲכָיו

A second is applied to a member of a group of Ḥāsīdīm. Ps. 32.6 says:

חַסִּידֶיךָ יְהוָה יִתְּנָה לְךָ חַסִּידִים

A third use of the term is similar to that of Jeremiah. It refers to Yahweh as ḥasid. Ps. 145.17 reads:

יְהוָה בָּרֵךְ בְּכָל־חַסִּידָיו

The use of the plural of ḥasid in the post-exilic psalms suggests the possibility that the Ḥāsīdīm constituted a distinct group at that time. This theory we shall now consider with some degree of detail.

The first observation that may be made about the Ḥāsīdīm of the post-exilic period, is that they felt they had the ḥesed relationship with Yahweh. At this later period, there was no longer the implication, present in the pre-exilic times, that the ḥasid was some exceptional individual who stood head and shoulders above his brethren, like Moses or the נָבִיא and צַדִּיק; nor was it any longer possible to interpret ḥasid as a person who is faithful to his ḥesed relationship with his fellow-men. Even its earliest post-exilic use in Ps. 132A.16 (c. 521) points to the fact that the ḥasid was considered a member of

a large group who felt close to God. For the psalmist states in vv.

15-16 of Ps. 132A:

לְיָהוָה [זִיּוֹן] בָּרַךְ אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵי חַסְדִּים
וּבְהִנֵּה אֵלֵינוּ יֵשֶׁע וְחַסְדֵּיךָ רַחֵם יִרְחַם

Yahweh promises to bless Zion and all its inhabitants, who seem to be אֱלֹהֵינוּ, אֱלֹהֵי, and חַסְדֵּי. From this usage, it is not altogether clear as to who the h^asidim might be. Do they include the אֱלֹהֵינוּ and אֱלֹהֵי? Do they include one and not the other?

Further study of this matter is evidently essential. Yet irrespective of what decision we reach on the above question, the h^asidim are apparently a large group, probably the bulk of the Judeans resident in the land. The fact that Yahweh promises them His blessing indicates that He feels that they, the h^asidim, have some claim upon Him, such as might be expected from a h^esed relationship between Himself and them. This is confirmed in 132B.9 (o. 516), which reads:

כִּהְיִיךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל זָבָק וְחַסְדֵּיךָ יִרְחַם

"Thy h^asidim," says the Psalmist to Yahweh, "will sing!" Is there any further doubt of the identity of the two parties between whom the h^esed relationship was believed to exist? To establish the point that the h^asidim felt that their h^esed relationship, indicated by their name, was with Yahweh, rather than any other person or group, and also to identify the h^asidim more fully, we shall now list each of the verses in which the term occurs, and comment briefly when necessary.

Between 516-486 B. C.

1. Ps. 43.1: אֲרִיבָה רִיבֵנוּ אֵלֵינוּ חַסְדֵּי

The implication is that the foreign nation, against which Yahweh is called upon to plead the cause of the psalmist, has no h^esed relationship

I suspect the
- is singular
an individual
and not a
nation; cf. v. 1
and note that
this is a pilgrim ps.

with Him, while his nation, Israel, has. Apparently then, the psalmist, who is no doubt a hasid, feels that Israel as a whole stands in hesed relationship to Yahweh.

2. Ps. 50.5: אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְיָ חֲסִידֵינוּ כְּרַחֵם בְּרַחֲמֵי יְיָ זָכָה

This call issued in the name of Yahweh leaves no doubt as to the parties involved in the hesed relationship. They are unquestionably Yahweh and His people Israel; at least those among the Israelites who are aware of the relationship and symbolize it by a special zebah.

3. Ps. 52.11: יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ

This verse is addressed to Yahweh, and indicates clearly that Yahweh was one of the parties involved in the hesed relationship. The same applies to

4. Ps. 97.10: יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ

5. Ps. 18.26 (and II Sam. 22.26) דָּם חֲסִידֵינוּ תִּתְּחַסֵּךְ

6. Ps. 149A.1 תִּבְהַלְתִּי בְּקִרְיַת חֲסִידֵינוּ

This verse is interesting in that it indicates that the hasidim felt they formed a distinct קָהָל. Perhaps it points to the existence of synagogues in which hasidim prayed publicly. This will be discussed more fully in a later section.

7. Ps. 149A.5 יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ

8. Ps. 149A.9b בְּדָרְ הָאֵל לְכֹחַ חֲסִידֵינוּ

Was the relationship conceived any differently in later periods? Let us test this by examining the usage of the term "hasid" in psalms of later dates.

486-458

1. Ps. 89B.20 אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ

As the verse is addressed to Yahweh, there can be no doubt as to who

shared the *hesed* relationship. The same applies to the other instances where *hasid* or any of its inflected forms occurs. These are listed below.

2. Ps. 79.2: *בשר חסידים לחיית-אדמה*
3. Ps. 85.9: *כי ידבר אלוק אל זמור ואל חסידיו*
4. Ps. 12.2: *הושיעה יהוה כי גמר חסיד*

That the *h^asidim* still felt that the *hesed* relationship existed between Yahweh and themselves as late as the Maccabean period is indicated by the following verses:

none of these is as late as the Maccabean period

1. Ps. 4.4: *כי הפלח יהוה חסיד לו*
2. Ps. 32.6: *אז יאמר יתהלל בן חסיד אליך*
3. Ps. 86A.2: *אמרה נפשי כי חסיד אני*

This verse is particularly clear in indicating the nature of the *hesed* relationship. Yahweh is here called upon to protect the *hasid* on the grounds of the *hesed* relationship assumed to exist between Yahweh and His *h^asidim*.

4. Ps. 145.10: *יודוך יהוה ל ששין וחסידים יתנובב*
5. Ps. 145.17: *צדיק יהוה בכל דרכיו וחסיד בל מציין*
6. Prv. 2.8: *ידרך חסידיו ישמר*
7. II Ch. 6.41: *כהניך יהוה אלהים יאגדו תמידה*
8. Ps. 30.5: *וחסידים יאמרו בל וביק: צלחך יא יהיה ית חסידיו*
9. Ps. 31.24: *אהבו את יהוה כל חסידיו*
10. Ps. 37.28: *לא יצדק את חסידיו*
11. Ps. 148.14: *תהלל ל כל חסידיו*
12. Ps. 116.15: *אפי' יצוץ צמ קרובו... יקר בעיני יהוה האמת לחסידיו*

13. Ps. 16.10

אֵלֵינוּ מִלְּפָנֶיךָ יְיָ

14. I Sam. 2.9

וְעַתָּה יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לְפָנֶיךָ יְיָ

We may therefore consider it as an established fact that throughout the post-exilic Biblical literature the term *hasid* implied a member of a group which looked upon itself as one standing in *hesed* relationship with Yahweh. We are now ready to consider the identification of the group known as *h^asidim*.

The verses containing the term *hasid* are not sufficient in themselves to identify the *h^asidim* with any degree of certainty. However, a careful reading of the psalms in which the term occurs, indicates that the psalmist has identified himself with the *h^asidim* and expresses their sentiments. It is, therefore, perfectly safe to draw on the entire psalm for information. But the problem may be treated from an even broader scope. The synonyms and antonyms of "*hasid*" which appear in the psalms bearing the term "*hasid*", are repeated throughout the Psalter. Moreover, the ideas in those psalms are parallel to those in the psalms which do not employ the term "*hasid*." These considerations point to the significant conclusion that with few, if any, exceptions, the entire Book of Psalms reflects *hasidic* thought and ideology. It is consequently safe to assume that no matter how the psalmist identifies his central character or characters, he is thinking of *h^asidim*. Hence we can proceed to identify the *h^asidim* not only on the basis of the few psalms in which the term occurs, but in all the 176 psalms or fragments identified in the Book of Psalms.

For the sake of clarity, the identification of the *h^asidim* will be divided into three periods:

1. 537-486

2. 486-458

3. 458-165²

Period I
(537-486)

The first element in the identification of the h^asidim has already been mentioned. They are Israelites who feel they have a *hesed* relationship with Yahweh. This is indicated not only by the use of the term *hasid* or one of its inflections, but likewise by the frequent references to Yahweh's awareness of His *hesed* toward the h^asidim. Such expressions occur frequently during this period, e.g., Ps. 36.6,11; 48A.10; 51A.2; 52.10; 57.4; 63.4; 66B.20; 98.3; 100.5; 103.11; 117.2.

Which Israelites are included under the heading of h^asidim is our next question. Ps. 144A is evidently spoken by a king of Israel, who says:

הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה צוּרֵנוּ הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ
אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ
אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ
אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ
(Ps. 144A.1-2)

That the speaker is a *hasid* is clearly indicated in the beginning of the second verse. That he is a king may be concluded from the expression:

הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ

This is explicitly stated in v. 10:

יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ

The reference to David signifies the king is a member of the Davidic³ dynasty, and is either Zerubabel or Menahem.

Another reference to a ḥasidic king is found in Ps. 18.51 or II Sam. 22.51.

יְהוָה וְאֶמְצִיא מִלְכִּי וְעַד הַסֹּף לֹאֲמַיִחוּ לְגֹבַהּ וְלִנְרוֹ מִן־חַמֵּשׁ

There is even a hint that a priest might be a ḥasid. Thus we have in Ps. 5.4:

בְּקֶרֶךְ אֶצְרִיךָ לֹקֵחַ עֹלֶה

Gunkel says: " *צֶרֶךְ* das übliche Wort vom surdsten des Opfers...Das Wort wird auch vom Darlegen der Beweisgründe gebraucht..., aber nicht vom Vortragen des Gebetes."⁴ If his assertion is correct, the speaker must be a priest, as no laymen officiated at the altar during the post-exilic period. The king did indeed have the privilege of acting as the chief priest, and Zerubabel might have been expected to serve in that capacity, but he was overthrown before he had the opportunity⁵ to do so.

That koh^anim might have belonged to the ḥasidic group may perhaps be inferred from 132A.15-16:

לְיָדָהּ [צִיּוֹן?] בֶּרֶךְ סֹבֵרֵךְ אֲבִינִיָּה אֶלְבִּיץ לֹחֵם
יִכְנֶנֶה אֶלְבִּיץ יֵאָזֵר וְחִסְדֵּיהָ כֵּן יִרְנָנוּ :

In these verses the ebionim, koh^anim, and ḥ^asidim are parallel. They are either alike or mutually exclusive. Should we adopt the latter theory, we would be forced to conclude that the ebionim were not ḥ^asidim. However, we shall later show that the ebionim were always considered ḥ^asidim. Hence the koh^anim too must have been considered part of the group making up the ḥ^asidim. It is well to note, however, that at this period (537-486 B.C.) the officiating priests must have been the koh^anim-Leviim and not the

Sadoqites of the period following 458 B.C.

There is a third reference relating the kohanim to the hasidim of this period. Ps. 132B.9 states:

וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁכַּח אֶת-יְהוָה
וְיִשְׁכַּח אֶת-בְּרִיתוֹ

The passage is similar to Ps. 132A, and leads to the same conclusion. Of this much we may be certain, that there was ^{in this period} friendship, good feeling, and general agreement between the hasidim and kohanim.

While the king and the kohanim may have belonged to the hasidim, they were only an infinitesimal part of the group. Judging by the tone used in many of the psalms of this period, practically all of Palestine Jewry, if not world-Jewry, was regarded by the psalmists as hasidic. This is the case in Pss. 29, 46A, 47, 50, 52, 67, 68, 76, 78, 81, 89A, 95, 97, 105, 111, 115A, 144B, 149A.

It will be helpful to discover, if possible, who were not regarded as hasidim.

Following our assumption that practically all the psalmists were hasidim, it is obvious that their opponents were either non-hasidim or hasidim of an opposing group. We shall consider the latter possibility further on, but for the present we can examine those terms that seem to refer to non-hasidim. In Ps. 5.11, we have:

כִּי אֵין בְּלִבִּי יִשְׁכַּח אֶת-יְהוָה

In Ps. 36.2, we read:

כִּי אֵין בְּלִבִּי יִשְׁכַּח אֶת-יְהוָה

Ps. 52.9:

כִּי אֵין בְּלִבִּי יִשְׁכַּח אֶת-יְהוָה

These people are evidently atheists and are excluded from the hasidic community. A second group of r^osa'im are the unethical people.

Thus, in Ps. 5.6-7:

אֵל יִתְצַבּוּ הַזֹּלִיִּים לִנְגַד צִיִּיִּךָ
אֵלֶּיךָ כֹּה פִּעֲלֵי אֵלֶּיךָ: אֵלֶּיךָ דַּבְּרִי כִּי
אֵלֶּיךָ דַּבְּרִי אֶרְמוֹהַּ יִתְצַבּוּ וְהוּא

In Ps. 5.8, the psalmist continues:

כִּי אֵין הַפִּיִּהוּ נִבְנוּהַ קִרְבֵּי הַוֹּת
קִבְּרֵי פִתּוֹחַ גְּרוֹמֵם לִשְׁמֵם יִחְלִיקוֹן

Ps. 38.13 says:

יִנְקֹא מִקֶּקֶל נִפְשִׁי וְדַרְשִׁי רַצְתִּי דַּבְּרוּ הַוֹּת
וְאֶרְמוֹהַ כֹּה הַיּוֹם יִהְיֶה

In v. 21, he continues:

וְאֶשְׁלֵא רַצְתִּי תַחַת טֹבָה יִשְׁלֹנִי
תַחַת רַבּוֹבֵי-טֹבָה

Ps. 50 also describes the unethical character of the *raša'*, especially in vv. 18-20, which read:

אִם רָאוּת גָּבַהּ וְהִרְשָׁה וְצִוּ מַמְלָכִים חֹלְקִים:
פִּיךָ אֵלֶיךָ קִרְדָּה וְלִשְׁוֹן תִּצְמִיד אֶרְמוֹהַ:
תִּשָּׁא [תִּשָּׂא? מִלֵּךְ] דִּמְיוֹן תִּבְדֹּר בֶּן-אָמֶם תִּתֵּן-דִּפְיִ:

Another description of the *raša'* is given in Ps. 52.4-6:

הוּא תַמְסֵךְ לִשְׁוֹן כְּתִירוֹ מִלֵּשׁ צִלָּה רָמִיהַ:
אֶבְרַת וְדִ מִטְּלֵי עֵקֶר מִדְּבַר צִדֵּק סִלָּה:
אֶפְרַת כֹּה דַבְּרִי-בְּלִי לִשְׁוֹן אֶרְמוֹהַ:

A third group of non-*hāsīdīm* are apparently the wealthy. This is indicated in Ps. 52.9:

וַיִּבְטַח בְּרֵב צִירוֹ יִצֵּד בְּהִלָּהוּ [בְּהִלָּהוּ?]

It need hardly be added that foreign nations were not acceptable as *hāsīdīm*. It should be noted, however, that the basis for their exclusion was religion, or rather the lack of it, from the Jewish view-

point. Race played no part at this time. This latter point will be brought out more fully in the discussion on Universalism and Particularism.

The specific references to non-Israelites as opponents of the ḥasidim are as follows:

Ps. 42.11:

(apparently foreign nations)

קדשך בדלמות חרבוני
באומי מלי בל היום
איה זלתיק

I think this refers to individuals, either foreigners (Phoenicians) or Israelite ḥasidim.

Ps. 68.31:

לדור חית קנה רב
בדגלי צמח את רבם
בזר צמח קרבנות יחפלו

That ^{foreign} nations were welcomed if they wished to serve Yahweh is expressed in the following verses:

יבגו חמנימי מני מצרים כוז תריץ יבין לאלהים
ממלכות הארץ יירו לאלהים נמרו יהוה סלה

Idol-worshipping nations were, however, generally regarded as unfriendly to Israel. Thus Ps. 97.7 declares:

יבאו ל צדקי בסל המהבאלים
השתחו לו לא אלהים

Period II
(486-458)

In general, the identification of the ḥasid during Period I obtains for the second span of time. These ḥasidim, like their fathers, feel a ḥesed relationship with Yahweh. This is expressed in Pss. 25.6,7,10; 33A.18,22; 44.27; 61.8; 63.4; 107.1,8,15,20,31,43;

138.2,8.

1st period?

2nd period?

Certain individuals like the king are ^{still} again within the ranks of the h^asidim. (cf. Ps. 61.8; 63.12) An interesting indication of the fact that Israelites living in the distant country-places are to be grouped with the h^asidim is the (pilgrim) psalm, 121, describing a hasid, who, (on the occasion of a festival), has to make his way to Jerusalem through the desert.⁶ We also have at this period references to prisoners who had been freed. No doubt these were the fortunate ones among the many victims made captive during the unhappy year which opened this second period. Thus Ps. 102B.20-21 declares:

*Does not put
out this as a
pilgrimage.*

כִּי הִשְׁקִיף מִמְּרוֹם קִדְּמוֹ יְהוָה מִשְׁמַיִם אֶל אֶרֶץ הַחַיִּים
לֵאמֹר אֲנִי אֶסֶר לְפָנָיו בְּנֵי תַמְזָרָה :

Likewise Ps. 107.2-3 reads:

גִּלְגָּלִי יְהוָה אֲנִי אֲנִי גִלְגָּלִי - זָר :
וּמִיָּדָיו קִבְּצָם מִמִּדְבָּר מִחֲדָר מִצְרַיִם :

But even more emphatically than before do we have the frequently repeated assertion that all of Israel may be considered h^asidim. In Ps. 24B.6, we have: הִשְׁקִיף כִּנִּיךָ יִצְחָק . Ps. 44 is written entirely in the name of Israel. (cf. vv. 5,13) The same may be said of many other psalms, notably 46B, 60,66A,74A,79,80,83,85,89B,94A, 102B,118B,123,129.

This factor is emphasized by the evident enmity toward foreign nations that became manifest at this time. The reasons for this phenomenon are obvious to all who accept Dr. Morgenstern's theory of what took place in 486 B.C. Hence we find that most of the references to "enemies" at this period refer to foreign nations, particularly to those which shared in the cruel destruction of Jerusalem. Following

are some of the sentiments voiced at this period:

Ps. 63.10: לְאֻמֹּת יִבְקֶשׁ נַפְשִׁי (apparently foreign nations) הָאֻמִּים

74A.4: (foreigners who destroyed Jerusalem) לְאֻמֵּי צִוְרִיָּק
בְּקִרְבֵּי מוֹצֵדִק

74A.8: אֲמֵנוּ (i.e., foreign nations) בָּלָבָם נִשְׁמַח יְהוָה

74A.18: זָכַר זִמְתּוֹ אֵלֶיךָ חֵרֶץ יְהוָה (foreign)

וְצִיָּק נִבְלָה (indicates attitude toward foreign nations at that time) לְאֻמֵּי מִמָּוֶל

74A.22: יִזְכֹּר חֲרֻכְתְּךָ מִנִּי נִבְלָה כֹּל הַיּוֹם

74A.23: וְאֵל תִּשְׁבַּח קוֹל לְצִוְרִיָּק אֲמֹן קִמְּךָ אֵלֶיךָ תִּמְצִיץ

This attitude is typical of the period and the other psalms sharing this viewpoint will here be listed, as the quotations will be largely repetitions: Pss. 2,9,10,11,14,33A,44,53,60,63,74A,79,80,83,89B,89C,94A, 110,118B,124(foreigners are implied, though not clearly), 129,137B,149B.

It is worthy of note that the enmity expressed toward foreign nations did not arise only because they had brought suffering on Israel, but because of the indignation which the h^asidim felt at the nations' utter disregard of Yahweh. Thus in 74A.18, the psalmist cries:

זָכַר זִמְתּוֹ אֵלֶיךָ חֵרֶץ יְהוָה
וְצִיָּק נִבְלָה לְאֻמֵּי מִמָּוֶל

In v.22, he adds: יִזְכֹּר חֲרֻכְתְּךָ מִנִּי נִבְלָה כֹּל הַיּוֹם

In Pss. 14 and 53, the psalmist says to his God:

v. 1 אֲמַר נִבְלָה בִּלְבָבוֹ אֵין אֱלֹהִים

v. 4 in Ps. 14; v. 5 in 53: יְהוָה לֹא קִרְאָו

Ps. 2.2: יִתְצַבּוּ מַלְכֵי אֲרָץ וְרוֹצְנִים טָסְדּוּ יַחַד אֵל יְהוָה וְאֵל מִיִּחוּ

9.18: כֹּל גִּוּוִּים שִׁבְחֵי אֱלֹהִים

79.6: שִׁבְךָ חֲמַתְךָ אֵל הַקִּיָּים אֲשֶׁר אֵל יִדְצֹק

וְאֵל מִמָּוֶל אֲשֶׁר בִּשְׂמֶךָ לֹא קִרְאָו

83.6: כִּי נִדְרָה לָךְ יִחְזֹל חַיִּיק בְּרִית 'בְּרִיתוֹ
94A.7: וַיֵּאמְרוּ לָנוּ יִרְאֵה יְהוָה וְלֹא יִבִּין אֲנֵהוּ יִצְרָק

Again it must be noted that the psalms pointing to foreign nations as enemies are almost entirely limited to less than a decade after 486 B.C. Thereafter, the universalistic tendencies of the ḥasidim reassert themselves. This point will, however, be discussed in greater detail in the section on Universalism and Particularism.

It is further worthy of note that shortly after the intense period of suffering passed, the ḥasidim once more turned their attention to religious considerations. In Ps. 12 (c. 460) they declare their abhorrence of unethical and irreligious thoughts and practises. Thus the psalmist excoriates those who declare: (v. 5) מִי אֵל בִּין לֹא

Such an atheistic belief excludes the Israelite from the ranks of the ḥasidim. Likewise the ethically vile, the anti-social, are cut off from hasidic circles. Ps. 12 treats this aspect most clearly.

That this psalm is ḥasidic, we may conclude from the fact that the author bemoans the disappearance of the אֱלֹהִים. "כִּי גָמַל חֲסִידוֹ" wails the psalmist (v.2). The psalm emphasizes faith in Yahweh (v. 7) and expresses confidence in the deliverance of the ḥasid from the hands of his enemies (vv. 6,8).

Who are these enemies? Mowinckel asserts that they are godless magicians, demons, who work spells and harm the people. However, this psalm seems to point in other directions. The rāṣa'im are rather liars (v.3-- אֱלֹהִים יִדְבָּרוּ), hypocrites (v.3-- וְלֹא יִדְבָּרוּ), arrogant (vv. 4-5-- אֲנִי אֶתְבָּרֵךְ אֶתְבָּרֵךְ אֶתְבָּרֵךְ), oppressors of אֲבוֹנִים and אֲבוֹנִים (v.6), and are also responsible for the exaltation of vileness (v.9). All these definitions seem to point

to r^{sa}'im as anti-social people rather than magicians who bewitch their victims.

Psalm 10 (c. 479) also describes the r^{sa}' as unethical and anti-social. He is:

1. atheistic

- v. 3-- נאף יהוה
- v. 4-- אין אלהים כל משמתי
- v. 5-- מות משפטיק אנקו
- v. 11-- אמר בקבו גבתי אל הסתר פניו כל חסד אנלח
- v. 13-- נאף רשע אלהים אמר בקבו לא תברש

2. arrogant

- v. 2-- בגאווה רשע ידלק צדי
- v. 3-- כי האז רשע אל תאמר נבו
- v. 4-- כגבה אפו כל ידע
- v. 6-- אמר בקבו כל אמוט

3. a liar

- v. 7-- כי כן מלא חמדות ותק תחת לשונו ואין
- 4. an oppressor (v. 10) ויכבה נשכח ישי ונפל קדשיו חלכאויס

5. a murderer

- v. 8 ישי בשארק חצרוס במסתרים יפיק נקי
- v. 9 יאצק באמת בארצה בסבה יאורק אשטף צני

There is nothing here to support Mowinckel's contention that the r^{sa}'im depended largely on their magical powers. They are definitely rich and powerful people whose atheism and arrogance led them to despoil their weaker fellows. They are denounced, not for making their victims ill, but rather for physically oppressing them, and even shedding

their blood.

Period III
(458-165 B. C.)

in my opinion this is too late

A significant change in the identification of the hasid was made after 458. Ezra appeared on the scene accompanied by a considerable number of Babylonian Jews. Their theories of Judaism and particularly of the Jewish religion differed in certain essential points from those of the h^asidim, who had long dwelt in Palestine, and had unwittingly, and yet naturally, taken over many of the syncretistic beliefs and practises of their environment. In his efforts to rid Judaism of these, to him strange and heathen concepts, he initiated a struggle that was long drawn out. Officially his ^{victory} conquest was ^{achieved} completed with the official introduction of the Pg code in 411 B. C. Actually the contest was continued into the Hellenistic period, when his former supporters and opponents change sides, but continue their struggle on into the Maccabean period.

The basic notion of a h^ased relationship between the h^asidim and Yahweh was, however, maintained throughout. This is indicated not only by the use of the term hasid even in I Sam. 9 (c. 170-165), but by the continued ascription of h^ased to Yahweh. This occurs in Pss. 6.5; 17.7; 23.6; 40.12; 42.9; 59.11,17,18; 62.13; 69.14,17; 90.14; 92.3; 94B.18; 103A.4; 106.1,7; 109.21; 118A.1-4; 119,41,59,64,76,88,124,149; 130.7; 136; 143.8,12.

*Is this the correct reference
in any case
The dating is
impossible*

Furthermore there are psalmists who, even at this late date, would include all of Israel under this heading. Thus we read in

Ps. 148.14 (c. 350-200 B.C.):

וְיָרֵם קֶרֶן לְעַמּוֹ תְּהִלָּה לְבָן חֲסִידִין
לְבֵן יִשְׂרָאֵל עִם קְרוֹבּוֹ הַלְלוּהוּ:

There is no mistaking the parallelism of עִם with חֲסִידִין and לְבֵן יִשְׂרָאֵל.

The hasidic author of this psalm undoubtedly considers the nation as a whole hasidic.

Ps. 136 (c. 250-200) also considers all of Israel as hasidic.

Note verse 9, which exults:

וַיִּזְכֹּר יִשְׂרָאֵל מַעֲשֵׂי בִי לְעוֹלָם חֲסִידוֹ
וַיִּזְכֹּר יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּתוֹכוֹ בִּי לְעוֹלָם חֲסִידוֹ

Likewise, v. 14:

v. 16:

אֲמִילֵךְ וְאֵם בְּמִדְבָּר בִּי לְעוֹלָם חֲסִידוֹ

v. 22:

נִחַלְתָּ יִשְׂרָאֵל עַבְדּוֹ בִּי לְעוֹלָם חֲסִידוֹ

But perhaps this psalm is not conclusive because its author seems to feel that not Israel alone but the entire universe stands in hased relationship with Yahweh. Thus he declares in v. 25:

נִוְתַן לְחַם לֶחֶם בָּרֶךְ בִּי לְעוֹלָם חֲסִידוֹ

Ps. 147 (c. 350-200 ?) also seems to look upon all of Israel as h^asidim. This is suggested by vv. 19-20:

מִגִּיד עֲבָדָיו לִיצְקָה חֲקִינוֹ וּמַשְׁבִּטִּין לְיִשְׂרָאֵל
אֲרַעֲהוּ בֵן לֹא גִוִּי וּמַשְׁבִּטִּים הֵם יַעֲזוּבֵם

Finally we have Ps. 106 (c. 458-400) where Israel is again unmistakably taken as a nation of h^asidim. In vv. 4-5, the psalmist implores:

זְכֹרֵנוּ יְהוָה בְּרִצְיוֹן עָמְךָ פִּקְדֹתֶיךָ בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל
אֲרִיזוֹת הַטּוֹבֹת בְּחִירֶיךָ אֲמַחַ שְׂמֹחַת גִּוִּיךָ אֲהַבְתָּ אֶת נַחֲלֶיךָ
In vv. 45-47 he adds:

וַיִּזְכֹּר לְעַם בְּרִיתוֹ וַיִּנָּחֵם כְּרַב חֲסִידוֹ
וַיִּתֵּן מִלֶּחֶם אֲרִיזוֹתֶיךָ לְפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ
הַמִּצְוֶה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְקִבְּלֵנוּ מִן הַגּוֹיִם
אֲהַבְתָּ אֶת קְדֻשַׁתְּךָ אֶת הַשְׁמַח בְּתוֹכֵנוּ:

It is significant that out of at least 65 psalms or fragments dated after 458, only four consider all of Israel as h^asidim, and of these four, one or two are not certain. This consideration seems to point to the conclusion that at this period, Israel was divided between the h^asidim and their opponents. The few psalmists who do include all of Israel may be among those who^homes are far from Jerusalem and are but little aware of the conflicts raging within the city.

Pertinent to this discussion are Pss. 115B, 118A, and 135. In the former we have, in vv. 9-11:

ישראל בטח ביהוה צורם ומגלם האל :
בית אבין בטחו ביהוה צורם ומגלם האל :
יראוי יהוה בטחו ביהוה צורם ומגלם האל :

Then again in vv. 12-13:

יהוה זכרנו יברק אור בית ישראל
יברק אור בית אבין :
יברק יראוי יהוה הקטנים עם הגדולים :

In Ps. 118A, vv. 2-4, we find:

יאלמו-נא ישראל כי לעולם חסדו :
יאלמו-נא בית אבין כי לעולם חסדו :
יאלמו-נא יראוי יהוה כי לעולם חסדו :

In Ps. 135.19-20, we may read:

בית ישראל ברכו את יהוה בית אבין ברכו את יהוה :
בית העליון ברכו את יהוה יראוי יהוה ברכו את יהוה :

Are בית ישראל and בית אבין parallel or mutually exclusive? Upon this answer hinges whether or not both of these, as well as בית העליון are parallel to the יראוי יהוה who are undoubtedly the h^asidim, or not. Gunkel declares that each of the terms represents a specific

group in Israel.⁸ As in Ezra 9.1 and 10.25, the term *יִשְׂרָאֵל* is applied to the laity. *קִיָּא אֱהִי* and *קִיָּא הָאֵל* are likewise distinct groups in Israel. Gunkel then concludes that the *יִשְׂרָאֵל* must be proselytes. The meaning of this term has been discussed by Dr. B. J. Bamberger in his article: "Fear and Love of God in the Old Testament."⁹ In it, Bamberger established that *יִשְׂרָאֵל* meant religion, and the *יִשְׂרָאֵל* can only mean people who observe the religion. Proselytes might well be included under this heading, but they certainly cannot be the only ones entitled to the honor. Certainly Abraham (Gen. 22.12) was no proselyte, nor was Obadiah (I Ki. 18.3) nor even Jonah (Jon. 1.9). The number of instances of Israelites termed *יִשְׂרָאֵל* is too great to be reproduced, nor is it necessary. The assumption that the *יִשְׂרָאֵל* are proselytes has no justification whatever, even at this late date. Gunkel's theory that the groups are distinct is, however, correct. Hence we may conclude that at this time only certain people in Israel were considered *יִשְׂרָאֵל*, and these must have been the *hāsīdīm*, with whom the *יִשְׂרָאֵל* were apparently equated. Thus in Ps. 103B.11, the psalmist says:

כִּי כִגְדָה אֱמִין אֶל הָאֵלִים גְּבִיר חֲסִידָיו אֶל יִשְׂרָאֵל

In v. 17, he adds:

וַחֲסִידָיו יִשְׂרָאֵל מִלִּפְנֵי אֱלֹהִים אֶל יִשְׂרָאֵל

In Ps. 33A.16, we read:

הִנֵּה עַל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱמִין חֲסִידָיו

And similarly in Ps. 147, probably composed c. 350-200, we find in v. 11:

רֹאשׁ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱמִין חֲסִידָיו

Individual ḥ^asidim are difficult to point out. There were no kings between Menahem and the Maccabees. High-priests, beginning with Johanan in 411 B.C.,¹⁰ belonged to an aristocratic group which must have had but little sympathy with the hasidic theories which will be discussed later. Some individual lower priests, however, may well have belonged to the ḥ^asidim. Thus in Ps. 16, probably composed ^{early} in the second century B.C., the speaker, who, in v. 10 calls himself a ḥasid, is undoubtedly a priest. In v. 4 he declares:

יִרְבּוּ עֲצוּתָם אֶחָד מֵהֵרָו
 בִּלְאִסִּיק נִסְכֵּיהֶם מִצֶּה וְכֵן אֶת אֵל מִמּוֹת עַד עַתָּה
 Who but a priest would offer up any drink offerings? And that there were lower clergy living in the country-places and feeling sympathetic with the country-people and their ideals we know from the story of Mattathias himself.

As for the assumption that the ḥ^asidim were the mass of people, as distinguished from the aristocrats, we might justify it by the frequency of the petitions in behalf of the עַמִּי, אֲבוֹתַי etc. with which the psalms abound. Thus אֲבוֹתַי occurs twenty times in 16 different psalms; עַמִּי --5 times in 4 psalms; חֲלָבָה --3 times; אֶבְרָהָם 3 times; צִדִּיק or צִדִּיקָא --39 times in 25 psalms. Besides these, we have frequent references to אֲבוֹתַי, אֲבוֹתֵינוּ, אֲבוֹתֵינוּ, אֲבוֹתֵינוּ and יִתְרוֹ, all of whom refer to the mass of people, and not to the powerful upper class.

Other individual ḥ^asidim are psalmists who lived in various rural districts of Palestine. Thus we find a ḥasid coming יִרְבּוּ וְחֲמוּמֵיךְ אֲבוֹתֵינוּ (42.7) while another declares: אֲבוֹתֵינוּ בִּי גִרְתִּי מִן עַמִּי אֲבוֹתֵינוּ (120.5).

As the history of the period under consideration contains no calamitous clashes between Israel and other nations, we find few denunciations of the latter. Ps. 59.6 seems to be the one instance:

הַקִּיף יַעֲקֹב לֹא הָיוּ אֵל תַּחַן לִי הַגִּדִי אֵין
cries the psalmist.

Other references to r^oh^aim seem to strike at certain Israelites, who oppress the h^asidim, apparently, for no other reason than their being h^asidim.

This is illustrated by the following verses:

Ps. 3.7: לֹא אֵינִי מִרְבֹּקֶת עִם אֶחָד מִקִּיבֵי יָמִי

6.11: יִבְרָא וַיִּבְרָא מִיָּד לֹא אֵינִי

7.13-16: חֲרָבוֹ יִשְׁלַח קִשְׁתִּי בִרְךְ וַיְכַוְנֶנּוּ
וְלֹא רָבִין לִי-מִוֶּת חֲצִין לְבֹלְקִים יִפְעֹל
כִּנֵּה יִחַל-אֵין וְהִרְהֵ אֵל וַיִּלֶּךְ עֲקֵר
בְּיָד כִּלְכֵּל וַיִּחַרְבּוּ

17.9-10: מִכֵּי רַעֲדִים עֵשׂוּ שְׂדֵי אֵבִי הַנֶּפֶשׁ יִקְרָב וְאֵין
חֲלָמִי סִגְרָן בִּימֵי דְבָרֵי הַגִּזְזוֹת

31.14:

כִּי אֶמְדֵּת דְּבַת רַבִּים מִקֹּדֶם אֶסְבִּיב
הַבִּזְזִים יִחַד אֵין לְקַחַת נֶפֶשׁ לִמְאֹל:

31.19:

תִּמְאֲמַנָּה שְׂבֵת עֲקֵר הַדְּבָרוֹת אֵל צְדִיק דֹּחֵק בְּקִצְרֵי וְקוֹץ

35.7:

כִּי חֲנַם טָמְנוֹ לִי שֹׂמֵר וְגַם חֲנַם חֲפֹז לִנְפִשׁ

35.11:

יִקְוִין צְדִיק-חַסֵּד אֵין לֹא יִדְמֵי גִּשְׁמוֹת

35.12:

יִשְׁמְעֵי רַעַת תַּחַת טֹבָה שְׂבֹא לִנְפִשׁ

35.20-21

כִּי לֹא אֶלֶם יִדְבְּחוּ וְלֹא יִתְּנִי-חַיִּי

דְּבָרֵי גִּזְזוֹת יִחַשְׁבוּן: וַיִּרְחֲבוּ אֵין פִּיבֵם
אֲמָרוּ הֵאֵל הַזֶּה חֲמוֹתֵי צִינָנוּ

37.12

וְגַם רַעַד לְצְדִיק וְחֹרֶק אֵין אֵין

37.14: כורב פתחו רגלים וברכו קדש
 אלהים דני ואביון וטובו ישרי-דרך:
 37.32: צוה רשע לעזוב ואלק לזהימו
 41.6: אלהי יומרו רצ לי גמי יומה וקצ אמו
 57.5: נפתי דמק לבאים אשכח להטיוס דני-אקם
 64.4-5: שניה חנית וחפיואלמן חרב חד
 אר אט כחרב לטונם דרכו חלץ דבר גר
 ליהור כחמוריו גם בתאם ירבו ולא יראו:
 69.5: רבו מעורר טמי גמי חנם
 71.11
 ...אלהים דרכו רבבו ותבאבו כי אין מליץ:

Other r^{as}'im are like those of former periods. We again meet the atheists (cf. 92.10; 3.3; 86A.14; 145.20), already mentioned. There are also Israelites who, to the ḥasidim at least, are idol-worshippers. In 31.7 the psalmist declares his abhorrence of those who are שורפי הבאי-למל. Judging by Jon. 2.9, they are idol-worshippers. It is, however, difficult to conceive of idol-worshippers at this late date, and it seems likely that the ḥasid is finding fault with the manner of their observance rather than with the object of their worship. There is, indeed, another reference to worship of other gods found in Ps. 16.4, but it is by no means clear. It reads:

ירבו על לבם אחר מחר

But the Biblia Hebraica edited by Kittel suggests that the last two words be emended to read אחר מחר.

Others considered unacceptable to ḥasidim are arrogant (cf. 31.24), the violent (cf. 26.9; 57.5-6), the rich who may be assumed to wax fat at the expense of the weak (cf. 73.12), the crooked judges (cf. 26.10; 58.2-3; 82B.2-5a) and the liars (cf. 4.3).

A new category of wicked includes the $p'116h$ and $p'3f$ who give no regard, or at least an insufficient degree thereof, to the Law. They do not even study it. (cf. p_a 1.1; 119.21) This addition is natural. It is at this time that the Law is formulated and takes on the character of a sacred canon.

Thus we observe that during this third period, the h^a sidim include no longer Israel, but only a section thereof, whose characteristics we shall now proceed to study.

Notes to Section IV

- 1 For the number of psalms and their fragments, see the table listing the psalms on pages 5 to 10.
- 2 The fragment, Ps. 137A (c. 597 B.C.) does not exhibit any of the hasidic characteristics that will be pointed out later. It is, therefore, excluded from consideration. *This might be used as further evidence that only post-exilic writings belong to the "A" composition group.*
- 3 For a discussion of Menahem, see Morgenstern, J.: "Jerusalem, 485 B.C." unpublished as yet.
- 4 Gunkel: "Psalmen" 4th ed., p. 19
- 5 Morgenstern, J.: "A Chapter in the History of the High-Priesthood," p. 33
- 6 Morgenstern, J.: "Psalm 121," p. 318
- 7 Mowinkel, Sigmund: "Psalmenstudien I--Awan und die Individuellen Klagepsalmen,"
- 8 Gunkel: op.cit., pp. 497-498
- 9 Published in the H.U.C. Annual, Volume VI, 1929
- 10 Morgenstern, J.: "A Chapter in the History of the High-Priesthood," p. 58

Section V Hasidic Parties

A careful reader of the psalms will readily observe that some of the psalms are thoroughly universalistic in their outlook. Yahweh is not simply the God of Israel, but He who created and established the world. He is in truth the Great Master of all flesh, and their Kindly Provider. In contrast to these, there are numerous psalms which are nationalistic, and call upon Yahweh to care primarily, if not exclusively, for Israel. Both of these types of psalms are, however, filled with religious fervor and contain the phrases, concepts, beliefs and practises of the ḥasidim. Moreover, the psalmists of both groups speak of themselves as ḥasidim. The question therefore presents itself: Were there perhaps two or more ḥasidic groups? This question is given force by a difference of opinion concerning the dwelling-place of Yahweh. Whereas, most often, the ḥasid before 411 B.C. regarded the heavens as Yahweh's dwelling place, we occasionally find it to be the Temple in Jerusalem (cf. Ps. 132A.13-14). Perhaps also Ps. 50.16-17 is an indication of a quarrel between contesting parties. The verses read:

וְלֹאֲדָר אֱלֹהִים אֶלֶּי
מִפֶּיךָ לִסְבוּר חֶקֶי וְלֹאֲדָר אֱלֹהִים אֶלֶּי
וְלֹאֲדָר אֱלֹהִים אֶלֶּי וְלֹאֲדָר אֱלֹהִים אֶלֶּי

According to "Kittel," the phrase וְלֹאֲדָר אֱלֹהִים אֶלֶּי is a later addition. What remains may well be a fanatical partisan's viewpoint of an opponent who disagrees with what he conceives to be a vital religious point. For it does seem strange to the present-day reader that a truly wicked individual would declare God's statutes and have His covenant in his mouth! It is further significant that after further violent denunciation of this *rasa*, the psalmist ends his tirade with:

וְלֹאֲדָר אֱלֹהִים אֶלֶּי וְלֹאֲדָר אֱלֹהִים אֶלֶּי

Universalistic Psalms

Hasid or Synonym

Particularistic Psalms

97.8		בנות יהודה	[Judean cities]
		בני יצק (יצק)	44.5; 78.5,21,71; 79.7; 85.2
148.14		בני ישראל (ישראל)	105.6,10,23
			59,71; 78.5,21,30,55; 81.9,
			12,14; 83.5; 105.10,23; 129.1;
			149A.2
		בני תמותה	89.11; 102B.21
		בנימי	68.24; 80.3
	[Davidic Scion]	זקור	89B.20
	[Israel]	לוי יהודה	33A.12; 106.5
		זר	60.9
	[Israel]	זל	80.3
		זל	94A.6
		זל	18.51; 89B.4; 78.70
		זל	74A.20
113.7		זל	72.13
		חוסים ביהודה	2.12; 18.31
52.11; 97.10; 148.14		חוסים ביהודה	18.26; 79.2; 89.20; 132A.16;
			149A.1,5,9
89A.16		ידידי יהודה	60.7
		ידידי תלודת [תלודת ?]	
		ידידי	60.9; 78.68
		ידידי	68.7
		ידידי	60.6; 33A.18; 85.10
	[Israel]	ידידי	105.9
97.11		ידידי	33A.11
		ידידי	94A.6
		ידידי	78.64; 132A.16
		ידידי	105.3
		ידידי	33A.18
	[over Israel]	ידידי	2.6; 18.51; 21.18
		ידידי	80.3; 60.9
	[King of Israel]	ידידי	2.2; 18.51; 20B.7
	[Israel]	ידידי	105.15
	[Israel]	ידידי	105.15
		ידידי	18.27
	[Israel]	ידידי	76.13
	[Israel]	ידידי	68.13
	[Israel]	ידידי	68.10; 94A.5,13; 106.40
113.1		ידידי	79.2; 10; 102B.15,29
	[Israel]	ידידי	74A.2
29.11; 95.7; 100.4; 148.14		ידידי	28.9; 44.13; 60.5; 68.8;
			72.2,3; 78.20,71; 79.13;
			81.9,12,14; 83.4; 85.3,9;
			94A.5,13; 105.24,25,43; 102B.19
			106.4; 149A.4
		ידידי	18.28; 68.11; 72.2,4,12;
			74A.19,20; 76.10; 149A.4
113.9	[Israel]	ידידי	
	[Israel]	ידידי	102B.18

Universalistic Psalms

Hasid or Synonym

Particularistic Psalms

	ז ד ק ה	106.3
95.7; 100.4	י ה ו ה	74A.1; 79.13
97.11,12; 52.8; .	ז ד י ק י	33A.1; 68.4; 72.7; 118B.15,20
97.8	ז י	149A.2
	ז פ ו נ י ה ו ה	83.4
52.11	ק ו י י ה ו ה (ו א ק ו ב א מ ק)	
	ק ו ר א י י ה ו ה	99.6
	ז ר י ז ב ל ו נ	68.28
	ז ר י י ה ו ב ר	68.28
	ז ר י נ ב ת א י	68.28
	ז ב ל י י ה ו ה	105.37; 74A.2
	ז מ ר י מ ג ב ל	106.3
[Israel]	ג ל ל י י ה ו ה	74A.19
	ל מ י מ י	18.26

Universalistic Psalms

Rasa' or Synonym

Particularistic Psalms

8.3; 66A.3; 89A.11		אֱלֹהִים	76.6
		יְהוָה	11.10; 83.7; 137B.7
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	81.15; 21.9; 44.17; 61.4; 68.2,22; 74A.3,10,18; 78.53; 80.7; 83.3; 89B.23; 106.10,42; 132A.18; 137A.1,4,7,9,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19
[Foreign]		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	18.49
		יְהוָה	137B.8
		יְהוָה	89B.23 (parallel to 80.7 of 1)
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	94A.2 (parallel to 80.7 of 1)
		יְהוָה	83.8
104.35		יְהוָה	2.1,8; 33A.10; 44.3,15
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	78.55; 80.9; 79.1,6,10;
		יְהוָה	102B.16; 105.44; 106.35,
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	41,47; 110.6; 115A.2;
		יְהוָה	118B.10; 149B.7
[Foreign]		יְהוָה	83.7
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	83.7
		יְהוָה	2.1; 44.3,15; 105.44;
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	149B.7
		יְהוָה	44.17
[Foreign]		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	83.7
		יְהוָה	44.17
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	22.10; 68.13; 76.13;
		יְהוָה	102B.16; 149B.8
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	79.6
89A.11		יְהוָה	68.31; 105.38; .
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	78.12,45,51
		יְהוָה	68.2; 81.15; 44.8,11;
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	83.3; 89B.24
		יְהוָה	68.22
97.7		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	44.17
		יְהוָה	74A.18,22
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	18.45,46
		יְהוָה	68.7
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	60.8
8.3		יְהוָה	80.13
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	68.31
		יְהוָה	72.4
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	83.8
		יְהוָה	18.48; 106.34
60A		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	83.8
		יְהוָה	18.27
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	68.2
		יְהוָה	60.10,11
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	28.3; 94A.4
97.7		יְהוָה	74A.4,23
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	
		יְהוָה	
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	
		יְהוָה	
[Foreigners]		יְהוָה	
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	
		יְהוָה	
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	
		יְהוָה	
[Foreign]		יְהוָה	
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	
		יְהוָה	
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	
		יְהוָה	
24A.24 (parallel to P' of P)		יְהוָה	
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	
		יְהוָה	
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	
		יְהוָה	
8.3		יְהוָה	
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	
		יְהוָה	
		אֱלֹהֵינוּ	
		יְהוָה	

<u>Universalistic Psalms</u>	<u>Reza' or Synonym</u>	<u>Particularistic Psalms</u>
	פ'ן	44.6,8; 74A.10; 78.61
	ן	81.15; 89B.24; 106.11; 105.25
	פ'ן	83.8
	פ'ן	44.6; 18.40,49; 74A.23
[Foreign]	פ'ן	2.2
97.10; 104.35	פ'ן	28.3; 68.3; 94A.3; 106.18;
		129.4
	פ'ן	18.18; 21.9; 106.10,41;
		118B.7
[Foreign]	פ'ן	106.46; 137A.3
	פ'ן	60.8
[Foreign]	פ'ן	44.14; 796; 80.7
[Foreign]	פ'ן	137A.3

natural. By its very definition a universalistic psalm is one that does not concern itself with the nation primarily, but with the universe as a whole. Whether the universalistic authors of these psalms actually took no pride in their king and race is not clearly indicated.

The division between particularists and universalists does not stop at this point. Certain expressions are used to describe the people of whom they approve or disapprove. Some of these are unique to the particularists and others to the universalists, but most of the synonyms for Yahweh's people, including the term *q'oh*, are common property. Does it not point to the fact that though both groups were hasidic and basically alike, they still differed on certain points, just as two political parties in a democratic country?

Did either of the groups call itself by a special name? Did it perhaps use a specific term for its opponents? Let us again examine the chart for a possible answer. It is obvious that a "party" name would be used only by one of the groups. Moreover, such a name cannot be a proper noun or one indicating inferiority. In all likelihood it will be some term showing some close relationship with Yahweh. Does our chart reveal any such terms? Glancing down, we note that the particularists, besides using the terms employed by both groups, also use

the expressions: יְרֵאָהּ, יַחֲזִיק, יִדְרֶינָהּ, חֹסֵים בְּיָהּ, אֲחִירֵי יָהּ,
וְעִמָּם קִרְאוֹ יָהּ, זְכוֹנוֹתָיו, צַדִּיק וְצַדִּיק, מִלְחָמוֹת יָהּ, מִבְקָשׁ יָהּ
as synonyms for h^as'idim. The universalists on the other hand employ

the following: הַיְיִדִּים, הַיִּדִּים. As antonyms, the particularists use יִשְׂרָאֵלִים, יִשְׂרָאֵלִי, יִשְׂרָאֵלִי to describe Israelites of whom they disapprove. The universalists use for the same purpose only יִשְׂרָאֵלִי.

It would be interesting to trace as far as possible each of these terms to learn their full implications. They would undoubtedly lead to interesting results. But the time necessary for such a task is unfortunately lacking to the writer. He is, therefore, compelled regretfully to leave this subject and continue with his study of the basic beliefs and practises of the hasidim. He will, of course, be conscious of the possible existence of the two parties within the ranks of the h^asidim and will point out whatever evidence he finds to support or destroy this theory. (See Appendix II)

I find this chapter and the method it pursues altogether unconvincing. The differences which you call particularistic and universalistic may have existed in one group reacting differently at different times and under different circumstances

Section VI

The Hasidic Concept of Yahweh

To understand particularistic, universalistic, or *h'asidim* without a delimiting adjective, we must first of all know what their concept of God was. We can read scarcely a verse of their literature without coming across some reference to God. They must have been conscious of Him at all times and under all circumstances, when they sat in their houses, and when they walked by the way, and when they lay down, and when they rose up. For the sake of convenience, we shall divide this investigation into four periods. The first will include the exilic and the post-exilic up to 486. The second will trace the changes, if any, from 486 to 458. The third will continue from 458 to 400. The final period will bring us to the Maccabean period.

Period I 597-486 B.C.

We shall begin our study by noting the various names by which God was known to the *h'asidim*. These were: *יהוה*, *יהוה*, *יהוה*, *יהוה*, *יהוה*. Concerning the meaning of the first two terms, theologians, Bible scholars, and others have long¹ struggled. We cannot here undertake to reproduce that learning. *יהוה*¹ seems to be uncertain in meaning. Perhaps it is foreign in origin. The terms *יהוה* and *יהוה*, according to Dr. Morgenstern, are definitely not Hebrew names for the deity, but North-Semitic.² They indicate the rather interesting fact that the *h'asidim* did not hesitate to borrow from their environment such vital ideas as the very name of the deity. This is significant in view of the belief current at the time that the name was an essential part

of the deity. In Ps. 118B.10-12, the psalmist cries: יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ which implies that he expects to circumcize his enemies (proselytize them ?) merely by using the name of Yahweh. No doubt it was their general universalistic tendencies that made it so natural for them to accept new ideas and make them their own. For some time, these terms were current in hasidic literature without the implication that they referred to Yahweh. Dr. Morgenstern points out that יְיָ in Ps. 82A.6 , as well as יְיָ and יְיָ in Ps. 91.1 are properly to be regarded as names of foreign deities, not yet absorbed into the Hebrew concept of יְיָ . On the other hand, numerous other references to such as Ps. 21.8 ; 46A.5 ; 47.3 , and 78.17, 35, 55 have apparently been equated with יְיָ and are used as synonyms. It is interesting to note at this point that יְיָ is never found in any of the psalms listed as universalistic. This obtains not only for this period, but throughout the period under study. יְיָ , on the other hand, occurs at all periods and with all psalmists, be they particularistic, universalistic, or without either of these qualifications. Is it possible that the term יְיָ was one of the issues between universalists and particularists?

The most conspicuous concept of Yahweh at this time was His recognized position as ruler. The term יְיָ is actually applied to God, and He is endowed with the authority of ruler, both over His people Israel and the universe as a whole. (cf. Ps. 20B.10 ; 24A.7-10 ; 29.10 ; 47.3 , 7-9 ; 68.25 ; 89A.10-13 ; 96.10 ; 98.6 ; 102C.13) In several of these psalms, Yahweh is pictured as ascending the throne to rule over the world (cf. Ps. 93.1; 96.10,12). It was naturally expected that He would establish justice and righteousness in the world.

The thought was especially current in the period following the rebuilding of the Temple in 516 B.C. They then had no false hopes for an independent kingdom with a human king. God was Israel's ruler. With such a King at their head, the people began thinking of the desirability of urging other nations likewise to accept God's rule. The hope then sprang up that soon all nations of the world would accept Yahweh's rule, and in this manner would the Kingdom of God be established on earth.

Unhappily, a Davidic scion, probably Menahem, son of Zerubabel, reappeared in Judah. The possibility of an independent kingdom under the Davidic dynasty proved too attractive for Israel. They forgot their ideal of the establishment of the Kingdom of God and plunged into their mad adventure which ended with the calamity of 486.

The dream of the Kingdom of God was, however, not entirely forgotten. In later years it gathered renewed strength and assumed the form of a doctrine expressing the longing of Israel for a world of justice and righteousness in which all nations of the world would worship Yahweh as the only King. This hope Ps. 146 expresses: (v. 10)

יְהוָה יִרְשֵׁן אֶת-הָעוֹלָם
וְיִשְׁפֹּט בְּיֵשׁוּעַתוֹ
וְיִשְׁפֹּט בְּיֵשׁוּעַתוֹ
וְיִשְׁפֹּט בְּיֵשׁוּעַתוֹ

The belief in Yahweh's ruling and judging the world is ancient in Israel. The story of Elijah's contest with the prophets of Baal is apparently based on the notion that Yahweh comes to the sanctuary on the morning of Ros' Hasanah (VII/10) in the form of fire to ascend His throne and judge the world. How He comes, accompanied by His heavenly court, is mentioned in many parts of the Bible, especially in Isaiah and Job. As this matter is fully discussed by Dr. Morgenstern in many

of his published works (cf. The Mythological Background of Psalm 82, Amos Studies I and II, The Gates of Righteousness and others) nothing more need be added on this subject. The very fact that the Book of Job and even Apocryphal writings still discuss the heavenly court composed of the minor deities or angels, is sufficient evidence to prove that it was an accepted item in the picture of Yahweh over a long period of time. Psalms which express the hasidic viewpoint also contain numerous references to these minor deities. Those belonging to the period under discussion (597-486 B.C.) will now be examined to determine whether all h^asidim accepted the belief in minor deities.

Ps. 8.6 states: אֱלֹהִים יָשָׁב מֵאֲלֹהִים וְיָבֹד וְיִצְטָר וְיִשְׁתָּבֵשׁ

Elohim in this verse is taken to mean minor deities not only because such a translation appears more suitable to the text, but also because in the rest of the psalm, God Himself is addressed as יְהוָה (cf. vv. 2,10)

In Ps. 29.1, יְהוָה יִשְׁמַע קוֹל is very clearly an invitation for the minor deities to join the rest of the universe in the praise of Yahweh. Ps. 82A, the mythological background of which Dr. Morgenstern described fully and interestingly, makes references to minor and foreign deities, the full implication of which was suppressed by later editors. Nevertheless enough remains to show their import clearly.

The first verse says: אֱלֹהִים יָשָׁב מֵאֲלֹהִים וְיָבֹד וְיִצְטָר וְיִשְׁתָּבֵשׁ

And v. 6 adds: אֱלֹהִים יָשָׁב מֵאֲלֹהִים וְיָבֹד וְיִצְטָר וְיִשְׁתָּבֵשׁ

Dr. Morgenstern proves that the אֱלֹהִים was the heavenly court attending Yahweh when He sat in judgment over all creatures of the universe including the minor deities on Roš Hašānāh. The comment in v. 6 indicates that some of the minor deities had been guilty of a crime which shocked Yahweh greatly. Their punishment is: (v. 7)

4 אֲכַלְכֶּם מִלֶּחֶם וְיִשְׁתָּבֵשׁ וְיִצְטָר וְיִשְׁתָּבֵשׁ

While the belief in the minor deities cited above was of foreign origin, it was nevertheless widely accepted if we may judge by the frequency of the recurrence of this belief. Thus in Ps. 89A.7-8:

כִּי אֱלֹהֵי קֶשֶׁת יִצְרָק לַיהוָה יְדָמָה לַיהוָה בְּבֵן אֱלֹהִים
אֵל נִצְרָק בְּסִיף קֶדְשִׁים רַבָּה וְנֹרָא אֵל כָּל סְבִיבֹתָיו
Ps. 91.11:

כִּי מֵאֲכֹל יִצְוֶה אֶל לִשְׁמוֹת בְּבֵן דְּרָכִים
95.3:

כִּי זֶה קִדְשׁ יְהוָה וְאֵל אֵל גִּדּוֹל עַל כָּל אֱלֹהִים
96.4-5:

בִּיגְדֵי יְהוָה וְהַפֵּל מִזֶּבֶחַ וְנֹרָא כֹּהֵן אֵל אֱלֹהִים
97.9:

כִּי כָּל אֱלֹהֵי הַדְּמִים אֱלֵלִים וַיִּבְרָא גִמִּים עֲדָה
כִּי אֵתֶר יְהוָה שָׁמַיִן אֵל כָּל הַדָּרָךְ מִזֶּדֶן נִדְלָתָה אֵל כָּל אֱלֹהִים
103B.20-21:

קִרְבוּ יְהוָה מֵאֲכֹל קִדְשֵׁי כֹחַ... קִרְבוּ יְהוָה כָּל צִבְאוֹת מִזְרָתָן עֲדָה רָצוֹן
104.4:

עֲדָה מֵאֲכֹל רֹחוֹת מִזְרָתָן אֵל לֹבֵט

It should be noted here that most of the verses expressing belief in minor deities or angels were found in the psalms earlier indicated as universalistic, while the remaining ones came from psalms which belong neither to particularistic nor to the universalistic groups. Not a single indication of a belief in minor deities is found in any of the psalms marked as particularistic. Their sentiments on this subject are apparently well expressed in Ps. 18.32:

כִּי אֱלֹהֵי מִבְּלַעַד יְהוָה אֵל לֹבֵט גִּלְתִּי אֱלֹהִים

This difference in the concept of God seems to be a distinct issue between the two groups, and points strongly to the existence of two parties within hasidic ranks. May it perhaps have served as the beginning of the division ultimately taken over by the Pharisees and Sadducees? Further investigation along this line may prove fruitful.

There is another interesting point of division between the two parties--the dwelling place of Yahweh. The universalists assume that He dwells in no particular land or place on earth, but in heaven.

Ps. 93.4 states this belief:

אֵלֵינוּ בְּמִלְכּוֹת יְהוָה

Ps. 104.3 adds:

בְּמִקְדָּשׁוֹ בְּעֵלְיוֹתָיו

Apparently the waters above the heavens are meant, for nowhere do we find a hint that Yahweh dwelt in the seas below the heavens. This interpretation is supported by v. 32:

הַמִּבֵּית לְאֵלֶיךָ וְתִרְדָּד

Evidently He is dwelling above the earth if He is to look at it and cause it to tremble!

Ps. 24A.7-9 describes the entrance of Yahweh into the Temple. This indicates that the Temple could not have been His dwelling place, but that He came there from His regular habitation, the heaven, for His annual Ros' Hasanah visit to judge the people of the world.

The particularistic Psalms are, however, divided on the question of the location of God's dwelling place. Ps. 115A.3 declares bluntly:

Ps. 68.3 likewise speaks of Yahweh as

יְהוָה יֹאמֵר בְּעֵלְיוֹתָיו
יְהוָה יֹאמֵר בְּעֵלְיוֹתָיו

Ps. 20B.7 supports this belief:

יְהוָה יֹאמֵר בְּעֵלְיוֹתָיו

This psalm, however, has another verse which seems to contradict the one just quoted. Verse 3 states:

יְהוָה יֹאמֵר בְּעֵלְיוֹתָיו

Perhaps the psalmist meant that the expected help was to come when God visited Zion on Ros' Hasanah to judge the people. On the other hand, it may indicate that the psalmist really believed that Yahweh dwelt in Zion but that the announcements of His judgments came from heaven. There is finally the possibility that the psalmist conceived of Yahweh being in both places at the same time. This is perfectly understandable.

Unlike man or matter, God could be both in the Temple and in heaven. On Ros' Hasanah, He was popularly believed to hold court both in heaven and in the Temple at the same time.

The third alternative, namely that God was believed to dwell both in the Temple and in heaven, is supported by Ps. 76. In verse 3, we read:

יְהוָה בְּאֵל מִכּוֹ וּמִזְבִּחוֹ בִּירוּשָׁלַם

There is no doubt that this psalmist believed Yahweh dwelt in the Temple in Jerusalem! But then the same psalmist declares in verse 9: אֱלֹהִים בְּיָמֵינוּ
On the other hand, one of the very earliest psalms of the post-exilic period, composed c. 521 B.C., is emphatic in declaring Yahweh's home is in the Temple. In Ps. 132A.13-14, we find:

כִּי בָחַר יְהוָה בִּירוּשָׁלַם אֵלֶּה אֲמַרְךָ לְאֵל
לֵאמֹר מִנְחָתִי צִדִּי צִדִּי כִּי אֵלֶּה כִּי אֵלֶּה

And Ps. 28.2 supports the declaration by the comment that the people turned to the Dōbir of the sanctuary when they prayed: בְּנֵאֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ קָמָה
Since people could not have prayed to Yahweh without facing toward Him, it must be assumed that the people whose beliefs were voiced by the psalmist, conceived of Yahweh as dwelling in the Dōbir.

The psalms which were not listed as belonging to either of the two conflicting parties ~~are~~ likewise divided in their views concerning Yahweh's dwelling place.

Ps. 103B.19 says: יְהוָה בְּמִיָּם הַבַּיִת כְּסֵא

And likewise, Ps. 144A.5 declares: יְהוָה הֵא אֵלֶיךָ אֶרֶץ

Ps. 132B.7, on the other hand, says:

וְכֹאֵה אֲמַלְכֵנוּ וְיִתְחַוֶּה אֶרֶץ הַגִּלְיוֹן

may mean synagogues rather than Temple; the plural form seems to favor this interpretation. Yet the parallel of אֲמַלְכֵנוּ is "הַקֶּם הַגִּלְיוֹן" generally associated with the Temple. (cf. Lam.2.1; I Ch. 28.2; Ps. 99.5) Moreover, this verse unquestionably has affinities with the expression אֲמַלְכֵנוּ אֶרֶץ of Ps. 132A.5 The

latter cannot have any other meaning than Temple. Hence it seems best to translate *לְבֵיתוֹ* by "to His Temple." But *בֵּיתוֹ* by its very name implies that it is not merely the Temple, but God's dwelling place.

Finally, the opinion expressed in Ps. 46A should be mentioned.

In vv. 5-6, the psalmist says:

יְהוָה בֵּיתוֹ יֵשֵׁב זֵר אֱלֹהִים קִדְשׁ מִבְּנוֹת אֱלֹהִים
אֱלֹהִים בְּקִרְבָּהּ בֵּית תְּהוֹמֹת יִצְחָק אֱלֹהִים אֶפְנוֹת בְּקִרְבָּהּ

There is little doubt that the psalmist shared the opinion that Yahweh dwelt in Zion.

To continue our study of the hasidic concept of God, let us consider some of the mythical ideas current at the time. Interestingly enough, there are no references to them made in any of the particularistic psalms of this period. This harmonizes perfectly with their apparent refusal to accept the belief in minor deities. The universalistic party, as we shall henceforth refer to this group, does not hesitate to incorporate the ideas of its non-Jewish neighbors and add mystical elements to its concept of Yahweh. In Ps. 93.2, is the statement:

נֶכֶד בְּסֹאֵף מֵאֵל

Does it not imply that Yahweh had an ancient throne existing from the beginning of time? When was the beginning of time? What is the nature of this throne? Perhaps scholars will some day let us know, if they have not already done so.

In Ps. 104.2 we read: *עָטָה אֹרֶךְ בִּשְׁמַחַת נֹאֶמֶת אֱמִים בִּירוּשָׁלַיִם*

Yahweh is here presented as if clothed in light. The figure is reminiscent of the popular notion of *הַמַּלְאָךְ הַקָּדוֹשׁ* entering the Temple on *Rosh HaShanah*. The next verse describes Yahweh as "building upper chambers," "riding on clouds," and "moving on the wings of the wind."

הַמְקַדֵּשׁ הַמִּשְׁכָּן הַזֶּה רַבּוֹ הַמְהִלָּךְ אֵל בְּנֵי רָחֵם

Other mystical references are contained in the unassigned psalms.

In Ps. 36.8 we read: *אֱלֹהֵי זֵדִים בְּצֵל כְּנַע'ן יֹשֵׁב*

Likewise in Ps. 91.4: *כִּי יִשְׁכַּח אֱלֹהֵי חַסֵּד וְיִשְׁכַּח אֱלֹהֵי חַסֵּד*

Ps. 91.1 has this interesting picture: *יְהוָה בְּחַיְתוֹ בְּצֵל עֲרִיב יֹשֵׁב*

What, we wonder, is the origin of the tale that God dwells in a shady secret place?

Other anthropomorphic references seem to be figures of speech.

In Ps. 98.1, for instance, we find: *יְהוָה יֵצֵא לִפְנֵי יְהוָה*

And in Ps. 48A.11: *לֵב יְהוָה מֵעַתָּה יִשְׂכַּח*

The mystical elements in the God concept enumerated above are undoubtedly meant to increase His greatness in the eyes of the people.

For great He was in the eyes of all h^asidim. Particularists say:

When Yahweh goes forth to battle, ^{the} earth quakes, ^{the} mountains tremble, and the rain and snow fall (Ps. 68.9,15-17) and vv. 35-36 add:

... וְיִשְׁכַּח אֱלֹהֵי חַסֵּד

A somewhat similar idea is expressed in Ps. 76.5: *נִשְׁכַּח אֱלֹהֵי מִצְרָיִם*

v. 8 adds: *אֱלֹהֵי מִצְרָיִם וְיִשְׁכַּח אֱלֹהֵי חַסֵּד*

The universalists agree with these sentiments concerning the overpowering might and majesty of Yahweh (cf. Ps. 89A.14; 24A.8,10; 93.4) They add three extremely important elements to the concept of Yahweh, viz., He is everlasting (Ps. 93.4; 102C) and is the Creator of the world (Ps. 84; 96.5; and many others). The latter belief will be further considered when we reach the question of Universalism and Particularism. The third item added to the hasidic concept of Yahweh is the belief in His uniqueness. (Ps. 86B.8,10) This is understandable in view of the tendency of the universalists to incorporate into their concept of Yahweh those qualities of their neighbors' gods that appealed to them, so that

no other god could have all the attributes of Yahweh.

The unassigned psalms also speak with enthusiasm of God's power (cf. Ps. 48A.2; 50.1). Ps. 50.10 adds the note that Yahweh is the possessor of all creatures. Ps. 139B is also interesting in this connection. In verse 12, the psalmist declares:

על כבוד יי אלהים יאמר כבוד כבוד

Does it perhaps hark back to the belief that Yahweh is wrapped in light?

Verse 8 of this psalm is, however, most significant:

על כבוד יי אלהים יאמר כבוד כבוד

This is the earliest suggestion that Yahweh's power extends even into the netherworld! In considering the question of how ^hasidim conceived of death we shall have to refer back to this interesting statement for further comment.

The particularists rejoiced in Yahweh's unlimited power, partly at least, because they felt that He had exerted it in their behalf. He performed miracles by means of which He saved them from trouble and destruction. (cf. Ps. 105.5,12ff; 114.3-8) He is the source of Israel's strength and salvation (Ps. ~~105.5~~ 28.7-8; 68.21³⁶) and even walks before its armies (Ps. 68.8). In brief, ^{לפני} ^{האלהים} ^{ישראל} ^{יבנה} (Ps. 149A.9). For it is He who delivered Israel from the hands of its oppressors (Ps. 81; 105) and finally established peace in its land (Ps. 76.4).

The universalists of this period do not seem to have discussed Yahweh's special interest in Israel. But that is ^{im}natural. He was believed to use His great powers for the universe and the protection of the righteous (Ps. 65.4).

The unassigned psalms, that is, those not identified as belonging to either of the contending groups, of this period, also discuss Yahweh's

great assistance to Israel (cf. Ps. 98.1-3; 111.6,9; 78.11-28) and to its king (Ps. 144A.1-2).

Most important for us are the ethical qualities which the h^asidim ascribed to God. The particularists of this period do not seem to be much concerned with discussing them at this time. They were apparently directing their thoughts to the welfare of the nation during this trying period. Yet like all h^asidim, they did consider this matter. Thus in Ps. 115A.1, we find:

אֵל לֹנוּ יְהוָה אֵל לֹנוּ כִּי לֹא מָוֶן
לְעַמֵּנוּ הָיָה מִיָּמֵינוּ

The chief ethical qualities appreciated by the particularists were those that gave them the courage to strive for independence from mighty Persia.

The universalists did not underestimate God's ^{אֱלֹהִים} and ^{אֱלֹהִים} (cf. Ps. 89A.2; 100.5; 117.2). However, they added that Yahweh was a righteous God (Ps. 65.6; 89A.15), that He judged the world righteously, was gracious to all (Ps. 67.2) and heard the prayers of His petitioners (Ps. 65.3).

The unassigned psalms display a similar attitude to Yahweh. He is considered great in ^{אֱלֹהִים} and ^{אֱלֹהִים} (Ps. 36.6,8; 101.1; 103B.8,17), His righteousness and justice are recognized (Ps. 36.7; 103B.6; 48A.11-12; 101.1), and His faithfulness to the covenant with Israel are assumed (Ps. 111.5,9). In discussing the graciousness of Yahweh many details are added. Ps. 103.B.3 states the viewpoint briefly:

כִּי רַחֵם אֱלֹהִים בְּרַחֵם יְהוָה

The elements of God's mercy and His fatherhood are both brought out. The former attribute receives further support from Ps. 103B.8; 111.4; 78.38. In accord with this belief, h^asidim were confident of being delivered from

troubles brought on by sickness (Ps. 51A.13-14; 38; 66B.19-20; 91.15) or dangerous enemies (Ps. 36.13; 46A.2-4,8; 54.3-4,6). They firmly believed that God would supply their wants (Ps. 111.5), forgive their sins (Ps. 51A.7,11) 78.38; 103B.12) and would not be vengeful (Ps. 78.38; 103B.9). He was furthermore expected to help the h^asidim avoid sinfulness (Ps. 51A.16). In addition, the h^asidim pictured Yahweh, as the God of their salvation (Ps. 51A.16; 38.23), the source of all life (Ps. 36.10), holy and awe-inspiring (Ps. 111.9), and desirous of sincerity from His worshippers (51A.8).

It is in accord with such belief that the psalmist could truthfully say:

יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ (Ps. 111.10)

Period II 486-458 B.C.

Comparatively little change was made in the concept of Yahweh during this period. The name יְיָ disappeared, but יְהוָה and יְהוֹשֻׁעַ continued as in the earlier period. יְהוֹשֻׁעַ was used by particularists (Ps. 83.19) and in the unassigned psalms (Ps. 9.3; 77.11; 107.11). However, there was no mention of יְהוֹשֻׁעַ in the universalistic psalms which are rather few in number (three) at this time. This is a perfectly natural phenomenon. After the terrible experience of 486 B.C., the minds of the people must have been so filled with thoughts of their own unhappy lot, that they probably crowded out everything else.

Yahweh was still regarded as the ruler of the universe, both by the particularists (Ps. 44.5; 74A.12) and the unassigned psalmists (Ps. 10.16; 22.29). Ps. 22.4 presents Him as enthroned on the praises of Israel. The belief in minor deities had not yet disappeared. Par-

particularists made no mention of them. The universalists did not discuss them either. But no conclusion can be reached concerning their attitude because we have only three of their psalms during this period. The other psalmists assume their existence (cf. Ps. 138.1; 77.14).

Concerning God's dwelling place, the old disagreement continued. The universalists still believed He dwelt in heaven (Ps. 113.5-6) while the particularists were divided among themselves. According to Ps. 18.7,10,17 (which may belong to the period preceding 486) Yahweh dwells in heaven. Similar opinions are expressed in Ps. 2.4; 33A.13-14; 102B.20. However, Ps. 74.2,7 declares the Temple to have been Yahweh's habitation. Ps. 110.2 implies the same belief when it says:

יְהוָה יֵרֵד מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם וְיִשְׁפֹּט אֶת הָעָם

The latter statement is not conclusive only because it may mean that Yahweh will send His aid on Roš Haśānanah when He visits the Temple in order to judge the people.

The other psalmists of this period were likewise divided. According to Ps. 11.4;14.2; 123.1, Yahweh dwelt in heaven. Ps. 14.7, however, states:

יְהוָה לֹא יֵרֵד מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם

Unless Yahweh was believed to dwell in Zion such an expression would be meaningless. But again, we must make the reservation noted above with regard to Ps. 110.2. Apparently people were still uncertain as to Yahweh's exact dwelling place.

Mythical elements were still ascribed to Yahweh, though peculiarly enough, this occurred only in the particularistic psalms. In Ps. 61.5 and 63.8, Yahweh's "wings" are mentioned and in Ps. 80.2 and 18.11, He is pictured astride cherubim.

God's might was likewise recognized. The universalistic Ps. 66A is a psalm of praise to Yahweh extolling His might. The particularistic Ps. 18 exults in God's power and Ps. 118B expresses the absolute confidence of the h^asidim that no enemies will ever be able to overcome them because of Yahweh's power to save.

The middle group is also aware of God's omnipotence. Ps. 107.33ff. tells of His ability to make a desert land bloom and turn a fruitful country into desert, to set down the princes and raise up the lowly. Other expressions of this character are made in Ps. 77.17ff.; 138.2; 11.4. Ps. 121.4 distinguishes between God's ability to protect those who put their trust in Him, and the power of the idols who "fall asleep" and cannot be relied upon.

As in the earlier period, Yahweh was known for His powers to work miracles (Ps. 66A.6; 9.2) and for His special interest in His people, Israel. It is significant that even the universalists of this period felt that a word of comfort to Israel was desirable. Ps. 113.7-9 hints that Yahweh will once again raise up Judah from the lowly state into which she had fallen.

The particularists stress this point. They maintain that Yahweh selected Israel as His possession (Ps. 33A.12), delivered the people from the hands of their oppressors (Ps. 129.4), conquered Canaan for them (Ps. 80.10), and gave them the confidence that, with His help, they could easily overcome all enemies (Ps. 118B.10-12). The unhappy experience of 486 B.C. was explained thus: (Ps. 60.12)

כי לא יצאנו מיד יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ
כִּי לֹא יִצְאֵנוּ מִיָּד יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ

Almost the same words are used in Ps. 44.10. The reason for Yahweh's

neglect, was apparently unknown:

אם-לכתוב עם אלהים ונברא כבינו לאל זכר
הלא אלהים יחזק-לזמן כי הוא יצדק תמיד

The psalmist's guess is strangely uncomplimentary:

צורה למה תישן אדני הקיץ אל תזנח לנצח

Does he mean to imply that Yahweh, like the other idols, falls asleep?

The middle group also considered Yahweh as Israel's Protector, Savior, and Deliverer (cf. Ps. 77.16; 46B.12; 121.4; 125A.2).

This thought was applied not to Israel alone, but to all individuals who were weak and oppressed. (cf. Universalistic Pss. 12.8; 8; Particularistic Pss. 60.6,7; 61.3,4; 102B.21-22; 118B.5; also Pss. 9.14, 19; 22.9,25; 84.12; 121.2-8; 138.3,7) Yahweh was even presented as angry whenever a hasid is mistreated (Ps. 18.8-9).

God's protection of the deserving was explained by His faithfulness to the hesed relationship between him and the h^asidim. (cf. Particularistic Pss. 18.31,51; 44.27) The middle group also exalted Yahweh's hesed. Ps. 107 tells of it enthusiastically, but in Ps. 77.9, the question is raised whether or not Yahweh may forsake His hesed permanently. The implication is strong that He had put it aside, at least temporarily, but that He would soon resume it. The psalmist stated it thus:

האם לנצח חסד יגור אלהי צדק

The righteousness of Yahweh was recognized by all groups though the universalistic psalms did not state this belief directly. The particularists made this point in Ps. 18.31, while the middle group expressed its ideas in Ps. 9.8-9,16; 10.17; 11.7; 75.8. In accord with

this belief, the h^asidim felt confident that Yahweh would punish those who had acted wickedly, be they nations or individuals (cf. Ps. 9.13,16; 94A.1). If He did not utterly destroy the guilty, it was only because He was gracious and forgiving. Upon this basis, the psalmist pleads:

אֵל גָּדוֹל לֵב עֲלֵה עֲלֵה רִחוּם
 מִלִּפְנֵי יְקִיָּאֵל רִחוּם כִּי בָלוּ מֵלֶכֶת
 (Ps. 79.8)

At the same time Yahweh may get angry with His people, and at times for no apparent cause! Of this, the psalmist complains bitterly:

בְּלִי צָדִיק בְּאֵינֵנוּ וְלֹא בִנְחֻנֵּנוּ וְלֹא עֲקֵרֵנוּ בְּבִרְיָתְךָ
 לֹא נִסְוֶה אֲחֹרֶי לֵבֵנוּ וְלֹא אֲשֵׁרֵנוּ מִן הָאֲרֶחֶק
 (Ps. 44.14-19,21) : אִם עָשִׂינוּ עִם אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְנִכְרַח כִּבְיָנוּ לֹא זָכַר
 This bitterness was without a doubt due to the unexpected suffering and humiliation experienced in connection with Menahem's attempt to assume the throne of Judah in 486 B.C.

The ethical qualities of Yahweh were not greatly emphasized at this time. We do, however, have some fine expressions of Yahweh's exaltedness (Ps. 138.6), reliability (Ps. 33A.4) and the purity of His word (Ps. 12.7). The hope was expressed that He would finally put an end to war (Ps. 46B.10), and the belief is stated that He was the only God (Ps. 18.32) and the only One able to work miracles (Ps. 72.18).

Period III 458-400 B.C.

With the coming of Ezra, the particularistic movement was strengthened, and universalism became correspondingly weaker. Not a single psalm among those selected as universalistic belongs to this period.

There are, however, too few psalms in this period (only 8) to show the changes that must have begun to manifest themselves in the concept of God. There is a decided return to faith in God's righteousness and justice, which were at times questioned in the previous period of trial and suffering. Outside of one reference to Yahweh as *קדוש* (Ps. 99.1), there are no myths associated with Him and no minor deities are mentioned. He is now regarded as:

Ps. 24B.5: *אלהי יעקב*

Ps. 25.8: *אלהי יעקב אל יעזבנו אל יסורנו אל יתן עונותינו*

Ps. 99.3: *אלהי יעקב אל יתן עונותינו*

Ps. 99.8: *אלהי יעקב אל יתן עונותינו*

These attributes of Yahweh are acceptable as modern if we understand that *קדוש* does not imply vengeance but retribution, or if we accept the emendation proposed in the Biblia Hebraica.

Period IV
400-165 B. C.

It is necessary to keep in mind the few basic facts of the historic background to appreciate more fully the changes that occurred at this time in the thinking of Israel. The most important event took place in 411 B. C. when Johanan became High Priest, Israel became a theocracy, and Pg was proclaimed as part of the divine law. Within a few years, the Temple was reconstructed and provided with an inner room in which Yahweh might dwell. In 411 B. C. the particularistic ritualistic Sadducean party apparently assumed full control of official Judaism. It is assumed that the particularistic hasidic group joined them and was swallowed up. No purely particularistic psalms appear in this period.

The universalistic h^asidim are likewise silenced. The chief concern of the h^asidim now becomes the individual. However, a degree of universalism may still be found in many of the psalms written at this time. The middle group persisted and continued to adhere to its ancient principles. With the coming of Alexander in 333 B. C., a significant change occurred. The aristocratic Sadducean party began to adopt the Greek culture and philosophy, and naturally assumed a more universalistic outlook. The h^asidim, on the other hand, revolted by the idolatrous and oft immoral character of the Greek culture with which they came into contact, turned more nationalistic and became more zealous in their observance of time-honored Jewish customs and beliefs. It was undoubtedly this group which supported the Maccabees in their successful revolt against Syria.

The psalms of this period reflect to some extent the conditions of the times. Thus, in conformity with the dominant thought of this period, Yahweh is believed to dwell in the Temple. Some psalms merely imply this belief, as for example Ps. 20A.3: יְהוָה וְזָרַק מִקֶּדֶשׁ וּמִצִּיּוֹן יִשְׁעוֹ (cf. Ps. 3.5; 8.5; 134.3) Other psalms declare this belief without any equivocation. Thus Ps. 26.8 says:

יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי מִצִּיּוֹן בִּיטָה מִקֶּדֶשׁ מִבְּרִיךְ כְּבֹדוֹ

Ps. 135.21 adds: יְהוָה מִצִּיּוֹן [בְּרִיךְ] בְּלִילֵי יְהוָה

According to Kittel's Biblica Hebraica, this verse reads: יְהוָה מִצִּיּוֹן בְּלִילֵי יְהוָה

On the other hand, there still were h^asidim who clung to their belief that Yahweh dwelt in heaven. Ps. 7.8 and 57.4 which express this opinion are of uncertain date. They may belong to the sixth century. However, Ps. 73 is intensely individualistic and reflects the influence

of the Wisdom Literature of the 4th century. Nevertheless its composer certainly conceived of Yahweh as still dwelling in heaven:

v. 8: *וְיִשְׁמַח יְהוָה בְּעַמּוֹ*

וְיִשְׂמַח בְּעַמּוֹ

v. 9:

v. 25: *וְיִשְׂמַח יְהוָה בְּעַמּוֹ*

If we emphasize the pronoun *ס* it will leave us with the thought that even at this late date, h^asidim clung to their belief in the existence of other deities besides Yahweh, but felt that these, like men on earth, were helpless to aid or harm. This interpretation is supported by Ps. 7.8; 40.6 and 135.5. Moreover, we still have references to Yahweh's protecting wings (Ps. 17.8; 57.2), His right hand (Ps. 17.7), His sword (Ps. 17.13), His ears (Ps. 88.3; 130.2), His countenance (Ps. 88.15), and His anger (Ps. 88.17). These expressions are, however, not likely to be anthropomorphic. They are rather figures of speech. Other evidence of adherence to ancient traditions is the continued use of *יְהוָה* as synonym for Yahweh (e.g. Ps. 57.3; 73.11; 92.2). The notion that Yahweh may at times be roused to fury (Ps. 88.17; 102^A.11; 6.2; 7.12; 30.6), the anthropomorphic figures of Yahweh falling asleep and letting the world take its own made course (Ps. 73.20), and repenting of His former course of action (Ps. 135.14), add to our evidence.

Perhaps to counteract anthropomorphisms, there developed the doctrine of Yahweh's Word. According to this belief, Yahweh spoke words which were hypostasized and assumed the functions of His messengers. Possibly this was the concept behind:

וְיִשְׁמַח יְהוָה בְּעַמּוֹ

(Ps. 138.2)

According to Kittel, however, *וְיִשְׁמַח* is an error and should be re-

placed by *אלה*. However, in Ps. 147.15,17, we have a clear use of this doctrine. In these verses we find:

*האלה אלהי אלהיך עז מצודה ירוך צהר
אלה צהר ו'ספ*

In general, however, the conception of Yahweh at this period was much more exalted than formerly. God's *hesed* and righteousness were extolled not so much in relation to Israel but to the individual. (cf. Ps. 7.18; 17.2; 42.9; 40.18; 59.17-18; 62.13; 71.2,15,19,24; 143.12; 118A.1-4; 119.137) His *hesed* with the nation was, however, not overlooked (cf. Ps. 136). He was regarded as concerned with the prayer of the individual *hasid*, who might turn to Him (Ps. 31.2,3,8,21; 39.13; 64.2; 88.3; 102A.3; 130.7) and was expected to answer (Ps. 20A.2,5,6; 40.2ff.; 55.2ff.; 56.2; 57.2; 120.1-2), deliver him from his troubles (Ps. 7.11; 32.7; 41.2-4,11; 56.4-5,12; 57.4; 59.9,13; 69.34; 71), and punish the wicked (Ps. 3.8; 7.17; 147.6; 146.9).

For the reasons noted above, Yahweh was praised as:

Ps. 3.4: *אלן קדדני בקודי ומרים רומי*

Ps. 43.2: *אלהי מצו*

Ps. 103A.3: *הרפא לכל תחלואי*

Ps. 103A.4: *הקנא משחת חייבי*

Ps. 103A.5: *המגיב בטוב דבוק*

Ps. 140.8: *עז יאוצתי שבות לרומי*

Ps. 142.6: *יחסי, חלקי באלהי החיים*

Ps. 146.6: *האמי אלה לעולם*

Ps. 146.7: *עשה מעט לעדקים*

Ps. 146.7: *נותן אלה לרעבים*

Ps. 146.7: *אמר רומי*

Ps. 146.8: כֹּחַ צוּרִים, זִיכְרוֹן כְּבוֹדִים, אֱלֹהִים לְדִיּוּקִים

Ps. 146.9: אֱלֹהֵי אֲרָץ חַיִּים יִתְּנוּ שָׁלוֹם לְיִשְׂרָאֵל

Ps. 147.3: הַרְבֵּה אֶלֶּבֶדִי לֵךְ

Ps. 147.11: רֹחַ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

Ps. 147.6: מִצִּדְדֵי עֲלֵיוֹן

Yahweh's might and glory were no longer described in military terms. Instead he was presented as Creator of the universe (Ps. 33B.6-9; 119.90), Protector of the weak (92.6), He who disciplines peoples (Ps. 94³.10), He Who knows all (Ps. 94.9-11; 47.5), and is the only Source of salvation (Ps. 62.2ff.) and blessing (Ps. 115B.12-13). Indeed, every creature in creation depends upon Him (Ps. 145.5ff.). Happiness and even sorrow come from Him alone (Ps. 39.11ff.; 88.7ff; 102A.11). This last point is interesting in view of Mowinckel's contention that the hasidim were merely victims of the magical powers of the godless כֹּחַ . The hasidim did not regard themselves, as Mowinckel thinks, as victims of the כֹּחַ . Instead they attributed their troubles directly to God.

The final hasidic summation of Yahweh's greatness was expressed in the belief that He is everlasting (Ps. 135.13) and unique (Ps. 71.9; 135.15-16).

In accord with this exalted concept of Yahweh, the belief arose that He was too holy to have His name mentioned too freely. According to Lev. 25.16, a hoq introduced by the Priestly lawmakers, the mere mention of the name Yahweh was forbidden on pain of death:

וְיִזְכָּר שְׁמֵ יְהוָה יוֹמָת רָגִים יִרְגְּמוּ בּוֹ לְעַד הָעֶדְדָה בְּכָל
בְּאֶרֶץ בְּנֵי קִדְּוֹן שְׁמֵ יְהוָה:

Probably as a result of this attitude the custom arose of minimizing the use of the Name even in sacred literature, and we therefore find less frequent use of Yahweh in the later psalms. It would also explain the origin of the use of such expressions as $\text{p}^{\text{e}}\text{d}$ or $\text{y}^{\text{e}}\text{d}$ among Jews today. No orthodox Jew will even now pronounce the Name in full. With all that high regard in which the $\text{h}^{\text{a}}\text{sidim}$ held Yahweh, they still felt close to Him. He was not just a transcendent, unapproachable Being, but One who was very close to them. They could therefore turn to Him in prayer, speak of Him as $\text{y}^{\text{e}}\text{d}$ (Ps. 23.1) and believe that He would forgive, ^{or} at least overlook, their sins (Ps. 41.5; 69.6ff.; 103A.3; 130.4), at times because of their penitence and at other times as acts of pure grace. In return for all His favors, Yahweh wanted that people obey Him (Ps. 40.7), worship Him and trust in Him (Ps. 40.4-5), and act ethically (Ps. 33B.5). This apparently was conceived as Israel's obligation in its hesed relationship with Yahweh.

The psalms of this period also presented Yahweh as an ethical deity. He is gracious and merciful (Ps. 86A.15; 116.5; 145.8), righteous (Ps. 4.2; 116.5; 145.17), trustworthy (Ps. 31.4ff.; 37.5ff.), patient (Ps. 86A.15; 145.8), faithful to His hesed (Ps. 86A.13,15; 145.17), protector of all who rely on Him (Ps. 4.4; 31.4; 116.6; 145.14,20), and is He Who answers the prayers of those who call upon Him sincerely (Ps. 145.19; 148.18). In return He desires recognition in the form of songs and praise and thanksgiving (Ps. 30.13).

Yahweh and Man

In contrast with the greatness, might, and everlastingness of Yahweh, emphasized in every period, stands man's ephemeral and lowly state. At all periods and by all groups of psalmists, man is pointed out as a helpless creature of dust. His normal life-span is only seventy years (Ps. 90.10), and but for the grace of God, he and his work would have perished even sooner (Ps. 27.9; 90.17). Should man be so unfortunate as to incur God's wrath, he is doomed (Ps. 90.7-8). In comparison to Yahweh's wisdom, man's thoughts are nought but vanity (Ps. 94B.11), and it is vain for him even to attempt to understand God's ways and thoughts (Ps. 139A.6,17-18). For, it must ever be remembered that Yahweh created man (Ps. 139A.13-14) and knew him, his ways, thoughts, and destiny even before he was born (Ps. 139A.1-5,15-16). This relationship applies not only to the individual person, but to Israel as a whole (Ps. 123.2; 124.2-7) and to the rest of nature as well (Ps. 104.27-30). Such a relationship is described by Otto in his work on "The Idea of the Holy" as "creative consciousness."

At the same time man's dignity in comparison with the rest of nature is upheld. Ps. 8.6-7 marvels at man's importance in the universe:

וַיִּסְתַּח אֱלֹהִים מֵאֲפֹרִית וּבָבֹא וַיִּבְרָא תַדְרָכָהּ :

וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֱמֶת וְיִשְׁרָאֵל בְּיָמֵינוּ :

Ps. 115B.16 declares man master of the earth:

הַמֶּלֶךְ הָאֵלֶּים אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְהַמֶּלֶךְ הָאֵלֶּים

Notes to Section VI

1 Brown, Driver, and Briggs: op.cit., pp. 994-995

2 Morgenstern, J.: "The Mythological Background of Psalm 82," p. 112

3 ibid., pp. 120-121

4 ibid., p. 122

Section VII

Hasidic Worship

The Temple in Jerusalem

For the seventy years between 586 and 516 B.C., there was no Temple at which Jews might worship. Now it is inconceivable that Palestinian Jews completely neglected giving expression to their religious sentiments during that period of time. No doubt, they must have engaged in some form of worship without a Temple. This is by no means far-fetched. For the situation is not as novel as it might appear. As early as 621 B.C., the Temple in Jerusalem was declared as, not merely the official, but also as the only shrine at which offerings might be made. Naturally those living outside of the holy city could come only occasionally and soon developed the custom of visiting the Temple only on important holidays and the Pilgrimage Festivals, which might well have begun to take on their new characteristics at this time. What these might have been, only a thorough study would reveal. Unfortunately this writer has not the time necessary for such an undertaking.

But another question arises: Did the people outside of Jerusalem satisfy themselves with worshipping God only on the rare occasions of their visits to Jerusalem? Certainly, this assumption is unlikely. Accordingly, Dr. Morgenstern, in his unpublished notes on the Hasidim, ventures the guess that they developed some home ceremonies such as the 'Omer, mentioned in the earlier stratum of the Holiness Code, and met on Sabbaths and New Moons, for worship that did not involve sacrifice.

The most likely meeting place was the former shrine, and the most suitable worship was prayer, and the recital of Yahweh's praises, accompanied by music, song, and dance. The leaders at such services must have been the Koh^anim, Leviim, whom the Deuteronomic Code deprived of their right to offer up sacrifices. It is also possible that these meetings were used for reading those sections of the official Law known at that time. This theory would account for the rapid adjustment of Jewry to the loss of the Temple, and for the rise of the synagogue, attributed by scholars, notably Dr. K. Kohler, to the period of the Babylonian exile.

*I doubt this.
The readings from
the prophets preceded
the readings
from the Torah
in the synagogue.*

It seems highly probable that ^{this} the form of worship developed before the fall of the Temple served our people in good stead after 586 B.C. The conjecture is supported by the frequency with which hasidic psalmists, practically all of whom were native Palestinians, speak enthusiastically of worshipping Yahweh with prayer accompanied by song, dance, and music. We may therefore conclude that these were the popular forms of worship during the 6th century B.C. These activities must have taken on a certain sacred character as the years went by, and invested them with the dignity of age and tradition. With the passing of time, the need for a Temple was felt less and less.

No wonder, then, that Haggai and Zechariah had to urge their people to undertake the holy work of rebuilding their Temple. But the final success of their undertaking was still in doubt when Persia weighted the scales in favor of the Temple by supplying the materials needed for its construction.

What was the attitude of the h^asidim toward the Temple after it had

been erected? Nowhere in the Book of Psalms do we find any expression reflecting opposition to this reconstructed institution. On the contrary, it seems quickly to have won the active support of all Israel. Even in the early years following the erection of the sanctuary, universalists, particularists, and all others voiced their desire to visit the Temple and expressed their pleasure in the privilege of worshipping in the Temple as did their fathers before them.

אשרי הַבַּחֵר וְהַקָּרֵב יֵשֶׁן חֲזָרִים
לְעִבְדָה בְּטוֹב בֵּיתְךָ קִדְּשׁ יִיבֹלֵם

says the universalistic psalmist of Ps. 65.5 (c. 516-500 B.C.). We find a definite approval also in Ps. 100.4:

בְּאֵן עֲצֵרִים בְּתוֹבָה חֲזָרְתִּים בְּתֵהָרָה

Ps. 93.4 expresses a like sentiment: אֲבִיתָךְ נִשְׁוֶה קִדְּשׁ

and Ps. 122 is a paean in praise of Jerusalem and the Temple.

The middle group also approves of coming to the sanctuary. Ps. 132B.7 says:

נִדְּוָה אֶל־עַבְדֵּינוּ נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה אֲבָדָם רַחֲמֵינוּ

Nor was there any apparent opposition on the part of the ḥāsīdīm to the priests serving in the Temple. Ps. 132B.9 says:

כַּהֲנִים יִלְבְּשׁוּ צִדְקַת אֲחִיעֲזִיר יִרְגְּמוּ

Ps. 78 also indicates its sympathy with the priests. In v. 64 we read:

בָּנֵינוּ בַּחֲדָה נִכְלוּ וְאֶל־מִנְחָתוֹ לֹא תִגְבִּיֶה

Likewise Ps. 132A.16: וְכַהֲנֵיהֶם אֲלֵיךְ יֵצֵא וְחִסְדֵּיךָ יִרְגְּמוּ

Of course, it is necessary to remember that the priests here mentioned are presumably the כַּהֲנִים אֲשֶׁר לֹא who had not been carried off to Babylonia. Like the other ḥāsīdīm, they had remained in the Land, and undoubtedly shared the customs and beliefs of their fellow-ḥāsīdīm.

How often the ḥāsīdīm considered it necessary for them to come to the Temple is nowhere mentioned in the Book of Psalms. However, it is most likely that they came on the three Pilgrim Festivals established

in former generations. Certainly they must have come on Ros' Hasanah when Yahweh was believed to enter the Temple to judge them.

Let us now consider the question of how they worshipped in the Temple. There are comparatively few references to sacrifices.

Ps. 50.5 says:

אִסְכּוּ לִי חֲסִידֵי כְרַתְי חֲרִי זָבַח

There is no indication in this verse whether this hasidic rite is initiatory, annual, or more frequent. It is, however, important, and indicates that at least certain זבחים were considered mandatory by the h^asidim. There are several expressions of this sentiment. The universalistic psalm 65 says:

(v. 2) וְאֵלֶּךָ יְהוָה נֶגְדָה

The particularistic Ps. 76 shares this viewpoint: (v. 12)

וְזָכְרוּ וְאָמְרוּ לִפְנֵי אֱלֹהֵיבָם כִּי סִבִּיבֵינוּ יוֹשֵׁבֵנוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ

And the middle group adds:

Ps. 50.14: זָבַח אֱלֹהִים תֹּדֶבֶת וְאֵלֶּךָ אֶצְלוֹן נֶגְדִיק

Ps. 50.23: זָבַח תֹּדֶבֶת כִּבְדֶּנִּי

A fuller approval of the sacrificial cult is given in Ps. 66B:

v. 13: אֲבֹא בֵיתְךָ הַצֹּלוֹת אֵלֶּךָ נֶגְדִי

v. 14: אֲנִי בָנִי זָבַחְתִּי וְדַבַּר כִּי הִלֵּךְ לִי

צֹלוֹת מִחִים אֵלֶּךָ לֵךְ עִם קָטֹרֶת אֵלֹהִים

v. 15: אֲשֶׁר הִקְרַח עִם צִמְדֵיכֶם סֵלָה

It should be noted, however, that the קָטֹרֶת אֵלֹהִים, as well as the קָרַח עִם צִמְדֵיכֶם, are not general sacrifices, but specifically נֶגְדִיק. These are expected not so much because Yahweh desires them, but rather to fulfill a promise made. It is further of significance to note that such vows were not made except when in distress (cf. Ps. 66B.14).

Thus we find there are only three types of sacrifices that are approved by the h^asidim, namely the initiating *זבח*, and the *זבח/זב* and *זבד*. In general, however, their attitude to the sacrifices seems to be negative. Ps. 50 is very disparaging of those who would satisfy God by means of sacrifices. Vv. 8-15 are worth quoting:

אז לא זבחתי אכילתך וזולתיך לנגדי תמיד :
לא אקח זביתך כר יגבולותיך צתובים :
כי לי כל חיות יצר בהמות בהררי אולף :
ידצתי כל זוף כרים וזיג זבי צמדי :
אם ארדק אם אמוך אן כי לי תכל וגלאה :
באובל בשר אקיררם וצב צתובים אשתה :
זבח לא אלהים תובד וגלם לציון נדריק :
יקראני ביום זר אחל זק ותבה גני :

An even more spiritual approach to the question of sacrifices is given in Ps. 51A.18-19:

כי לא תחפר זבח ואותנה צולה לא תרצה :
זבחי אלהים רוח נשברה לך נשבר ונשבר אלהים אל תבנה :

With such an attitude toward sacrifice, we can hardly conceive of the h^asidim undertaking their long and difficult journeys to the Temple only to be present at the sacrificial ceremony. Evidently, they had other ceremonies in mind. These are not fully enumerated. In this early period we can find only hints of what they might have been. Thus in universalistic Ps. 100.4, we read:

קומו שרתו בתובד חזרותו בתהלה קובו-לו קרבן למ :

The particularistic Ps. 81 expresses a sentiment quite similar:

הינני לא אלהים צנינו בריצו לאלהי ידקב :
שא זמר ותנו תוף כנור נעים עם נבל :
תקצו בחדש אשר בבסה ליום חגנו :
כי חק לישראל הוא משפט לאלהי ידקב :

The reference to the ^{also - R. Haimah}sofar and hag clearly indicate that a major festival is thus being celebrated in the Temple.

The above discussion indicates that the h^asidim, while divided on certain questions are united in their attitude toward the Temple. It is quite possible that the particularists were enthusiastic in its support because they saw in it a centralizing and unifying force for Israel. The universalists, on the other hand, may have hoped that gradually all nations of the world might be won over to Yahweh's service, and come to the Temple to worship Him. It is further significant that none of the h^asidim were greatly concerned with the sacrificial cult. Apparently the influence of such early prophets as Amos and Isaiah was deeply felt. Finally, the nature of the worship, it should be noted, was not primarily sacrificial. The prayer, song, thanksgiving, and ^{also Jeremiah}sofar, seem to have played a more important role. ^{cf. also Deut. 16, 11, 13-16, 23, 22-2}

Between 486 and 458 B. C., no change in attitude toward the Temple takes place. The h^asidim still expressed their attachment to the Temple. (cf. Ps. 63; 84) Ps. 121 describes the prayer of a (pilgrim who had undertaken the long and dangerous journey to Jerusalem in order that he might celebrate some festival at the Temple.) Ps. 28.2 indicates that people faced the קריב during their prayers; presumably this is the procedure even when they prayed at home. Ps. 118B also speaks in glowing terms of coming to the Temple. In vv. 19-20, the hasid exclaims:

פתיח / וי / לר / זב / אבא / ב / אלה - יה :
 יה העד / ויה / זב / קים / אלה / ב :

The destruction of the Temple seems in no way to have lessened their

ardor. In all likelihood, the ḥāsīdīm quickly rebuilt as much of the Temple as they could within a very short time. Naturally its beauty and furnishings must have appeared drab. It is perhaps at this time that the Book of Ezekiel was enlarged by the addition of the last eight chapters that describe the Temple as it was to be reconstructed. Apparently that plan proved unacceptable, for in Ps. (c. 411) another design was recommended ~~for~~ the Mīskan, which was, with certain reservations, adopted for the structure that arose shortly after 404 B.C.²

The activities within the Temple were still the same. The offerings mentioned are: פ'ר' (Ps. 22.26; 61.6,9) and ת'ר' (Ps. 107.22). But perhaps more important are the worship and thanksgiving, as indicated below:

Ps. 107.22: נִסְסוּ בְּלִבְכֶּם לְיְהוָה

Ps. 61.9: כִּי אֲשַׁחֲוֶה אֶמֶךְ אֵל

Ps. 138.2: אֶת־תְּהִלָּתְךָ אֵל בֵּיתִי קִדְּשָׁךְ

Ps. 118B.24: אֲדַבֵּק כִּי צִנְחָנִי
פ. 118B.24 נִגְלִיתָ וּבִצְלָתְךָ בָּרָא

Dancing likewise took place, according to Ps. 118^B.27.

The latter psalm is used by Dr. Morgenstern to illustrate the ceremony in the Temple on a New Year's Day. In his unpublished notes on Ps. 118B, he makes some very illuminating comments, which may be summarized as follows:

vv. 19-20 picture the New Year's Day celebration, as do also vv. 25-27. They imply that the ḥāsīdīm anticipated Yahweh's deliverance on a New Year's Day, the traditional י' ה' (cf. Zech. 14; Is. 66). The verses seem to say that the eastern gates formerly sacred to Sydyo (פ'ר') is now Yahweh's. Furthermore, it appears that the festal pilgrimage made its entrance by way of the eastern gate.

v. 25 is a quotation from the liturgy of the New Year's Day service, uttered by the people in the Temple, while waiting the arrival of *ה'ה' א'ה' כ' .*

v. 26 is also a quotation from the liturgy of the Day. It may be the greeting of the chief-priest as he issues forth from the Temple bearing the sacred fire, but more likely it is the blessing of the priests upon the people who have come to worship.

v. 26 was, according to the ancient liturgy, the customary response to the priestly blessing.

v. 27 describes the next act in the ritual of the Day. After the new fire was kindled upon the altar by the first rays of the rising sun, the people circle close about the altar with the *א'ה' כ' ח* (intertwined ropes dipped in oil making tapers such as are used today for the *ה'ה' כ' ח* service.) They join hands and dance a *hag*, during which they light their tapers at the new altar fire and then carry them home for kindling their own hearths from the sacred flame of the altar.

The fact that no change in attitude took place before 458 B.C. need not surprise us. In a general way, the hasidic beliefs seem to have continued unaltered. The cataclysm of 486 seems to have done no more than strengthen the *h^asidim* in their old attitudes and practices. However, with the coming of Ezra and his emphasis on ritualism, a notable change must have occurred. And indeed we do have some indications thereof. In Ps. 20A.4 written some time after Ezra's coming, we find:

ה'ה' כ' ח א'ה' כ' ח

Clearly, the psalmist declares that Yahweh is pleased with sacrifices;

both the *חלה* and the *זבח* are acceptable to Him. The implication is furthermore clearly made that Yahweh will reward him who offers these sacrifices. Likewise Ps. 51B, inserted at the end of Ps. 51 seems to be deliberately intended to reverse the sense of the psalm and make it appear that the pious singer meant that God did not want sacrifices because the Temple was in ruins. When, however, Zion would be rebuilt, then He would be pleased with animal sacrifices.

And so the insertion reads:

הַיְיטִיבָה בְּזִבְחֶיךָ אֶת צִיּוֹן תִּבְנֶה חֹמֹת יְרוּשָׁלַיִם
אֵת תִּחְבֵּלֶיךָ זָבָחִי - לְזֶבֶק חֶלֶב וּבָלִיל אֵשׁ יִשְׂאֵל אֵל מִזְבִּיחֶךָ בְּרִיחִי:

We have in this last verse, mention of a type of sacrifice, which had heretofore been unnoticed or perhaps unknown-- *זבחי זבק*.

What might they have been? Kittel in his Biblica Hebraica (1937 ed.) suggests that *זבחי זבק* are a later insertion. Certainly

the meter would be improved by adopting the suggestion. From v. 21b, however, it remains clear enough that animal sacrifices are meant. This is substantiated by Deut. 33.19. There we have:

עֲלִים בֶּרֶךְ יִקְרְאוּ לֵם יִזְבְּחוּ זָבָחִי לְזֶבֶק
כִּי לֵפֶד עֲלִים יִנְקוּ וְזִבְיֹנִי טֹמֵא חֹל

There is little room to doubt that the *זבחי זבק* of this passage are animal sacrifices meant as thanksgiving offerings which, we recall, are among the few types approved by the *h^asidim*.

Ps. 4.6 also mentioned the *זבחי זבק* with approval, but unfortunately says nothing about their nature:

"יִזְבְּחוּ זָבָחִי לְזֶבֶק וּבִלְבָב חֹל יִהְיֶה"

the psalmist urges. Apparently then, we have no other alternative than to accept the interpretation given in Ps. 51.21, which declares that

the *זבחי זבק* are animal sacrifices.

perhaps "real sacrifices", i.e. of the very finest, viz. bullocks (and

Ps. 54.8 adds one more type of offering to the list, namely the קרבן . This seems to be on the same order as the others approved. It is an offering promised for some special reason.

Ps. 27.6 says: $\text{ואשכחתי קול קרן תרועה}$

This is the only time the Bible uses the expression קרן תרועה . It is most unlikely that any special type of קרבן is here referred to. The implication is rather, as Dr. Morgenstern pointed out in his unpublished notes to Ps. 27, that קרבן תרועה were approved sacrifices usually accompanied by shouts.

It is to be noted that following 458, there was a slightly greater interest in the sacrificial cult than formerly. Yet the increase was not very great. Ezra and Nehemiah apparently did not greatly antagonize the $\text{h}^{\text{a}}\text{sidim}$ with their innovations, and the interest of the $\text{h}^{\text{a}}\text{sidim}$ in the sanctuary was but slightly affected. There was no hostility apparent toward the priests such as might have been expected, had Ezra and Nehemiah been less circumspect than they probably were. Indeed we find several psalms of this and later periods expressing friendship toward the priests. Ps. 106 (c. 458-400) speaks of Aaron as אֵלֹהֵינוּ (v. 16) and praises Phineas for his act at Sittim (vv. 30-31). Ps. 115B (c. 411-350) likewise express friendship and calls upon יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ to trust in Yahweh and praise Him (vv. 10,12). Ps. 118^A is equally friendly.

Apparently the emphasis on the cult resulted in few if any changes in the actual practises of the $\text{h}^{\text{a}}\text{sidim}$. We may assume that the change of Roš Hašānāh from VII/1 to VII/10 must have been a violent wrench in the hasidic plan, but the introduction of Yom Kippurⁱⁿ must

have been sufficient to satisfy them with its [✓]sofar blowing and the sacrifice to Azazel.

The ḥasidim evidently continued with their beliefs that sacrifices were unimportant (cf. Ps. 40.7; 69.31-32) and their practise of singing, shouting and dancing. Not impossibly, the Levitical singers and musicians became a part of the Temple rite as a response to the ḥasidic practises.

The Synagogue

Recalling how early is the likely origin of the synagogue, and how important is the part it played in the religious life of the ḥasidim, it is surprising indeed that they remain practically unmentioned in the Book of Psalms. Likely references to the synagogues are made in Ps. 74.48. The psalmist mourns the destruction not only of the Temple, but of the synagogues as well. His mournful plaint is:

יָדָנוּ בְּזָרְיָנוּ קָרָב מִצָּדָק
יָרֵנוּ בְּלֹא מִצָּדִיק אֵל קִינָה

Particularly the latter verse seems to point to the synagogue, for no other institution aside from the former local shrines turned into synagogues could possibly have borne the name *מִצָּדִיק אֵל*.

Ps. 40, vv. 10-11 may also refer to synagogues. In those verses, the psalmist declares:

בְּיָמֵי לִבְדִּיק בִּקְהָלָהּ הִנֵּה שָׁבַת לֹא אָבָלוּ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
לִבְדִּיקָתְךָ לֹא כִסִּיתִי בְּתוֹךְ אֶבִּי אֲמוֹנֶתְךָ אֲמוֹנֶתִי לֹא כִסִּיתִי
מִסִּדֵּק אֲמוֹנֶתְךָ אֶקְבֵּל רַב:

Dr. Morgenstern, in his unpublished notes to this psalm, maintains that the psalmist might well have been a preacher at one of the many synagogues

and thus had his opportunity to speak of Yahweh **ה' בקרב רב**. This explanation is quite in harmony with the rest of the psalm and fits perfectly with the psalmist's statement:

ו' בקרב ומנחה לא חבלת אשנים ברית לוי
דולה וחטא לא מאלת
 v. 7:

ו' בקרב ומנחה לא חבלת אשנים ברית לוי
 v. 9:

If this interpretation is correct, then it is possible that a few other references to **קרב** or **רב** may also refer to a synagogue, e.g.,

אשרה אמן לאחי ביתך קרב אבאלק
 Ps. 22.23:

It is, however, unlikely as indicated in v. 26:

אמן תבא בקרב רב, נדרי אשם נגד יראיו

The psalmist may be thinking of the assembly in the Temple rather than the synagogue. Similar expressions are found in Ps. 35.18:

אודק בקרב רב במצות אהלך
ויראמוהו בקרב צדק
 Ps. 107.32:

תהלתו בקרב חסידים
 Ps. 149.1:

אודי ינוב בבא לנגד כסוד ישרים / צדקה
 Ps. 111.1:

There is also the slim possibility that Ps. 73.17 ^{מב} does a reference to synagogues. It reads: **עד אבוא אל מקדש-אל אבינה לזמירותם**

If we interpret **מקדש-אל** to mean Temple, it will not be at all clear.

But if we assume that **מקדש-אל** mean the synagogues, then his statement may be understood. Apparently he refers to the explanation given by the preachers. Ps. 52.11:

ואקוה אמן כי טוב נגד חסידים
 suggests the tempting theory that the psalmist is thinking of a synagogue service when he says: **ואקוה אמן**. Furthermore, **נגד חסידים**

may refer to some special service in which only the universalistic h^asidim,

the ה'א'י'ק participate. The evidence is, however, insufficient to prove or disprove the point, and it must be considered as nothing more than a guess.

These few references apparently exhaust the references to the synagogues in the Book of Psalms. The possibility that an inflected form of ה'א'י'ק , ה'א'י'ק or ה'א'י'ק might also have been used to represent synagogues was investigated, but in every case, it turned out to be a private dwelling place or a synonym for Temple. In a few instances the meaning was unclear but none of the forms of the above-mentioned words, showed any evidence of being used in the Book of Psalms as synonyms for synagogues.

The order of the service in the ancient synagogue is nowhere indicated in the Book of Psalms, though the probable contents may be conjectured. The large majority of psalms are either prayers or tell of praying. There is not the slightest doubt that personal prayer forms an essential part of the services. Very possibly, some petitions were individual, but it is quite likely that in due course of time, many such prayers took on a definite form which could be recited in unison by the entire congregation. Thus, the ה'א'י'ק seems to be a call for community prayer while the ה'א'י'ק of Ps. 103A is an example of a personal meditation. What people prayed for in those days is undoubtedly what we ask for at present. The most frequent type quoted in the Book of Psalms ask for deliverance from physical ailment, personal enemies, or other distress. At times, people indulged in fasts (cf. Ps. 35.13; 69.11-12; 109.24), and vowed ה'א'י'ק or ה'א'י'ק in addition to uttering prayers. Several such

prayers seem to be community appeals to Yahweh for vengeance against enemies of Israel (e.g. Ps. 74A; 80; 83; 94A). These prayers come within the decade following 486 B.C. Likewise we have prayers for the restoration of the captivity and the rebuilding of Zion. But Ps. 119, though it is long and tiresome, is significant in voicing an entirely different type of prayer. It is a petition for guidance in the study and observance of God's law. (cf. vv. 5, 10-12, 18-19, 26, 27, 29, 33....)

But prayers for help and guidance must have formed only a small part of the worship service. Largely, they seem to have been devoted to the singing of Yahweh's praises. According to Gunkel, the following psalms are hymns, songs, of thanksgiving, or songs of Yahweh's enthronement: 8, 19, 29, 33, 46-48, 65, 67, 68, 76, 84, 87, 93, 96, 100, 103, 104, 105, 111, 113, 114, 117, 122, 124, 129, 135, 136, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150. In addition, parts of the following psalms also contain hymnal elements: 9, 12, 24, 36, 75, 81, 89, 90, 95, 106, 115, 134, 139. ³ Thus, practically a third of the Book of Psalms is given over to expressing this sentiment.

The joyousness of spirit inherent in these psalms is expressive of the feelings of the h^asidim who saw in their worship not a formal ritual, but a joyous exercise. Judging by the frequency with which instruments are used, the terms זָמַר, נָחַל, נָגַן are applied, it appears that these hymns were sung rather than recited (cf. Ps. 33.1-3; 47.2; 67.5; 68.5; 96.1-2; 98.1, 4-6; 100.2; 105.2; 135.3; 149.1; 150.3-6). In addition, we have many references to singing in other psalms not listed specifically as hymns.

Dancing is another worship activity. We have already referred to it in the Temple service and here and there we find it mentioned in the psalms (Ps. 30.12; 149.3; 150.4) seemingly as part of a worship service.

In discussing the possible terms pointing to the existence of the synagogue, preaching was pointed out as a likely activity even at this early time. No doubt preaching was based on those Biblical texts that were known and accepted at that time. The works of the pre-exilic and exilic prophets must have been an important part of such literature, besides the J, E, D, and H codes. Somewhat later, the canonized text was undoubtedly used for the services.

I doubt whether any portions of the Codes were read in the synagogue worship before Ezra.

Home Worship

The worship in the Temple and synagogue was public. This was undoubtedly supplemented by private prayer in the home. Home prayers, though not home ceremonies, may well have been a later development, as most of the individual psalms, contrary to the opinion of Kohler,⁴ were late. And furthermore, mention of such private prayer occurs only in the late psalms, unless we regard Ps. 63.7 (c. 486 B.C.):

אֵם זְכַרְתִּיךָ אֵל יִצְחָק בְּאֵמֶרֶת אֶהְיֶה בְּךָ

as evidence of prayer. Ps. 119 is especially interesting for this purpose. In v. 62 we find:

v. 147 reads: קְדַמְתִּי בִנְיָמִן וְאֶזְעָדָה

v. 148 adds: קְדַמְתִּי צִיּוֹן אֶלְמִירָה

Perhaps in conformity with the Deuteronomic injunction:

וְהָיָה כִּדְבַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנִי מִצִּיּוֹן בֵּית אֱלֹהֵינוּ
וְאֶנְתָּם אֲבִינֶךָ יִדְבָּרְתָּ בֵּם בְּמִתְנֵה בְּבֵיתְךָ וּבִפְתָּח בֵּיתְךָ וּבְקוֹלְךָ:

the psalmist felt called upon to praise Yahweh פ'י'א י'א'ל. (Ps. 119.164)

The import of these verses is quite clear. Home prayers formed an integral part of the worship of God.

Notes to Section VII

- 1 Kohler, K., "The Origin of the Synagogues and Church," p. 16
- 2 Morgenstern, J.: "A Chapter in the History of the High-Priesthood," pp. 57-58
- 3 Gunkel, "Einleitung in die Psalmen," p. 32
- 4 Kohler, K., Op. cit., pp. 19-20

For other liturgical references of P^{e} 134; 136; 141, 2; also the sacrificial systems of the P^{e} in the different epochs could be compared very profitably with the evolution of the sacrificial system as revealed in the successive strata of Deut. 12

Section VIII

Hasidic Doctrine and Beliefs

An exhaustive study of each doctrine and belief that guided the life and activities of the h^asidim would no doubt prove of interest and value. Such an undertaking, however, is felt to be outside the scope of this thesis, which is attempting to give a general view of the h^asidim. Consequently these doctrines which are mentioned or implied in the Book of Psalms will be only briefly stated and some of their applications pointed out.

Individual Responsibility

The doctrine most prevalent throughout the Book of Psalms is that of individual responsibility, first clearly enunciated by Ezekiel shortly after 586 B. C. In Ez. 18;33.11-20, the prophet gives comfort and encouragement to the people who felt that it would be impossible for them to be saved, because of their own past sins and those of their fathers. The people, however, are assured that they will be judged according to their own deeds.

"לֹא אֶחָד יָמָוֶה עֲוֹנוֹתֵי אָבִיו" לֵאמֹר

(Ez. 18.4,20)

declares the prophet. The sins of the fathers, they are promised, will not be visited upon the sons. In Ez. 33.11-20, we have a significant addition to the doctrine. A rāsā[✓], if he turns saddiq, will not be considered a rāsā[✓], but a saddiq. This doctrine was important and held sway for a very long time.

Retribution

It is upon the doctrine of individual responsibility that the belief

in retribution was based. According to it, the saddiqim were to be rewarded and the resaim punished. This credo was accepted by all groups of hasidim at all periods. It is frequently stated outright, but even more often is it implied. The very notion of Yahweh as a righteous judge, so frequently mentioned and so completely accepted, implies that He will deliver the righteous and destroy the wicked. This concept is likewise implied in His hesed. The development of this belief marked a considerable advance over the old theology, according to which the nation was judged as a unit. Remnants of this belief lingered on in Israel and many psalms have their roots in the belief that the nation was regarded as a unit, and that it would be rewarded or punished as it deserved. (cf. Ps. 78; 81.12-13, 14-17; 95.8-11; 106) Other nations as well as Israel were believed subject to the same consideration. (cf. Ps. 74A.18,23; 79.6-7; 83; 105.25ff)

According to the belief in retribution, Yahweh was expected to judge, not only each individual person but also the minor deities. (cf. Ps. 82A)

The reasons for the rewards and punishments stated in the Psalter, reveal the attitude of the hasidim toward many of the problems of the time. Perhaps the most remarkable element in their concept of right and wrong is their absolute refusal to believe that bringing an offering to Yahweh is an act of righteousness for which one may expect reward. In a time when the Sanctuary was absolutely the center of Jewish life, and the priest its ruler, such an attitude is in itself sufficient to stamp its adherents as an opposing, perhaps even heretical, party. If no other proof of the existence of a hasidic party in Judaism were offered, this fact alone would have been sufficient to establish it.

The chief hasidic virtue preached in practically every psalm, indeed in almost every verse, is faith in Yahweh, faith which is complete and wholehearted, unblemished by doubts and uncertainty. Over and over again, the hasid declares his unfailing faith in Yahweh and seemingly never tires of urging his listeners to do likewise. The theme is so dominant throughout the Book of Psalms that it is impossible to find a psalm in which faith in God is not either declared, suggested, or implied.

Faith in Yahweh made both the nation and individual patient in the face of trials. Only rarely does an expression of impatience, like the following, cross the lips of the hasid:

Ps. 44.24: *צוה למה תאמין אלהים לא תצלה*

Ps. 73.13: *אך חק צדיק לבדי וארחי בקיון כבי*

Ps. 74.10: *יזמנו אלהים יחל צר ינאף איש אגן לנצח*

Ps. 77.8: *באזנים ינחמ ינחמי ולא יסיל לרעות צוז*

Ps. 77.9: *באזנים לנחם חסדו גמר אמי לדרור ודר*

all this, it should be explained, resulted from the national calamity of 485 B.C.

But aside from these few instances, the hasidim were ready to wait for Yahweh's justice to manifest itself. It is this absolute belief in Yahweh, this complete faith in His absolute righteousness which must have brought the later belief in resurrection.

Second in merit to faith in Yahweh was the love of Him and the consequent ready obedience to His commandments. The uninitiated might see in the latter, the regular offering of sacrifices and recitation of prayers. But wherever the laws and commandments are specified in the psalms, they turn out to be ethical rather than ritual in character.

Thus:

*ידרך צדקים במשפט ילמד צדקים דרכו:
כל ארחי יהיה חסד ואמת*

The general content of the פק' and conditions of the תנ" are negatively stated in Ps. 50.16:

in Ps. 50.16:
וְלֹכֵד אֶת־אֱלֹהִים מִן־לֶךְ לִסְפֹּר חֲקֵי וְהֵאָדָּה בְּרִיתִי אֵלַי - פִּיךָ.
וְאַתָּה שָׁמַע מוֹסֵר אֶת־לֶךְ דְּבַרִי אֲחֵרִיק:
אִם רָאִיתָ לֶךְ וְתֵלֵךְ אִם וְעַם מַנְאפִים חֵלֶקְךָ
פִּיךָ שְׁלֹחַת בְּרִדָּה וְלֹאֲנֶכָ תִּלְבֹּשׁ מְרֹמֶה
תִּשֶׁה [תִּשֶׁה? שֶׁל] בְּאֲחֵיךָ תִּדְבֹּר בֶּן אֲמֶךָ תִּתֵּן דְּבַרִי

One who follows the *fiqh* therefore avoids these unethical acts.

Another instance of what neglect of the commandments meant, is given in Ps. 106.34-39. Chiefly, the sins are disobedience of Yahweh's commands concerning idol-worship. This seemingly is purely ritualistic. Yet the disobedience involved sacrifice of children, described as the spilling of innocent blood. Such a concept is certainly not ritualistic, but ethical.

Ps. 112 describes a person who obeys the commandments. He is:

חטן וחמם וצדיק
 חטן וחמם
 וכלל דברין במשפט
 כזר נתן לאביונים
 צדקת אמת אדם

Ps. 119, written in praise of the Law, describes one who keeps the Law most fully. Following are his qualities:

אף לא פארו מאה
דרכ גקר הסר ממי
דרכ אמונה בחרות
הט לבי אל צדקות ואל אל קצו
צדק אלה אקום אכדוה לך אל משהו צדק

- v. 101 מִלֵּא אֵיכָה נָדָה כְּאֵלֶיךָ יְהוָה
 v. 104 אֲנִי מִלֵּא אֵיכָה נָדָה
 v. 121 אֲנִי מִלֵּא אֵיכָה נָדָה
 v. 163 אֲנִי מִלֵּא אֵיכָה נָדָה
 v. 164 אֲנִי מִלֵּא אֵיכָה נָדָה

The other acts of merit frequently mentioned are likewise ethical in character. Study of the Law came to the rank of its observance in the later period (cf. Ps. 1; 119). Justice is highly exalted, throughout the Book of Psalms. Humility is highly regarded (cf. Ps. 51A.19; 131.1). Honesty and truthfulness are frequently commended, both in the early and the late psalms. Avoiding the company of evil men is also considered a meritorious act.

A late psalm adds:

יְהוָה כִּי פִיךָ כִּי תִּשָּׁא אֶרֶץ וְטוֹב לֵךְ
 (Ps. 125.2)

This seems to imply more than is apparent on the surface. Quite possibly, the hasidic psalmist is a husbandman and means to reproach the city business people and officials who probably hold him in scorn. The verse may indicate that even as late as 350-200 B. C., the breach between the hasidim and their opponents had not yet been healed. Another psalm of the same period also makes mention of a virtue which seems likewise limited to country people Ps. 133.1 (c. 400-170) says:

כִּי מִן הַטֹּב וְהַטָּהוֹר וְהַנְּחָמָה וְהַנְּחִיָּה וְהַנְּחִיָּה

Gunkel believes that this verse means that at marriage or after the death of the head of the family, the sons do not share up the estate, but continue dwelling together in friendship and unity, thus keeping the estate intact.

How was this
breach ever
healed
completely

It should prove interesting to discover the nature of the rewards anticipated for meritorious acts.

In the period preceding 486 B.C., all groups agreed that the principal reward of the *saddiq* was deliverance from troubles, and long life. (cf. Ps. 101.6; 52.8,10; 86A.17; 89A.17-18; 97.10-11; 18.21ff.; 149A.4) Between 486 and 400 B.C. additional rewards are mentioned, viz:

שְׂרָרָה וְיָמִים רַבִּים (Ps. 25.13)

Thereafter, several specific rewards are mentioned:

Ps. 17.14; 127.3-5; 128.3-6:- many children

Ps. 41.12:-recovery from illness

Ps. 17.14:- their prosperity will pass on to their heirs.

Immortality

Beginning with the fourth century B.C., a new hope began to develop in hasidic circles--a hope that still serves to sustain the pious people of almost the entire world, the hope in immortality. Occasional delays in the execution of judgment and in the ending of suffering puzzled the *h^asidim*. Thus one psalmist complains: (Ps. 44.18-22)

כֹּל זֶמַן בָּאֵנוּ וְלֹא נִשְׁכַּח וְלֹא נִשְׁכַּח בְּדִרְתֵּנוּ;
לֹא נִשְׁכַּח אֲחֵרֵינוּ וְלֹא נִשְׁכַּח אֲחֵרֵינוּ;
כִּי דִבַּרְתָּ בְּמִקְוֵה תַנְחִיחַ וְתִכְסֶּה יָדֶיךָ בְּעֵלְמוֹת;
אִם נִשְׁכַּח אֵל אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְנִשְׁכַּח כִּסֵּינוּ לֹא נִשְׁכַּח;
כֹּל אֱלֹהִים יִחְקֹר וְלֹא יִחְקֹר בִּי הוּא יִשְׁכַּח תַּלְמוֹתֵינוּ לָנוּ

Similar questions though less bitterly stated occur occasionally. At times they are hopes or expression of faith in Yahweh's ultimate righteousness.

The classic answer to problems such as the one quoted above is stated

in Psl 92 (c. 400-335):
כִּי יִשְׁכַּח אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְנִשְׁכַּח כִּסֵּינוּ לֹא נִשְׁכַּח;
(Ps. 92.4)

לִּדְבַר כְּתוּב יִשְׁכַּח כִּסֵּינוּ לֹא נִשְׁכַּח (Ps. 92.4)

Another answer is provided in Ps. 94B (c. 400-335):

v. 12: אֲנִי הָקֵר אֶל תִּסְרוּ יְהוָה וְיִשְׁמְרֵךְ מִלְּפָנָיו

v. 13: אֶל־קִיט לֹא יִמָּוֶה נֶדַע צְדִיקָה לֹא־יִכָּחֵשׁ

The latter reply differs basically from the former. It is a re-statement of Jeremiah's doctrine of *ḥayim*.

When the hard facts of life belied these comforting replies, a different kind of explanation was necessary to save the belief in the justice of God. Immortality was the answer.

Some statements were made in the fourth century B. C. Which probably were not meant to present a new idea or belief. Thus 115B.18

(c. 411-350) states: וְאֵלֵינוּ נִבְרַךְ יְהוָה אֲדָמָה וְעַד עַד

In all likelihood the writer meant that Israel would always praise Yahweh. But there was nothing to prevent a reader from thinking it meant that certain righteous people would praise Yahweh forever, thus suggesting the thought of everlasting life. Similarly in Ps. 41.13

we read: וְתִלְבֵּט לְבָבִי לְדָוִד

But much more suggestive of everlasting life, or life after death are the following:

Ps. 16.10: אֲנִי תָתֵן חֲסִידֶיךָ אֶחָד אֶחָד

Ps. 17.15: אֲנִי בְצִדְקָה אֶחָד פְּנִיךָ מִבְּדֹחַ בְּהִקְלֵךְ מִיָּמֶיךָ

Ps. 49.16: אֲנִי אֶל־יָמֶיךָ יִפְתָּה נֶפֶשׁ מִיָּד אֱלֹהִים כִּי יִקְחֶנִּי

Ps. 49.21: אֲנִי בִקְרָא וְלֹא יִבִּין

Dr. Morgenstern in his unpublished notes to this psalm suggests that בִּיקְרָא is an Aramaism equal to Hebrew בְּנִיבִי and is reminiscent of Dan. 12.3:

וְיִבְרָךְ הַיְּהוָה . The parallel in thought with Daniel suggests that each of the last three psalms cited above was composed in the same period; namely, 200-170 B. C.

Sin

Having observed the reasons and the manner of reward, we can readily understand what ḥasidim regarded as sinful and as wicked. It is important at this point to distinguish a sinner from a ^{raṣa}ṣa. Any person, including the most pious, ethical, and learned ḥasid, might become a sinner, knowingly or unknowingly. The ḥasid therefore prays:

עֲיָאוּר אֵי יָקִין אֲנִי מִתְּרוֹרַת נֶקֶט
לֹא מִזִּדּוֹן [מִזִּדּוֹן?] חֶסֶק עָרַבְתָּ אֵלַי [יִשְׁעָךְ?] בִּי
אֵל אֱלֹהֵי וְנִקִּית אֶבְרָרְךָ כִּי

(Ps. 19B.13-14)

What makes one a sinner is nowhere clearly indicated, despite the frequency with which the ḥasidim pray for forgiveness for sin. (cf. Ps. 19B.12; 25.7ff.; 31.11; 32.9; 41.5; 89B.33; 103B.10; 130.3; 143.2)

Only Ps. 51A.6-7 gives us a hint of what sin might be. The passage reads:

לֹא לִעֲבֹר חֲטָאוֹת וְהִרַצְתָּ בְּעֵינֶיךָ עֲוֹנוֹתַי
אֶת עֵינֶיךָ וְהִצַּדְתָּ בְּעֵינֶיךָ חֲטָאוֹתַי בְּשֶׁלֶטֶק
בֶּן בְּזוּז חֲטָאוֹת וְחֲטָאוֹת יִחַתְתִּי אִמִּי

Simply that the sex act
If sin is to be conceived as here presented, then the sinner is one who unwillingly, unknowingly, or involuntarily, transgresses one or more of Yahweh's Laws. In Pss. 78 and 106, the sins of Israel are enumerated. They are of two types; the first of these consists of:

1. Losing faith in Yahweh and
2. Testing Him

(cf. Ps. 78.11ff.; 106.14ff.) Secondly: worshipping idols, with all the evil that it involves (Ps. 78.58; 106.20ff.) A third type of sin is the eating of ^{חֲמֵץ}חֲמֵץ. What this might be can only be guessed at. The verse mentioning it states:

וַיִּצְוֵהוּ לֵבָרֵךְ כִּדְוֹר וַיִּזְכֹּר אֶת חֲמֵץ

(Ps. 106.28)

Apparently the sin consists of eating an offering to Baal Pe'or (who is considered a dead object). Wickedness, however, is that kind of act of which only the *raša'* is guilty. The worst of these and the source of all acts of wickedness, is a denial of God. The atheists are denounced throughout the Book of Psalms by both the particularists and the universalists. Thus before 486 B.C. we have such denunciation in Ps. 50.22, 42.11, and 52.9. Between 486 and 400 B.C. we have many such references to the nations that oppressed Israel. (cf. Ps. 9.18; 14.1; 53.2; 74.10; 79.6; 83.7; 94A.7) Ps. 10.4, 11, 13, however, may refer to individual *raša'im*, while Ps. 28 and 75.6 almost certainly refer to individuals. After 400 B.C., we again find utterances directed at individual atheists (cf. Ps. 73.9; 139A.20)

sacrifices to the spirits of the dead

Other wicked acts, such as lying, slandering, hypocrisy, arrogance, oppression of the weak, injustice, resort to murder, have already been discussed in Section IV in connection with the identification of the *raša'im*. Because of these qualities the *raša'im* were guilty of keeping evil company (Pss. 50.18), disregarding the Torah and its study (Ps. 119.50, 127, 150, 155), borrowing but failing to repay, and hating all manner of discipline

*But what is the difference between the sinner and the *raša'*, of which you speak?*

The punishment for sin was consequently thought to differ from the one imposed for wickedness. Sin might be forgiven as an act of grace on God's part, in view of man's weakness and natural inability to resist sin. Thus the psalmist mourns:

וְיָחַד אֶת הַיָּדָיִם וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה

(Ps. 51A.7)

Only rarely did the hasid express the belief that he was clean of all

iniquity. Such sentiments were voiced in:

1. Ps. 17.3-4:

בַּחֲנוּת לִבִּי בַקִּדְוֹת לֵאלֹהֵי צִדְקָתְךָ כִּי חֲמַלְנוּ זִמְתִּי בִּלְיָדְךָ כִּי
אֶפְסֹתִי אִדָּם בַּדְּבָר שֶׁבְּתִיק אֵין מִמֶּנִּי

2. Ps. 26.1-2:

יְפֹטֵנִי יְהוָה כִּי אֵין דַּמִּי הִלֵּכְתִּי וּבִיָּהוָה בִּטְחֹתִי אֵין אֶמְרֹדִי
חֲסִנִּי וְנִסְתִּי צָר וָפֶה בְּאֶזְנוֹתִי וְלִבִּי

Usually, however, the plea to God for deliverance was coupled with an admission of sinfulness. Before 400, such confessions are found in Ps. 25.7ff.; 85.3; 89B.33. After 400, they are repeated in Ps. 31.11; 32.9; 41.5; 130.3; 143.2.

The punishment for the sins of Israel were variously conceived. There were those who still seemed to expect that God would consider Israel as a unit. They did not indeed believe, as did Amos and Hosea of the 8th century, that Yahweh would doom the nation as a whole. However, national suffering was explained in accord with various ancient doctrines. Psalm 78, for instance, tells of the rejection of all the ten northern tribes because of their sinfulness, and the selection of Judah (vv. 67-68). This interpretation resembles Isaiah's doctrine of *קִלְקָל יִשְׂרָאֵל*. According to it, the people as a whole was doomed to perish for its sins, but a small remnant would be saved (Is. 10.20-22). Presumably this remnant was destined eventually to grow into a great nation. This is clearly the import of Ex. 32.10, where God is represented as saying to Moses:

וְאֵלֶיךָ הִנֵּחֵנִי יְיָ וְיִחַר זַעַמְךָ בָּיָמִי וְאַתָּה אֶמְלֵךְ אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲמַר לִי יְיָ גִּדְּלוּ

Likewise the story of Noah and his family being saved from the flood

in which all others perished because of their wickedness, is but a universalized application of the Isaianic doctrine.

Musar

Another interpretation of the suffering of Israel for its sins is in accord with Jeremiah's doctrine of discipline. Israel, they believed, was destined to suffer until it would become regenerate. Then all who remained were to enjoy a happy national life (Jer. 31). This doctrine is found in the particularistic Ps. 81.12-15, composed between 516-486, in the universalistic Ps. 66A.10-12, composed in 479-458, and in Pss. 80.17-20; 89B.32ff., composed at the same period. It is also assumed in the later Ps. 94B.12-13.

It seems to me that you read more into these passages (except 94.12-13) than is actually there

L^eMa'an Somo

The most widely adopted doctrine concerned with the manner of God's dealing with sinful Israel, was Ezekiel's *למאן*. It played an important role in hasidic belief and should be clearly understood. Realizing that the people was not fully regenerated by its sufferings, and yet firmly believing that Yahweh was eventually to restore Israel to its land and prosperity, Ezekiel was faced with the necessity of explaining how a just God might overlook the sinfulness of Israel. To meet the challenge, he evolved the doctrine *למאן*, fully summarized in Ez. 36.22-24,26.

אכן אמר לביית ישראל כי אמר אדני יהוה לא למענכם אני עשה
בית ישראל כי אם לשם קדש וואר חללם בקיום ארץ באגם עמ
וקדשתי את שמי הקדוש המהולל בקיום ארץ חללם בתוכם וידעו הקיום כי
אני יהוה נאם אדני יהוה בקדש בכם לעיניכם: ולקחתי אתכם מן הקיום
וקדשתי אתכם מכל הארצות והבאתי אתכם אל ארצכם... ונתתי אתכם לבם חזק
ולחם חדש אתם בקרבכם --

This doctrine has many applications in the Bible. The most striking case is in Ex. 33.12:

אני יאמר וצריכ לאמר כי ציאתי לך אלך אלך אלך
אל בני האדם

In the Psalter, the doctrine *אמן* is most often expressed in 486 B.C. and shortly thereafter. But we find it also in earlier psalms. Thus in 115A.1-3 (composed before 516 B.C.) we have:

אני יהוה אל אלהיך
אל חסדך אל אמתך
אל יאמר כי ציאתי לך אלך אלך אלך
אל בני האדם

Between 516 and 486 B.C. this doctrine was implied in Ps. 98.2-3.

Other instances of the application of *אמן*, before 400 B. C., are the following: Ps. 79.9-10; 83.4-6; 17-19; 89C.51-52; 102B.14-16; 106.6-12.

But even though many *hasidim* still regarded Israel as a unit for reward and punishment, others, probably the majority, thought primarily of the individual. The very doctrine *אמן* was extended to apply to individuals. Ps. 25 (485-400 B.C.) presents a plea for deliverance:

v. 7:
חַסְדֵּי יְהוָה וְרַחֲמָיו
אֵלֶיךָ יְהוָה
v. 11:
אֵלֶיךָ יְהוָה וְרַחֲמָיו
אֵלֶיךָ יְהוָה

Ps. 23.3 (4th century) uses the same basis of appeal:

יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה
יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה

Similar pleas are voiced in Ps. 31.4; 109.21 and 143.11.

In all these instances, *אמן* no longer means what Ezekiel had in mind when he first propounded the doctrine. Evidently Yahweh

is not called upon to glorify His Name in the eyes of all nations by saving some individual sinner. Rather does it imply that Yahweh is now looked upon as a gracious God who knows fully the weaknesses to which feeble man is subject, and is entreated to overlook man's faults. It is granted that He punishes man for sinful acts, but not as severely as absolute justice, unqualified by mercy, would demand. Ps. 130.3 gives classic expression to this belief:

יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲדָמָה אֵלֶיךָ וְתִפְּלוֹתֶיךָ
יְהוָה הַיָּשׁוּׁר מִן - אֱמֶלֶךְ לִפְנֵי חַיִּיתָ וְיִרְדְּתָה בָּרוּךְ

Similarly Ps. 143.2:

וְאַל תִּבְּיֹא בַּחֲמַטְךָ אֶת עַדְּךָ כִּי לֹא יִצְדַּק אֲפֻיִּיךָ בְּחַיִּי

The usual punishment for sin was apparently illness. We have many instances in the Psalter of ḥasidim confessing their sinfulness, while praying and fasting for healing. (cf. Ps. 6.3-4; 22.15-16; 25.18; 31.10-11; 35.15-17; 38.4-9; 39; 42.10-12; 43.5; 51A.1-14; 55.5-6, 17-19; 61; 69.30-32; 88; 102A; 109.21-27; 130.1-5.

The punishment of the *raśa'im* was expected to be much more severe than that of the sinner.

In the period preceding 400 B. C., the exact nature of this punishment was apparently not determined. It was taken for granted that Yahweh would punish the wicked by slaying him (cf. Ps. 5; 8.18; 34; 52; 75; 107). In Ps. 112 (c. 516-500) the punishment of the *raśa'* is described more graphically:

וְיִשְׂכַּר יְהוָה (the reward of the righteous) וְיִשְׂכַּר

בְּחַיִּי יִתְּנֶנּוּ וְיִתְּנֶנּוּ

וְיִתְּנֶנּוּ [תְּנִינָה] וְיִתְּנֶנּוּ

(v. 10)

In the later period, the conception of the punishment becomes clearer.

Unlike an ordinary sinner, the *raśa'* was doomed: וְיִתְּנֶנּוּ וְיִתְּנֶנּוּ

exclaims the one psalmist (Ps. 31.18), and another adds: וְיִתְּנֶנּוּ (Ps. 37.28)

The author of Psalm 1 completes the picture: (v.4)

אֵל בֶּן הַבְּרָצִים כִּי אֵם כְּמֶלֶךְ אֵלֶּי תִפְגַּע רֹחַ

Death itself was no punishment. It was recognized as a perfectly normal phenomenon. Ps. 89C (c. 486-479) already declares:

יֵגֶר יָחִיד וְלֹא יִדְאָה מוֹת יִמְלֹךְ גְּבוּרַת מֶלֶךְ מֵלֶכֶת סֶלָה:

Hence, the belief developed that death would overtake the [√]rasa' before the end of his normal life span. Thus Ps. 55.24 reads:

וְהָיָה מְלָכִים תִּהְיֶינָה לְבָאֵר שָׁמַיְךָ
אֲנִשִּׁי דְּמִיָּה וְהָיָה לֹא יִחַלּוּ יָחִידִים

The manner in which the ḥāsīdīm expected [√]rasa'im to be punished was rather primitive. Ps. 37.14-15 states:

יִרְבֶּה כְּתֹמֵי רָעִים וְדִכּוּ קְדוֹת אֱלֹהֵי צִיָּן וְאֶבְיוֹן אֶטְבֹּחַ יְשִׁי דְּבִרָּה
חֲרָבָה תִּבְּרֹא בָלֶבֶת וְקִשְׁמָתָהּ תִּשְׁבְּרָה

Likewise Ps. 55.16:

וְדִכּוּ מְלָכִים כִּי רָחַת בְּמִקְרָבֶיךָ

Ps. 57.7 adds:

פֶּתַח כִּינּוּ לִפְנֵי כִכְלִי נִבְּרִי [כִּכְלִי נִתְכַּבֵּד בְּהִי] כִּי
כִּי לִפְנֵי שִׁחָה נִפְלוּ בְּתֹכָהּ

It seems very much as if they still believed in the Lex Talionis principle when applied to their enemies.

[√]śe'ol

As has already been stated, the most common requital for wickedness was death and descent to [√]śe'ol. How did the ḥāsīdīm conceive of [√]śe'ol? Apparently it was a dark and gloomy place (Ps. 88.13) to which all the dead went (Ps. 89C.49) and those who were near death felt they were close to the gates of [√]śe'ol. (Ps. 8.6; 30.4; 86.13; 88.4; 94B.17; 103A.4; 116.3; 141.7) There is, however, no suffering of any kind in [√]śe'ol unless it be the inability to praise God. (Ps. 6.6; 30.10; 88.12; 104.33; 115B.17) Even Yahweh himself forgets those who descend into its depths. (Ps. 88.6)

There was one psalmist, however, who as early as 516-486 B.C., expressed a contrary opinion which is remarkable for its beauty of thought and greatness of faith. It is well worth repeating:

! 20 like ar'ol ark pl r'ne polc pl

(Ps. 139B.8)

But saw this passage in this early?

Outside of this single statement, there is no intimation that ^vs'ol had any contact with the outside. Once an individual entered, he was believed doomed to remain there forever (Ps. 49.12; 20; 143.3,7). He could not bring anything along (Ps. 49.2-28) and apparently could engage in no activity.

The picture of ^vs'ol naturally changed when the idea of immortality developed, shortly after 170 B. C. God was then recognized as supreme in that region as He was elsewhere. (Ps. 16.10; 49.16) The wicked only would then remain in ^vs'ol while the righteous would be saved from the sorrowful fate of remaining there indefinitely.

Section IX

Universalism and Particularism

We have frequently mentioned the universalistic and particularistic parties within the ranks of the ḥasidim. Some of the points of disagreement between the two have already been alluded to. However, the general outlook of these parties still remains to be discussed. Moreover, the views of the middle group on the question of universalism and particularism demands further clarification.

Hasidic Particularism before 486 B.C.

In these days when Nazism and Fascism run riot, the term particularism bears an evil connotation. Its mention brings to mind the German brand, whereby only "Germans" with "Aryan" blood in their veins are deemed worthy of preservation. All other people are fit only to serve this "superior race," or are altogether doomed to extinction. God has no place in the particularism of the Nazis. Only in their own strong arm do they place any faith.

Not such was the nature of the hasidic particularism. Its basis was not racial but religious. Accordingly, the particularistic author of Ps. 45 did not repress his enthusiastic description of the beauty and wealth of the Tyrian princess who married the king of Israel. (vv. 12-15) He spoke in glowing terms of the joy occasioned by the marriage (v. 16), and showered blessings and praise on the king who was entering upon a mixed marriage which would have been strictly forbidden after the days of Ezra (vv. 17-18). Thus we see that even intermarriage was not considered objectionable. Moreover, the closing of the psalm:

פֶּן יִסָּחֵם עַם אֲרָם (v. 18) indicates that the particularist hasid

Nationalism is not synonymous with particularism

of course not; it did not become until Ezra.

felt a cordial relationship with foreign nations might well exist.

The desire of the particularists to get up a king over Israel was based on the conviction that a ruler was needed (to help spread Yahweh's Name among the nations and) to keep Israel itself loyal to Him. (cf. II Sam. 7.24-26) ¹ Without a king each individual might do *אֵלֶּיךָ יָבֹאוּ כָּל־הָעָם* which would not be *וְיָבֹאוּ כָּל־הָעָם* (Ju. 17.6) The particularists therefore believed that Yahweh approved of their program, and would aid them in carrying it out. They proceed to build up sentiment in favor of a king by inserting chapter 7 into II Sam, in which they enumerated the promises that Yahweh was believed to have made to David. These included:

1. David's dynasty will be established forever (v. 4-16)
2. One of his descendants will erect the Temple (v. 13)
3. Israel will be established as Yahweh's people

forever (v. 24)

The insertion into the Book of Samuel served to emphasize the religious character of their proposal, clothed it with authority, and aided in its more ready acceptance by the people as a whole.

The same sentiments were voiced in Pss. 45, 78, and 132A, the particularistic psalms composed shortly before 521. In Ps. 45, the king, no doubt Zerubabel, is declared God's anointed (v. 8) and is promised that his dynasty would last (vv. 7,17). There is also the implication that Israel would remain undisturbed (vv. 6,18). Ps. 132A emphasizes the rebuilding of the Temple (vv. 2-5) and repeats Yahweh's promise to make the Davidic dynasty everlasting (vv. 11-12) and to grant peace to Israel (vv. 13-18).

Ps. 78 tells of Yahweh's selection of David as "shepherd" of Israel (vv. 70-71) and implies that the people will henceforth be under God's own care (v. 68); it also holds out the hope for a Temple, to be erected on Mt. Zion (vv. 68-69). In view of the fact that particularists² carried on the agitation in behalf of the restoration of the Davidic dynasty, it is perhaps surprising to note the stress on religious and ethical values rather than the racial prestige. A Temple was to be erected (Ps. 132A.5), the koh^anim were to be clothed with *קִדְּשׁ* (authority?), and the needy supplied with food (Ps. 132A.15-16). Only incidentally was it stated that the enemies of the king would be discomfited (Ps. 132A. 18; 45.6)

The hopes for an independent kingdom were dashed in 521 B.C. However, the Persians wisely or perhaps kindly mollified the wounded feelings of the particularistic elements by assisting them in the work of rebuilding the Temple. The particularists must have been glad to accept Persian help, since the erection of the Temple was an important part of their program (cf. II Sam. 7; Ps. 132A.) In fact, they had probably never ceased hoping for its rebuilding since its destruction in 586 B.C.

The Judeans, led into the Babylonian captivity in 597, mourned^{and 586 BC} deeply their separation from Jerusalem and its Temple, and vowed never to forget it (Ps. 137A.5-7) Indeed they believed that Yahweh would be displeased if they sang their religious hymns on foreign soil (Ps. 137A.4). This doctrine gave way, however, after Jeremiah assured them in his famous letter that Yahweh's authority was not limited to Palestine, but extended over the universe, so that His people in Babylonia might

worship Him there as truly and as fully as in Palestine. (Jer. 29.7) Despite Jeremiah's assurances, the particularistic h^asidim must have persisted in believing that Yahweh preferred to be worshipped in the Temple in Jerusalem, at least on the occasion of certain festivals, if at no other time. It should be noted at this point that the disinterest in the Temple evinced by many h^asidim must have prevailed among the universalists rather than the particularists.

Once the Temple arose in 516 B.C., it took the place of the Davidic scion in the hearts of the particularists, and they transferred their loyalty to it, at least temporarily. It was, to them, God's dwelling place (Ps. 137.13-14; 50.2), and the place He loved most (Ps. 78.68). They resumed the ancient custom of visiting the Temple at regular intervals, were probably responsible for legislation introduced at this time compelling the people to bring their ma^caser, b^ekorot, n^edarim, n^edabot, and t^erumot to the Temple in Jerusalem. (Deut. 12.17-18a). This was necessary because the Palestinians had not as yet accustomed themselves to regular pilgrimages to the Temple. Throughout the sixth century, the particularists felt no enmity toward the foreign nations. There was, however, some evidence of their contempt for idol-worshippers. This feeling seems to have been based on their desire to glorify Yahweh. Thus, in Ps. 115A, we read:

v. 1: אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי שָׁמַיִם
v. 4: וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לַיהוָה
v. 8: כִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לַיהוָה

Towards the end of the sixth century, B. C., a different spirit began to develop in the ranks of the particularistic h^asidim. A son of

Zerubabel, Menahem, seems to have matured. Flames that had been dormant since the Zerubabel tragedy began to come to life and the hope for an independent kingdom was slowly revived.

Persia apparently made no effort to interfere with little Judea's dreams, probably because it must have appeared as of slight consequence. Gradually the agitation took on form, first expressed in the confidence that Yahweh would support the re-establishment of the Davidic throne.

Ps. 20B.7, composed at this time, declares with absolute faith:

אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי הוֹצִיץ יְהוָה מִצִּיּוֹן
יְצִיאוּ מִן הַמָּוֶת קִרְיָתוֹ בְּיַד יְהוָה

Ps. 21 likewise asserts:

v. 2: יְהוָה בְּצִדְקָתוֹ יִשְׁמַח מֶלֶךְ וּבִיּוֹשָׁעַתוֹ מִהִיקוֹל מָוֶז
v. 3: תִּשְׁמַח נַפְשׁוֹ נִתְּנָה לוֹ מִיְּדֵי זִמְיוֹ בְּאֵן מִנְחָה
v. 6: לִצְדָקָה כְּבוֹדוֹ בִּיּוֹשָׁעַתוֹ הוֹצֵא לַעֲבָדֶיךָ תִּשְׁמַח עַלֵּיו
v. 8: כִּי הִמְלִיךְ קוֹטֵחַ קִיבּוֹב וּבְחֹסֶד עֲלֵיוֹן הוֹצֵא יָמָיו

Ps. 18 voices similar sentiments. Yahweh, the Rock and Fortress of the king (v. 3) answers when His hasid (i.e. king) calls (vv. 4-18-), for He considers the king as His anointed one with whom He stands in hesed relationship (v. 51).

The desire for a king was undoubtedly coupled with the thought that Israel could best glorify Yahweh by spreading His name among the nations with the effective and strong aid which a king might lend them (Ps. 18.50). For particularistic though they were, they yet conceived of Yahweh as a universal deity. He was in their eyes the supreme judge of the universe (Ps. 76.9; 105.7); He was to be worshipped by foreign people as well as by Israel (Ps. 68.30,32; 76.12-13); nature was subject to Yahweh's power; and no people could resist Him. It was He who had

brought plagues on Egypt (Ps. 78.43-51) and had driven out the Canaanites to make room for His people Israel (Ps. 78.55).

Perhaps opposition to this program was somehow manifested by foreign nations. Israel therefore began to look upon them as opponents of Yahweh himself:

יְקוֹם אֱלֹהִים יְבוֹלֵי אִיִּים וְיִסּוּסֵי מִצְרָיִם מִבְּנֵי
 אֶם אֱלֹהִים יִמְחֶה רָא אִיִּים קִצְקִצַּת עֵר מִהֶבֶל קִמְצָה
 (Ps. 68.2,22)

The term *מִהֶבֶל קִמְצָה* is significant in that it states plainly that the only ones who will be destroyed will be those who persist in the sinful act of worshipping idols. This fate is not at all what the particularists² wish upon their foreign neighbors. Consequently they suggest the only method they know by which the idol-worshipping nations might escape their doom.

v. 30: מִהֶבֶלֶךָ הָיָה וְהָיָה לְךָ יִבְיֹולוּ אֱלֹהִים זֶה
 v. 32: יִמְחֹלוּ חֲמֻסֵּי מַי מַעְרִים כֹּחַ תִּהְיֶה יְדִיו לְאֱלֹהִים
 v. 33: מִלִּבֹּת הָאֵשׁ יֵצֵאוּ אֱלֹהִים זֶה וְזֶה אֶדְנִי

These verses are significant in that they plainly declare that the foreign nations are not to be destroyed but only made to realize the futility of trusting any god but Yahweh.

but this is universalism

The particularistic germ concealed in this outlook was the belief that Yahweh was to be glorified through Israel.

הִתְהַלַּךְ יְהוָה בְּקִצְצֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲמַלְלֵהוּ וְגִין
 (Ps. 114.2)

sings the psalmist. Deutero-Isaiah had taught his people that they were to be Yahweh's ^{עֲבָדִים} and spread His Name and teachings amongst the

nations. The prophet, it is true, had insisted that the ^EEbed was to be humble and downtrodden. But the people were apparently greatly impressed with the glory of their mission and developed the belief that Yahweh would never permit them to be destroyed or ~~ever~~ harmed. This thought was in accord with the doctrine ^{1st 1st}, previously discussed. The logical conclusion, therefore, was that Yahweh would help Israel in all its troubles with its neighbors. Indeed, He would Himself fight for His people!

Since defeat with such a Champion was unthinkable, the particularists ^{this too is a type of universal law.} began to dream of glorifying Yahweh's Name by forcing other nations to recognize Him, through war if necessary. The 20th chapter of Deuteronomy, ³ composed at this time (c. 800-485) actually records the procedure, to be followed in conducting such wars. Ps. 20B.8-9 supplies us with an illuminating illustration of the ease with which Israel expected to overcome its enemies in these days:

v. 8: ^{אֵלֵינוּ בְּכֹכֵךְ אִמְרָה בְּסוֹסֶיךָ אֲנַחְנוּ בְּלֵב יָהּ יִבְרָא}
v. 9: ^{וְהָיָה כִּי יִצְוֶה אֲנִי וְיִצְוֶה אֲנִי וְיִצְוֶה אֲנִי}

Their confidence in Israel's invincibility because of Yahweh's assistance, they justified by another doctrine--Zukut Abot, stated in Gen. 22.14-18; 28.13-14; Ex. 32.13. It declares that the seed of Abraham will become numerous, conquer its enemies, and become a blessing to the nations of the earth because the patriarch proved his absolute faith in Yahweh.

Ps. 105 illustrates this doctrine. It tells that in keeping with His covenant with Abraham (vv. 6-8), Yahweh protected Israel in Egypt, ^dcaref for it in the desert, and presented it with the lands as well as the fruits of the labor of other nations. Typically enough, the

particularistic psalmist made no mention of how Israel became a blessing to other nations, but stressed Yahweh's punishment of Israel's oppressor, Egypt. Similarly Ps. 18 tells of the conquest of enemy nations by Yahweh. The subjected peoples, it was confidently felt, would recognize the supremacy of Israel and would then be taught to know Yahweh (v. 50).

Hasidic Universalism before 486 B.C.

In studying the particularism of the h^asidim, we observed that they were not particularistic in our modern sense of the term. They were very much concerned with the welfare of other nations, and earnestly desired to have them recognize the true God and worship Him. Their fault lay in their confidence that Yahweh desired them to force His worship upon unwilling nations. Furthermore, they felt superior to others because they alone worshipped the true God. This gave them the added feeling that Yahweh favored them, their land, and their institutions above all nations.

This is universalism

Similarly we shall have occasion to note that the universalistic h^asidim were not altogether universalistic. They felt loyal to Israel, loved their land and Temple and were convinced that their God, Yahweh, was superior to all others. Echoes of such sentiments may be found in the universalistic psalms of this period.

Ps. 67.2-3 is the prayer of a universalistic psalmist for Yahweh to bless Israel so that His way and His salvation may become known among the nations of the earth. Ps. 89A.16 evinces the joy of the h^asid in being one of the nation that worships Yahweh. Ps. 95.7 indicates how

close Israel felt to its God:

בִּי הָיָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ מִלְּפָנֶיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְלֹא
13' אֲנִי וְכָל בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

Says the ⁵psalmist. Ps. 65.5; 93.5; 96.8 point out the universalists' attachment to the Temple. Their contempt for the gods of the other nations (cf. Ps. 89A.7-8; 96.5) is likewise ²out of harmony with what we now expect of true universalists. In their defense, it should be stated that all these, to us moderns, anti-universalistic views were not meant to be anti-foreign but rather to enhance the greatness and glory of Yahweh.

(But this is not correct)

Unlike the particularists, the universalists showed no interest in forcing the nations to accept Yahweh as their God, though they were fully as eager to have them worship Him. The universalists must have made Deutero-Isaiah their guide, and labored actively to fulfill the mission which that prophet had put upon Israel in the name of God.

Deutero-Isaiah's doctrine of salvation which guided the universalistic ^hasidim is by no means outmoded today, and is worth restating at least briefly.

Approximately in 540 B.C. Deutero-Isaiah came to his people with a message of comfort--Yahweh was about to overthrow Babylonia through the agency of Cyrus, permit the Judeans in Babylonia to return to Palestine and make it possible for Israel to resume its national life. The prophet's explanation for the restoration was that Israel had already suffered ^{חַסְדֵּי יְיָ} (Is. 40.2). Yahweh's motive, however, for the restoration of Israel was, according to Deutero-Isaiah, more than a mere compensation for suffering. He had a mission for Israel. The peoples of the world were imperfect and needed regeneration. Israel might save them suffering by teaching them to know and worship Yahweh.

Accordingly, Deutero-Isaiah addressed himself to Israel as follows:

Is. 42.1:

בן עבד יהוה כחירו כלתה נבוא
לתי כוחי עליו מלכא ללויים ילדיו

Trito-Isaiah

Is. 43.12:

אני יהוה והוא עבד ופועל ואין קבץ
ואת עבד לא ידע יהוה ואין עו

Deutero-Isaiah

Is. 49.6: ויאמר נקח מהיותנו עבד לעמים את עבד
ועבדיו ישראל אלהים ונבטחם ונאמין
אליהם יסודות עבד קצת כארץ

Trito-Isaiah

The import of these remarks is stated above. Israel was selected to serve as Ebed Yahweh and to be His witness unto the nations of the world, so that they, too, might learn to know and worship Him and thereby become regenerate and worthy of salvation. In accord with this doctrine Is. 2.1-4 and Mi. 4.1-3, present the glorious dream of a world worshipping Yahweh and living in perfect peace and harmony. In the Pentateuch this doctrine is reflected in the character of Abraham, personalizing Israel. He is represented as the one through whom all nations will be blessed:

Gen. 12.3: ונקרכו בקי לך משכחם האדמה

The people of the world, according to the import of this fiction, needed Abraham's (Israel's) help in securing God's blessing because they themselves were sinful and were consequently suffering as a result of God's displeasure. This belief was illustrated in the story of the Tower of Babel related in Gen. 11.1-9.

With the motive of providing salvation for the world, the universalists undertook what seems to have been the first active proselytizing movement in the world. Their literature is filled with glowing attributes to Yahweh and invitations for other nations to join in His worship.

As might have been anticipated, the universalists presented Yahweh⁴ as the most powerful, though not as the only God. He was the ruler, not of Israel alone, but of the entire Universe. (cf. Ps. 84A.10-13; 93.1; 96.9-10; 97.1)⁵ He it was who had created the world (cf. Ps. 8.4; 96.5; 102C.26; 104.2), brought life into it (cf. Ps. 100.3; 104.30), made the earth fruitful (Ps. 65.10-14; 67.7), and established the order of the universe (cf. Ps. 24A.1-2; 65.7-8; 74.15-17; 89A.3; 93.1). Yahweh's might was constantly manifested over the universe (cf. Ps. 29.3; 74.13-14); He was to be found everywhere (Ps. 139B.7-10), and was eternal (Ps. 102C.27).

For these reasons humanity as a whole was called upon to recognize Yahweh and adopt His worship (cf. Ps. 65.3,6,9; 67.8; 86B.9; 96.1-3,7; 97.6,9; 117.1-2). To those who might hesitate, there was added the warning that Yahweh was the judge of the world (cf. Ps. 67.4-6; 89A.15; 96.1-13). Even nature was urged to sing and declare and praises of Yahweh, or was represented as so doing (cf. Ps. 8.2,10; 19A.2; 65.9; 89A.6; 93.3-4; 96.6-9,11-12; 100.1-2).

Thus did the universalists hope to win the world to Yahweh's worship and thereby bring salvation to all nations on earth.

The Middle Group Before 486 B.C.

The hasidim whose opinions reflect neither extreme, show positive concern with the question of universalism. Since the particularists themselves were in no sense isolationists who limited their thoughts to the four ells of Palestine and Judaism, it is only natural that the middle group should also concern itself with the rest of the world. Yahweh was presented by them as King of the Universe, to whom angels

(Ps. 103B.20-22), nature (Ps. 19A.1-2, 5b-7; 47.8; 57.11-12; 103B.19), and humanity (Ps. 47.9-10; 57.10) owed praise. For He, Yahweh, is the salvation of man and beast (Ps. 36.7). It may safely be assumed that the rendering of praise was a recognition of Yahweh as God. Hence the call upon the nations to join in His worship amounted to an invitation to proselytism.

Unlike the universalistic party, the middle group showed a more positive pride in belonging to Israel. An important argument in defense of the recognition of Yahweh was the interest He evinced in Israel which worships Him. He loves Jacob (Ps. 47.5), makes his ways known to Israel through its prophets (Ps. 103B.7), serves as its leader (Ps. 48A.15), delivers it from all danger (Ps. 57.4-7; 98.2-3) and defeats its enemies (Ps. 47.4).

Yahweh was also presented as being greatly pleased with Jerusalem, the center of His worship (Ps. 48A.1; 87.3; 101.8; 122.4-5). He loves it more than any other spot (Ps. 87.2), and it is therefore a mark of distinction to have been born in Jerusalem (Ps. 87.4-6). Consequently Mt. Zion is the most glorious elevation in the world (Ps. 48A. 2b³-3) and only certain privileged persons may dwell therein. The description of the man deemed worthy to appear before God in Zion is deserving of quotation. Ps. 15.2-5 lists his qualities in this manner:

הואק תמים ופדל לבק ודבר אמת בלבו
 אה נקל אל לשון
 לא זנה לרעהו רדו וחרכה לא נשא אל קרובו
 נבזה בדמיון נאום ואת יראי ופדו יכבד
 נשבע לברך ולא יאמר יכסו לא נחן בנגח
 ושמר אל בקי לא לקח

There is not a word in this entire ethical statement that is racial, national, or in any way particularistic. Of course it is understood that only Israelites will want to dwell in the courts of the Lord. Hence indirectly they are the only ones to whom the passage may properly be applied. Foreigners, according to Ps. 144A.8,11 are pictured differently:

אֵלֶּיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יִשְׁמָחַן וְיִשְׂמָחַן

The general tone of these psalms is not unfriendly to foreign nations, but holds them inferior to Israel because of the manner of their worship. They are, therefore, invited to join Israel's ranks and together worship the true God of the universe, Yahweh.

Hasidic Particularism between 486 and 458 B.C.

Just about the year 486 the agitation of the particularists for the establishment of an independent kingdom reached its climax. Yahweh's selection of David and his promise to establish the Davidic dynasty permanently were repeated, restated:

כִּי תִבְרָא אֶתְּיָהּ אֶתְּיָהּ אֶתְּיָהּ
אֶתְּיָהּ אֶתְּיָהּ אֶתְּיָהּ אֶתְּיָהּ
(Ps. 89B.4-5)

A like view is presented in Ps. 89B.20-22, 27-30, 34-38. The firmness of this belief may be further deduced from its continued persistence even after the calamity of 486 (cf. Ps. 80.16; 89C.50). Furthermore, the Davidic claimant to the throne of Israel was represented as the "son of Yahweh" (Ps. 2.7; 80.16,18), who stood in hesed relationship (Ps. 89B.24) with God and who would be punished only lightly for his sin (Ps. 89B.33).

This Davidic king, it was believed, would be a just and righteous ruler who would protect the weak against the strong (Ps. 72.2,4,7,12-14) so that he would be praised by the many he delivered from danger (Ps. 72.15) and merit appointment as a priest of Yahweh (Ps. 110.14). It was further assumed that under his reign there would be peace (Ps. 72.3,7) and prosperity (Ps. 72.6,15-16). The people therefore prayed that he be endowed with long life (Ps. 61.7-8).

Such a king the people were ready to support even in battle (Ps. 110.3). However, it was felt that a step of this kind would hardly be necessary. In accord with the spirit expressed in the war legislation of Deut. 20, the people, or at least the particularists, believed that Yahweh Himself would destroy the enemies of the king who were likewise the foes of Israel and Yahweh. (cf. Ps. 2.5,9,12; 72.9-11; 89B.24-25, 28; 110.1-2,5-6). Their lands would naturally fall to Israel whose borders would then be extended to equal those that had once obtained in the days of King David (Ps. 2.8; 72.8; 89^B.26).

So confident had the particularists been of the widening of their borders that special legislation was introduced to permit people to kill animals for food without having to come up to the Temple for their ordinary ^qzibahim (Deut. 12.20-27). Furthermore, being closely attached to their Temple they felt, as had the original Deuteronomic legislators, that there must be no other Temple anywhere outside of Jerusalem no matter how difficult it might be for people dwelling far off to come to Jerusalem. Fearing lest these visits be overlooked, they added the requirement that on the three Pilgrim Festivals, all Israelites appear at the Temple in Jerusalem. (Cf. Ex. 23.17; 34.23-24; Deut. 16.16ff.)

It is perfectly natural that the neighbors of Israel, dwelling within the borders of the territory Israel hoped to possess, should become alarmed for their safety, and antagonistic to Israel. Impatiently they must have waited for an opportunity to disabuse Israel of its vain and foolish dreams. The particularistic h^asidim realized that there was danger (Ps. 28.63) but unfortunately did not appreciate to the full the extent thereof, and did not imagine the nature of the disaster they were inviting (cf. Ps. 2; 61; 83;100)

The inevitable soon came and assumed a more terrible form than had ever been thought possible. Menahem seized the opportunity of the chaos in Persia resulting from the death of Darius I in 486, to raise the banner of revolt in Judea. The Persian army was engaged elsewhere in quelling rebellions in Babylon and Egypt. The Persian satrap, therefore, let loose upon Israel all its neighboring foes and added to them some wild desert tribes and whatever forces Persia could spare. The ruin and destruction that followed were terrible. The land was overrun, the cities demolished, Jerusalem devastated, the Temple ruined, and vast numbers of people were carried off and sold into slavery. (Ps. 44.10-27; 60.4-5; 74.4-9; 79.1-4,7; 80.6-7,13-14; 94A.5-6; 118B.5,10-12; 129.1-3)

Marvelous to relate, Israel as a whole, with the particularistic h^asidim in its midst, continued to believe in Yahweh. He was still regarded as the Master of the Universe (Ps. 92; 72.19), He was yet destined to be worshipped by all people (Ps. 102B.16,23), and remained the Judge of the world (Ps. 9.8-9,20; 94A.2). His power, moreover, was still recognized (Ps. 9.10-11; 33A.10; 44.3-4), and what is even more significant is that Israel, according to the particularistic Ps. 80, still looked upon Yahweh as *יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ* (v. 2).

The misfortune that befell Israel was blamed on Yahweh's displeasure with Israel, though no specific reasons for such an attitude were indicated. (cf. Ps. 44.10, 24-25; 60.3; 74.1; 79.5; 80.5; 85.6). Hence Israel was not without hope that some day they would yet overcome their enemies (cf. Ps. 33A.10; 44.6-8; 60.14; 149B). This was partially realized in 479 when the Nabataeans invaded Edom and partially destroyed it (Mal 1.2-4). Indeed they still entertained the hope that Yahweh would yet aid them to rebuild their land, reconstruct the Temple and make Israel into a great nation (cf. Ps. 33A.1-4, 18-22; 44.5; 74A.2-3; 79.9, 11; 80.2-4, 8-12; 85.2-5, 8-14; 94A.14; 102B; 118B.6, 10-29).

But Israel's attitude toward the neighbors who had treated it so fiendishly became definitely unfriendly. Where formerly they were regarded with pity, and perhaps scorn for worshipping idols, they were now looked upon with hate. A desire for revenge filled the hearts of the particularists. We find these sentiments strongly expressed in the psalms. (cf. Ps. 60.8, 10-11; 74A.1-11; 22-23; 79.6, 10, 12; 83.10-19; 94A.1-2; 118B.7; 129.5-8; 137B.7-9)

Hasidic Universalism between 486 and 458 B.C.

There are only two universalistic psalms that belong to this period--Psalms 66A and 113. The latter seem to profess the same viewpoint as the earlier universalists. Yahweh is still considered the Lord of the entire universe (v.3) and the One who is exalted above all nations (v.4). The latter verse, however, can hardly be considered as clear an invitation to proselytism as obtained in the earlier period. There is farther the prayer that Yahweh raise Israel out of the dust.

Ps. 66A seems to have been written after the worst effects of the disaster had worn off. Yahweh is again pictured as master of the entire world (v. 4) and all nations are again invited to praise Him (v.8). The reference to the bitter experience of 486 is interesting. Vv. 10-12 read as follows:

כִּי בְחַנְתָּנוּ אֱלֹהִים זָכַרְתָּנוּ כְּצָרָה כֹּסֶם
 יִבְאֹגְנוּ בְּמִצְוָה אֶת מִדְּקָה בְּמַחְלֵינוּ
 הִרְבֵּת אֱמֶת לְכֹאמְנוּ בְּאֵל וּבְחַיִּים
 וְלֹא צִיָּאָה לְרוּיָה [לְכֹחֵהּ?]

There is no bitterness apparent. The sufferings were interpreted as in harmony with the prophetic teachings of purification by trials. Its sense approaches Jeremiah's doctrine of נִסִּים. There is an interesting problem posed by v. 12: Who might the ^{ones} be who was made to ride upon the heads of Israel? Perhaps the enemy, but possibly it was Menahem. The latter theory seems plausible in view of the fact that the universalists never showed any enthusiasm for an earthly king and must have resented his assumption of power. When the attempt ended disastrously for all Israel, it is hardly conceivable that the attitude of the universalists toward a king could be anything but bitter. It is likely, therefore, that at this period the universalists inserted Chapter 8 into the Book of I Samuel. In this insertion, the office of king is bitterly assailed, on the ground of his enslaving the people (I Sam. 8.11-17) and was in addition considered tantamount to a rejection of Yahweh as Ruler (I. Sam 8.7-8). For the universalists, the kingship over Israel was henceforth a closed chapter.

approaches
Deut. Isa

are
interesting
suggestions
But not
usually is a
collective
noun, "man-
kind".

The Middle Group between 486-458

There is little of importance to add to the picture of the middle

group of h^asidim at this time. To them Yahweh remained the Universal God. He continued to be regarded as the Creator (Ps. 121.2; 124.8), Perfect in His knowledge of the universe (Ps. 138.6), His power extended throughout the world (Ps. 46B.7,9), everything belonged to Him (Ps. 75.7), and all were subject to His judgment. (Ps. 9.9; 75.3).

These h^asidim, therefore, felt that proselytism was still desirable, and called upon foreign kings (Ps. 138.4-5) and nations (Ps. 22.28-32; 46B.11) to recognize the supremacy of Yahweh and the wisdom of worshipping him.

Their particularism also continued. Before the calamity came, they asked Yahweh to protect Menahem (Ps. 84.10). After it happened, they prayed that God restore Zion and rebuild the walls of Jerusalem (Ps. 51B.20). At the same time they denounced the foreign enemies as חֲסִידֵי אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים (Ps. 9.18:

בְּרֵאשִׁית אֶת אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְאֶת אֱלֹהֵי אֲחֵרִים
יְהוָה יִשְׁמַר מִן הַיָּד הַזֹּאת וְיִשְׁמַר מִן הַיָּד הַזֹּאת

(Ps. 14.4; 53.5),

אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֶתְּחַלֵּץ אֲנִי (Ps. 22.22)

בְּרֵאשִׁית אֶת אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְאֶת אֱלֹהֵי אֲחֵרִים (Ps. 22.17).

They also expressed the hope that Yahweh would destroy them (Ps. 11.6) and rejoiced when they learned of the destruction of Edom (?) (Ps. 9.6) and especially when the destruction of a large part of the Persian fleet (Ps. 48B.8) became known.

Universalism and Particularism after 458 B.C.

"With the arrival of Ezra and his introduction of the ritualistic program which culminated in the establishment of Israel as a theocracy in 458 B.C., the problem of universalism and particularism ceased to agitate the minds of the people.

But didn't really?

With the elimination of the hope for an independent kingdom, the urge for conquest and expansion disappeared, and with it, the particularistic party. Perhaps its adherents were gradually absorbed within the ranks of the Sadducean ritualists. Likewise the motivation for universalism was greatly weakened by the anti-proselyte position of the governing body controlled by Ezra and Nehemiah.

Two of the psalms composed between 458 and 400 still present the viewpoint of the particularists. Ps. 99 declares that Yahweh is great in Zion (v. 2) and established righteousness in Israel (v.4). Moses, Aaron, and Samuel had the power to call upon Yahweh and receive a reply, presumably a favorable one (v. 6). This belief, it might be noted, is pre-exilic. Jer. 15.1 mentioned Moses and Samuel and implied that in ordinary cases, they possessed the power to sway Yahweh in His judgments.¹⁹ Another sign of the particularism of this psalm is the implication that Yahweh was more ready to forgive Israel's sins (v.8) than those of other nations. Ps. 106 praises Yahweh for the special interest He evinced in Israel (vv. 8-11). He did, indeed, punish them for their sinfulness (vv. 40-43), but when He observed their suffering, (v. 44) he delivered them from the hands of their oppressors (vv. 45-46.).

The chief sin of which Israel is accused illustrates the spirit of the times:

v. 34: *לֹא יִשְׁמְרוּ אֶת הַבְּרִית וְאֶת הַחֻקִּים אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם*

v. 35: *וְיִשְׁמְרוּ אֶת הַבְּרִית וְאֶת הַחֻקִּים אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם*

Foreign nations, with their idol-worship, are to be regarded as enemies with whom Israel may have no friendly relations.

After 400 B. C. the Sadduceans assumed official control of Judah, and P^g became part of the basic law of the land. Henceforth, the ḥāsīdīm

concerned themselves primarily with personal religious and ethical problems. However, the central figure in all their speculations was, of course, God, and His relation to the universe, the nation, and the individual. Hence there was still room for consideration of universalism and particularism. Their utterances on this subject we shall now examine.

Yahweh is now clearly recognized as the universal Lord, guardian, judge, creator, and helper, of all people, (Ps. 7.9,12; 64.10; 94B.9; 136.10-12,17-20; 145.12-16) creatures (Ps. 33B.5; 136.25; 145.15-16) and deities (Ps. 148.2) ¹² and the universe as a whole (Ps. 33B; 69; ⁹⁰115B; 119; 134; 135; 136; 145; 146; 147; 148; 150).

Many psalms not mentioned in this list because they are individualistic imply that Yahweh is the only God in the world.

It might be noted that despite the official negative attitude toward proselytes, prevailing at this time, we still have statements inviting all people to recognize Yahweh (Ps. 33B.8; 64.10; 49.12). That this invitation must have been accepted ^{by some} we can conclude from the expression:

(Ps. 146.9) יהוה אלהי אברהם

That the h^asidim continued to be loyal to their own little country need hardly be stated. That believed still that Yahweh preferred them to all other nations:

Ps. 135.4: ב' ידקק את לו וה' יצאנו ל סגלנו :

Ps. 147.19-20: : אֵיזָדְדֵּרוּ לַיָּדְקָה חֶקְיוֹ וּמַעֲשָׂיו לַיִּשְׂרָאֵל
אֵל זָמַח בֵּן אֶל גֵּוֹ וּמַעֲשָׂיִם בְּכָל יְדָעִים

However, they account for Yahweh's favor on an ethical basis so refined, that to this day we still quote it with pride, and hope the lesson contained therein reaches the heart of Israel. It begins by asking who is worthy to be a worshipper of Yahweh, and gives the following answer:

נָקִי כַפַּיִם וְבוֹ אֶבֶן אֶזְרָא לֹא יִשָּׂא לְעוֹלָם נִפְסוּ
(Ps. 24^b.4) וְלֹא יִשָּׂא לְעוֹלָם נִפְסוּ

Let Israel take this to heart! Let the nations of the world see and learn!

Notes to Section IX

- 1 Cf. also Morgenstern, J.: "The Book of the Covenant" II, pp. 140-141
- 2 Morgenstern, J.: Unpublished notes to Deuteronomy
- 3 ibid.
- 4 It is important to note in this connection how completely the universalists ignored all mention of a human ruler. Apparently they had no enthusiasm for the movement headed by Menahem, nor are they likely to have been found~~am~~ among the supporters of Zerubabel.
- 5 See discussion on "Concept of Yahweh," p. 47ff.
- 6 Morgenstern, J.: Unpublished notes to Deuteronomy
- 7 Rogers, R. W., "A History of Ancient Persia," Chap. VII
- 8 Morgenstern, J., "Jerusalem: 485" unpublished
- 9 In his lectures on Amos, Dr. Morgenstern said that I Sam. 8 was written between 485 and 458 B. C. when Israel had no king and held no hope of getting one.
- 10 Morgenstern, J.: Unpublished notes on the Psalms
- 11 Morgenstern, J.: "Moses with the Shining Face," p. 21ff.
- 12 This psalm is probably the latest expression of the universalists. Note its continued adherence to the belief in minor deities now described as *1'245*, and *1'123*. *But compare the same ideas in the later apocalyptic writings. The work of these same Hasidim*

Section X

Conclusions

The problem investigated in this study was in no sense finally or completely solved. The writer often felt his preparation for the task was not fully adequate and that the ramifications of the questions at times led into directions which the limitations of time made it impossible for him to pursue. His conclusions, therefore, are only tentative, but are deemed worthy of further investigation and checking. The chief outcomes of this study are the following:

1. The ^hasidim came into being no earlier than the exilic period. Before the time of Ezra, most Israelites living in Palestine including the ^hasidim and kings were members of this party.

2. The name is based on the assumption that a relationship of ^hesed exists between Yahweh and Israel, according to which Yahweh must always protect His people while they are to worship Him and spread His Name abroad. To confirm the relationship a special ^hesed is to be offered by the ^hasidim.

3. Naturally only those who recognized Yahweh as their God could be ^hasidim. This definition excluded not only non-Israelites but also atheistically minded Jews of whom there were apparently many. Both the rich and the unscrupulous belonged to this group. To understand the spirit of the ^hasidim, it must be clearly understood that the basis of exclusion was not race but religion.

4. After the arrival of Ezra in 458 B. C., the ritualists, including the newly-arrived Jews from Babylonia and the aristocratic priestly families, remained outside, though the priestly families descended from the ^hasidim continued their association with

Jerusalem and thereby showed that Israel was His favorite people and that He was especially concerned with its welfare.

8. The universalists believed strongly in proselytism as the means of carrying out the mission of bringing salvation to the world. This was in accord with the charge laid upon them by Deutero-Isaiah.

9. The ^{nationalists} particularists believed in proselytism probably for the same reason. However, they felt that if the foreign nations refused to accept Yahweh as their God, then it was proper to force them to take this step. Even war was considered justifiable in the attainment of such an end. They had no doubt of success and are probably the ones responsible for introducing the war legislation of Deut. 20, the changes in sacrificial procedure of Deut. 12, and the requirement of visiting the Temple on the three Pilgrim Festivals.

10. The particularists supported the aspirations of Zerubabel and Menahem toward the establishment of an independent kingdom while the universalists probably remained neutral on the question.

11. In general the hasidim were to be distinguished by the following beliefs:

a. The worship of Yahweh must be joyous. Music, song and dance were an important part of the ritual.

b. The Temple was only one of the places in which worship might be carried on. Furthermore, its sacrificial cult was by no means its most important feature. God was not concerned about animal sacrifices. But if a hasid promised to bring an offering, then he

was expected to fulfill his obligation.

c. Prayer might be offered in a synagogue or at home, daily as well as on certain festivals.

d. Yahweh was the source of all joy and sorrow that might come upon man. No human being can successfully resist His will.

e. Each Roš Hašanah, VII/10, Yahweh accompanied by His court of minor deities, entered the Temple at sunrise to judge Israel, humanity, the minor deities, and the universe as a whole. With the entrance of His Kabod, a light was kindled on the altar, around which the ḥasidim danced and from which they kindled 'Abot taken home to light their hearths.

f. Other mythical elements were also included in their beliefs.

g. The ḥasidim were guided by many interesting doctrines described in the body of this study. These were:

Yahweh's word

Yahweh's Kingdom

Musar,

Lema'an Šemo,

Individual Responsibility

Universal Salvation

Zekut 'Abot

h. Of some significance is their distinction between sin and wickedness, their concept of reward and punishment, Še'ol and immortality.

i. It is to their credit, no doubt, that the synagogue came into existence.

Bibliography

Listed below are the works to which reference has been made in the body of this study. No effort was made to list all of the works consulted in its preparation.

Chief Sources

Biblica Hebraica, Edited Rudolf Kittel, P. Kahle, A. L. and O. Eissfeldt, Stuttgart, 1937

Morgenstern, J., Unpublished Notes on the Book of Psalms

Other References

Bamberger, B. J., Fear and Love of God in the Old Testament
H. U. C. Annual, Vol. VI
Cincinnati, 1929

Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament
Houghton Mifflin and Co.
1906

Carpenter, J. D. and Harford, G., The Composition of the Hexateuch
Longmans Green and Co.
1908

Eissfeldt, O., Einleitung in das Alte Testament
Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) Tübingen, 1934

Glueck, N., Das Wort Heseb
Verlag von Alfred Töppelmann in Giessen, 1927

Gunkel, H., Einleitung in die Psalmen
Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1928

Gunkel, H., Die Psalmen, 4. Auflage,
Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1926

Köhler, K., The Origins of Synagogue and Church
New York, Macmillan Co., 1929

Morgenstern, J., Book of the Covenant II
H.U.C. Annual Vol. VII
Cincinnati, 1930

Book of the Covenant III,
H.U.C. Annual Vol. VIII-IX
Cincinnati, 1931-2

A Chapter in the History of the High Priesthood
Reprint from The American Journal of Semitic Languages and
Literature Vol. LV, Nos. 1,2, and 4. Jan., April, and Oct., 1938

Morgenstern, J. Moses with the Shining Face

H. U. C. Annual

Vol. II

Cincinnati, 1925

The Mythological Background of Psalm 82

H. U. C. Annual Vol. XIV

Cincinnati, 1939

Psalm 121

Reprint from Journal of Biblical Literature Vol. LVIII, Part IV

1939

Unpublished Notes to Deuteronomy, Malachi, Hasidim, and
Jerusalem: 485

Rogers, R. W., A History of Ancient Persia

New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929

Mowinkel, S. - Psalmen studien

Kristiania, Jacob Dybwad, 1921

Appendix I

Brief Notes on the Dating of Certain Psalms

Some of the datings suggested by this writer differed in some degree from those suggested by Dr. Morgenstern. A brief statement is herewith submitted in defense of these changes.

Psalm 3

In his notes, Dr. Morgenstern points out that *למנוח* (v. 5) indicates that the psalmist believed Yahweh dwelt in the Temple. Furthermore, the psalm is individualistic. These factors led him to the conclusion that the psalm was composed 400-300. However, we know that some particularists believed Yahweh's usual habitat was the Temple as early as 521 B. C. (cf. Ps. 132A). We also have instances of individual psalms composed before 400 B. C. Furthermore Dr. Morgenstern declares the use of *למנוח* in v. 3 may indicate an earlier date when the influence of Deutero-Isaiah was still strong. Consequently it seems best to date the psalm between 521 and 350 B. C.

I am not convinced

Psalm 4

The chief basis for Dr. Morgenstern's dating the psalm at 400-200 B.C. is the verse concluding with: *למנוח*. This certainly sounds like the priestly blessing (cf. Nu. 6.25,28). However, it is quite likely to have been used much earlier. Hence it is felt that a date between 516 and 200 B. C. is justifiable.

Perhaps, but a guess

Psalm 7

Despite the use of *למנוח*, Dr. Morgenstern feels that it is possible for the psalm to have been written even earlier than 485 B.C. He adds the thought that the universalistic belief in Yahweh as judge of the nations is even earlier. Why then exclude the possibility of an

early date by limiting the time of composition to the period 400-200? Perhaps
The dates 521 to 200 seem preferable.

Psalm 10

Accepting the arrangement of Kittel and the emendations of פ"מ in v. 5 to 100, it becomes evident that the alphabetical arrangement of Ps. 9 is concluded in this psalm. The unhappy situation is further described and the reference to the destruction of the nations is repeated in v. 16. The psalm concludes with the confident hope that Yahweh will soon free Israel from all the terror which it had recently suffered (vv. 17-18). Such a hope best fits 478 B.C.¹ Perhaps

Psalm 11

Verse 3 reads: כִּי כְעֵת וְהָרָסוּן בְּיָדֵינוּ מִן הַכּוֹחַ [פְּרָגִי]

Evidently a period of anarchy is prevailing in Judea! Since it shows no P influence, the year 485 B.C. is most suitable.² Perhaps

Psalm 23

The early date (516-500) seems unlikely because:

1. v. 3 employs *לְעַלְמָא* in a "perfunctory conventional manner."³ This fact suggests a late date.

2. v. 6 implies Yahweh's dwelling place to be the temple. This concept is more usual after 400 B.C. and supports the contention of a later date.

3. The individualism of the psalm is a further consideration. It therefore seems that a date 516 to 300 B.C. is defensible. right my notes say the same

1 Dr. Morgenstern does not regard this Psalm as continuation of Ps. 9 and feels v. 16 is best interpreted as picturing the period of Ezra when anti-foreign nation sentiment was strongest.

2 Dr. Morgenstern in his note suggests 458-400

3 Cf. Morgenstern, J.: "Jerusalem: 485" unpublished

Psalm 40

Vv. 14-18 of the psalm are the same as vv. 206 of Ps. 70, which Dr. Morgenstern dates 350-200 B.C. This dating seems more suitable to Ps. 40 than 516-485 B.C.

good

Psalm 53

This psalm is the same as Ps. 14 which Dr. Morgenstern dated 485-458 B.C. This dating seemed equally applicable to the psalm under discussion.

Correct

Psalm 55

v. 18 *וְיָרֵם וְיִקְרָא וְיִזְכֹּר וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה* seems to indicate the day begins with the evening according to the latest calendar, which was not introduced before 250 B.C. Moreover, the reference to prayer three times daily is likewise very late. Consequently the likely date for this psalm is set 250-165 B.C.

good

Psalm 58

The references to minor deities in vv. 2,12 point to the likelihood of an early, sixth century, date. The time of composition may accordingly be set as early as 500 or as late as 250 B.C.

This was my own suggestion in my notes

Psalm 60

Many sections of this psalm are corrupt. No clear meaning can be derived from the context, and no advantage is derived by dividing the psalm into two sections.

perhaps

Psalm 63

There is nothing in this psalm to eliminate the likelihood that it was composed in behalf of Menahem. Nor is there any positive indication of a late date. 486 B.C. is therefore the most likely time of its composition.

I can not agree

Psalm 64

This psalm contains no positive indications of a late date and may have been composed at any time between 500 and 200 B.C.

I cannot agree

Psalm 83

vv. 3-4 indicate the nations have not yet made their attack on Jerusalem. It should therefore be dated before 485-479 B.C. The most likely date is 486 B.C.

good

Psalm 108

If this is a single psalm, then vv. 10-14 point clearly to a date between 485-479 B.C.

right - 1/7

Psalm 111

v. 6 seems to point to extension of boundaries which would set the date some time before 486.

right

Psalm 138

Dr. Morgenstern divides the psalm into two parts. Vv. 1-3, 7-8 are, he believes, a late framework. However, the reference to minor deities in v. 1, seems to point an early date. The psalm seems to be continuous and a unit. The entire psalm is therefore dated at 478 B.C.

I can't see

Appendix II

Definition of Certain Terms

קִי יְהוָה

קִי יְהוָה with יְהוָה as a direct accusative of קִי, occurs only in post-exilic literature. Its earliest appearance is in Is. 40.31 and 49.31. קִי יְהוָה with Yahweh as the antecedent of the suffix occurs in Is. 26.8, but the latter is part of a late pronouncement which all Bible critics place in the post-exilic period.

קִי יְהוָה however, occurs in three pre-exilic passages, including Hos. 12.7; Is. 8.17; Jer. 14.22, as well as in post-exilic literature.

The expression is usually translated by "wait for the Lord." But קִי related to the Arabic قَوِيَ --be strong, قَوَّى strengthen, and the Syriac ܩܝܬܐ -endure, seems to imply a sense of strength and expectancy. A literal translation of קִי יְהוָה must accordingly be: Yahweh's strong men. Perhaps it is a technical name adopted by the universalistic ḥāsīdīm describing themselves, thereby, as -
"Those whose strength is in Yahweh." It would certainly make a better and clearer translation than "Those who wait for the Lord."

Note especially Is. 40.30-31:

יִדְּבָלוּ נַפְשֵׁי יְהוָה וְיִחַלְּצוּם יְהוָה
וְיִחַלְּצוּם יְהוָה וְיִחַלְּצוּם יְהוָה
וְיִחַלְּצוּם יְהוָה וְיִחַלְּצוּם יְהוָה

In the other quotations in which קִי יְהוָה occurs, the proposed translation improves the sense of the text. Following are the instances:

Ps. 37.9 וְיִחַלְּצוּם יְהוָה וְיִחַלְּצוּם יְהוָה
Ps. 25.3 אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יִחַלְּצוּם יְהוָה
Ps. 69.7 אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יִחַלְּצוּם יְהוָה
Lam. 3.25: אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יִחַלְּצוּם יְהוָה

What then is the meaning of קוה אל יְהוָה ? Following the Arabic root it should mean "strengthen" Yahweh. How can we "strengthen" Yahweh? The Arabic قَوَّى has a secondary meaning "to encourage." Perhaps the meaning of "importune" could best present the sense of the word when related to Yahweh. Our next question might well be:

"Can we importune Yahweh in any other way other than by prayer or sacrifice?"

Since we found this expression used by the universalistic ḥāsīdīm, to whom sacrifice was of little consequence, the possibility that קוה אל יְהוָה means "he prayed to Yahweh," recommends itself.

How does this sense fit into the text? Following are the instances in which an inflection of קוה occurs:

Ps. 130.5: קויתי וְהוָה קוֹתֵנִי נַפְשִׁי

Ps. 25.5: אֱלֹהֶיךָ קוֹתֵנִי כֹל יוֹם

Ps. 25.21: גַּם וְיִשְׂרָאֵל חָנִן כִּי קוֹתֵיכָם

Ps. 39.8: וְתַמָּה מִה קוֹתֵי אֲפָנִי

Ps. 40.2: קוה קוֹתֵנִי וְהוָה וַיֵּט אָזְנוֹ

Ps. 82.11: אֲדוֹנָי אֲדוֹנָי כִּי צָדִיקֵי אֱמֶת בְּיָדָם וַיִּדְרֹךְ

Is. 26.8: אֵל אֱמֶת מַבְטֵיךָ יְהוָה קוֹנֵנוֹן לֵאמֹר וְאֶכְדָּרְךָ

"Pray" certainly fits as well for קוה אל יְהוָה in each of the above quotations, if not better, ^{that wait for Yahweh} It also suits the original sense "strengthen," as a person who prays wholeheartedly presumably is strengthened and encouraged by this activity.

Hence it seems logical to conclude that the קוֹתֵי יְהוָה are the universalistic ḥāsīdīm whose chief religious activity is: קוה אל יְהוָה from which they derive strength and faith.

I cannot approve of this. The "קוֹתֵי יְהוָה" are those whose "קוֹה" is in "יְהוָה", i.e. who trust in Him unswervingly and therefore wait confidently for His promised salvation.