

Statement by Referee of Senior Thesis

The Senior dissertation entitled:

"Traditions Concerning the Early Relationship of
Jahweh and Israel in Dateable Prophetic Writings"

written by Sherwin T. Wine
(name of student)

- 1) may (with revisions) be considered for
publication: (✓)
cannot be considered for publication: ()
- 2) may, on request, be loaned by the Library: (✓)
may not be loaned by the Library: ()

Sheldon H. Blank
(signature of referee)

Sheldon H. Blank
(referee)

Mar. 7, 1956
(date)

TRADITIONS CONCERNING THE EARLY RELATIONSHIP OF
JAHWEH AND ISRAEL IN DATEABLE PROPHETIC WRITINGS

by

Sherwin Wine

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for
the Master of Hebrew Letters
Degree and Ordination.

Hebrew Union College-
Jewish Institute of Religion
Cincinnati, Ohio
February, 1956

Referee:
Dr. Sheldon H. Blank

SUMMARY

The purpose of the following investigation is to discover those traditions concerning the relationship of Jahweh and Israel in the days preceding the initial Israelite conquest of the land of Canaan, which are reflected in the writings of the prophets, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Deutero-Isaiah.

There are three aspects to the early relationship of Jahweh and Israel under which these traditions are arranged: (1) divine election; (2) divine providence; and (3) divine legislation. To each of these aspects a chapter is devoted.

In the first chapter concerning divine election the following three questions are answered, wherever possible: (1) Did each of the prophets under consideration believe that at some time in the past Jahweh adopted Israel as his people, as the special object of his providence? (2) If so, did he believe that Israel, in turn, had adopted Jahweh as its God, as the exclusive object of its devotion and obedience? (3) If he acknowledged the divine election of Israel, at what time and place did he believe that event to have occurred?

In the second chapter concerning divine providence the following two questions are answered, wherever possible: (1) What pledges or promises did each of the prophets under

consideration believe that Jahweh made during the period of Israel's early history, to provide and care for the nation? (2) What providential acts did he believe that Jahweh performed in fulfillment of these promises?

In the third chapter concerning divine legislation, the following two questions are answered, wherever possible: (1) What demands, if any, did each of the prophets under consideration believe that Jahweh made upon the people of Israel in pre-Conquest days? (2) When and where did he believe that such demands, if any, had been delivered?

In all three chapters, not only the traditions which each of the prophets accepted, but also those traditions possessed by his contemporaries, which he may have rejected, are noted.

In the final conclusion, all of the relevant traditions or beliefs discovered are arranged chronologically in order to indicate the temporal terminus ad quem for the emergence of each of them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
I. Jahweh Chose Israel	4
II. Jahweh Protected Israel	31
III. Jahweh Commanded Israel	53
Final Conclusion	84
Footnotes	88
Bibliography	97

INTRODUCTION

The history of the relationship of Jahweh to the children of Israel in the days prior to the final conquest of the land of Canaan is described in detail in the various narratives of the Hexateuch. These accounts, whether J,E,D, or P, are characterized by both a prose style and a chronologically ordered presentation. Although they are not always mutually consistent, since many of the historical assertions of each narrative contradict, either explicitly or implicitly, those of another, they concern themselves, generally, with the same major personalities and events. Unfortunately, however, their respective authors are presently anonymous, with the consequence that the date and setting of their composition are often difficult to ascertain.

Another source of historical opinion concerning God's early relationship with Israel is the statements of the literary prophets, whether oracular or otherwise, which are recorded in the four books of the Latter Prophets. Although these prophetic writings are neither historical narratives nor generally prosaic, they do contain references, however rare and haphazardly dispersed, to the association of certain personalities, events, and laws with the pre-Conquest encounters of Jahweh with Israel. Moreover, these scattered references, unlike the Hexateuchal accounts, are

usually not anonymous. Since most of their authors are both known by name and dateable, the time and setting of their utterances can be approximately determined, with the happy result that certain historical opinions can be associated with certain specific periods of time in Israel's history. Thus, where the evidence permits, a development of historical opinions and beliefs can be noted.

In view of this advantage, we, therefore, propose to study in the succeeding chapters the beliefs and opinions concerning the early relationship of Jahweh to Israel which are reflected in the writings of those literary prophets who are clearly dateable and whose extant oracles are sufficiently ample to provide fruitful investigation. The prophets whose statements will be considered are the following (in the order of their appearance in history): Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Deutero-Isaiah.¹ Any assertion made by these individuals which is recorded in the books of the Latter Prophets and which concerns the relationship of God to Israel in the period of historical time covered by the Hexateuchal narratives, will be regarded as relevant to our study.²

The purpose of our investigation is twofold. First, it is our intention to ascertain, to the degree that the evidence allows, the beliefs concerning Jahweh's early association with Israel to whose contemporary existence each of the prophets under consideration alluded, either by acceptance or rejection. And second, it is our intention

to contrast these beliefs of each prophet with the relevant allusions of the other five prophets under study in order to discover similarities and differences. The discovery of these similarities and differences may enable us to trace the development of certain historical traditions concerning God and Israel, which occurred during the eighth, seventh and sixth centuries.

Our procedure in the following investigation will be to study the appropriate historical references of our six prophets under three categories. These categories are suggested by the three major functions ascribed to Jahweh in his relationship to Israel by all the Hexateuchal writers. They may be designated as divine election, divine providence, and divine law-giving. One chapter will be devoted to each of these aspects of Jahweh's relationship to Israel in the period preceding the final Conquest of Canaan. Moreover, each chapter will contain an introduction of appropriate Hexateuchal illustrations in order that we may more readily notice relevant statements in the prophetic writings under investigation.³

CHAPTER I

JAHWEH CHOSE ISRAEL

In the various accounts of the Hexateuch, whether J, E, D, or P, there is common agreement that, at some time in the early history of Israel. Jahweh became the God of Israel, and Israel was received as the people of Jahweh. The establishment of mutual and intimate relations between the Deity and the Hebrew nation is the most dramatic event recorded in the four histories. Whether the setting of this union was Horeb (Deut. 5:2) or the wilderness of Sinai (Ex. 19:2), the event is associated in each of the accounts with the departure of the Hebrews from an Egyptian sojourn.

At some place in the wilderness adjacent to Egypt Jahweh entered into a bérith¹ or covenant with Israel, whereby he pledged that he would adopt that nation as his people, that is, as the special object of his providence, on condition that Israel would adopt him as their God, that is, as the special object of their veneration and obedience. "You shall be my people and I shall be your God,"² is the covenant formula. "You shall be my people if I shall be your God," is the freer and more meaningful translation.

The adoption of Israel by Jahweh was not, according to the Hexateuchal writers, an arbitrary choice. God had had earlier intimate relations with the progenitors of the Hebrew race. Jahweh became the patron of the Israelite

nation because he had anciently been the patron of the fathers of that people, namely, the Patriarchs. E describes the Deity as introducing himself to Moses in the wilderness of Egypt as the "God of Abreham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" (Ex. 3:6). And P explains the concern of the Deity to free the Hebrews from Pharaonic bondage by referring to a previous commitment made by Jahweh to the Patriarchs under the name of El Shaddai (Ex. 6:3,4). God's choice of Israel to be his people at the time of Egyptian Exodus was motivated by his earlier affection for the fathers of that nation, and by his promises to them to protect and provide for their seed. In fact, the wilderness covenant was not the initial election of Israel by Jahweh, but merely a confirmation of one made earlier through the progenitors of the race. When Jahweh blessed Abraham, it was then that Israel became the people of Jahweh. And when the Patriarch accepted Jahweh as the object of his exclusive devotion, it was then that Jahweh became the God of Israel. Thus, the election of the Hebrew nation by God and the complementary adoption of God by that people were, according to the Hexateuchal accounts, not confined to one event, but were rather instituted through a sequence of events, beginning with the blessing of Abraham and culminating in the Exodus covenant.

The particular event, or sequence of events,

which involved the establishment through mutual consent of intimate relations between Jahweh and the people of Israel, whereby the former pledged to make the latter his people, and the latter pledged to make the former its God, is the event, or sequence of events, with which we are concerned in this chapter. In our study of the writings of each of the literary prophets under consideration, we will use the following three questions as our guides. First, did the prophet in question recognize that at some time in the past Jahweh adopted Israel as his people, as the special object of his providence? Second, if so, did the prophet recognize that Israel adopted Jahweh as its God, that is, as the exclusive object of its devotion and obedience? And third, if the prophet acknowledged either of these events, at what time and place did he believe this relationship to have been initiated? The itemizing of specific providential promises made by God and of ritual and ethical obligations assumed by the people at the time of their mutual election, as they were imagined by the prophets, will be reserved for succeeding chapters.

AMCS

The prophet from Tekoa makes no explicit reference to a pre-Conquest adoption of the Hebrew tribes by Jahweh. However, many of his statements imply the recog-

nition of such an event. Three times in his oracular utterances he employs the word "rammi (my people)" (7:8,15; 8:2), as a denotation of Israel, indicating by that reference that the nation is the people of Jahweh. Also, in a dramatic announcement of doom, "Prepare to meet your God, O Israel," (4:12), he affirms the characteristic of Jahweh as the Deity attached to, or adopted by, the Hebrew nation. "My people" and "your God" together constitute the basic part of the covenant formula.

Moreover, in contrasting Israel with the other nations, he asserts in the name of Jahweh,

"But you I have known better than all the families of the earth." (3:2) ³

The implication of this verse is that the Deity had established in the past a more intimate relationship with the Hebrew people than with any other nation. Furthermore, in the prophetic words which follow those just cited, Amos suggests the mutual character of the adoption.

"Therefore, I will punish you for all your iniquities." (3:2)

Israel, unlike the other peoples, had enjoyed the special providence of Jahweh, but only on condition that she would make him her God in the full sense of veneration and obedience. Having failed to fulfill this condition, she is justifiably punished, since the Deity has already fulfilled his obligation as the patron of the nation. For Amos, the

past event of Israel's election to the status of Jahweh's people involved a contract of mutual obligation, or more succinctly, a bérith.⁴

The time and place of this bérith, entered into by both Jahweh and Israel, is, as noted above, not explicitly stated by the prophet. But his belief in this matter may be inferred from certain historical references. The earliest event in the career of the Hebrews, cited by Amos, is the exodus of that people from Egypt (3:1; 9:7). This national deliverance, moreover, is associated with the providential care of Jahweh. It is the Deity who brings the children of Israel out of Egypt. It is a very justifiable inference that the prophet considered the land of Egypt or an adjacent area as the place, and the period of the Exodus as the time, of God's bérith with Israel.

As for previous commitments to Israel's progenitors, Amos is silent. Although Patriarchal names, such as "Isaac," "Jacob," and "Israel"⁵ certainly are employed by the prophet, they are never used as denotations of individuals, but rather as personifications of the nation.

HOSEA

The prophet Hosea in his oracular statements alludes to the establishment in the past of an intimate and special relationship between the Deity and the Hebrew

people. In fact, he conceives of this union in fairly passionate terms. For Hosea, Jahweh had been married to Israel. When God through the prophet repudiates Ephraim, he speaks as an indignant husband divorcing his espoused.

"Plead with your mother, plead --
For she is not my wife and I am not
her husband." (2:4)

When the faithless people is imagined as desiring at some future time to return to Jahweh, their words are the words of an adulterous and rejected wife seeking to return to her first husband (2:9). Even the youthful encounter of Israel with God in the wilderness is conceived of as the tender love of early marriage.

"Therefore, behold, I will allure her,
And bring her into the wilderness,
And speak tenderly to her...
And there she shall answer as in the
days of her youth..." (2:16,17)

There are two interesting implications in this tale of young love. First, the motivation of Jahweh in establishing an intimate relationship with Israel was not merely to secure the service of devotees, but also, and above all, it was the presence of real affection. Jahweh loved Israel. That is why he chose her. This early passion of God for the nation is demonstrated in another very tender simile.

"When Israel was a child, I loved him,
And out of Egypt I called my son." (11:1)

Jahweh was charmed by his people in their youth. Whether

his love was that of husband for wife, or that of father for child, the affection was there. Second, the complementary love of Israel for God indicates the character of mutual consent in the establishment of the relationship. The nation willingly became the bride of Jahweh. She chose Jahweh just as eagerly as he had chosen her. And her responsibility to God was, consequently, equal to his.

A more prosaic reference by Hosea to the creation of a special intimacy and tie between Jahweh and Israel is made in a denunciation of his people's sinfulness. He rebukes them oracularly.

"Because they have broken my bērith,
And transgressed my tōrah." (8:1)

If the bērith or covenant here referred to may, quite reasonably, be identified with the wilderness compact alluded to in the Hexateuch, then we may assume that the prophet acknowledged the former transaction of such an agreement between the Deity and the nation. Even if the identification is reckless, the recognition of some such earlier covenant by Hosea is obvious. Thus, to the mutual consent of two lovers is added the less poetic mutual pledge of two parties to a contract.

The time and place of the choice of Israel by the Deity, in the belief of the prophet, seem to be, respectively, the period of the Exodus and the land of Egypt. Firstly, he oracularly states, "I am Jahweh your God from

the land of Egypt," (13:4) -- meaning, presumably, thereby "I, Jahweh, have been your God ever since your departure from the land of Egypt."⁶ Apparently, the Deity had not been adopted or venerated by the Hebrews prior to this time. Secondly, in a verse already cited, he refers to Jahweh as having called Israel to himself "from Egypt" (11:1). The people was summoned or chosen by God at the time of the Exodus.

With regard to Hosea's belief concerning prior commitments by Jahweh to the Patriarchs as a prelude to the "betrothal," matters are obscure. If 12:2-14 is genuinely Hoseanic and not a later anti-Samaritan polemic,⁷ then a particular reference is significant. In this brief biography of the Patriarch Jacob, we find that

"He met him (God) at Bethel,
And there he (God) spoke with him."⁸ ¹² (20:4)

If this item is an allusion to the contents of the reworked J account of Jacob's encounter with the Deity at Bethel (Gen. 28:11-22), then perhaps Jahweh's promise to bestow the land of Canaan upon the Patriarch and his descendants is to be associated with it. However, the derogatory character of the biographical references mitigate against such a conclusion.

ISAIAH

Isaiah of Jerusalem makes no explicit mention of the election of Israel by Jahweh at some ancient time. However, his oracles are replete with implications of such an event. Firstly, Israel is several times acknowledged as the people of Jahweh.⁹ Secondly, Jahweh is denoted in the distinctive idiom of Isaiah as "qədōš Jisrā'ēl (the holy one of Israel)."¹⁰ This appellation is quite properly associated with the trisagion of 6:3, where Jahweh is designated as "qədōš." The genitive "Jisrā'ēl," which is added in the title cited above, suggests the intimate and exclusive association of holy Jahweh with the people of Israel. However, if the genitive is an objective genitive, then the title may be translated as the "one holy to Israel," meaning thereby, consecrated to Israel, as contrasted to the absence of such consecration to other nations. In either case, the special possession or adoption of Jahweh by one people is indicated.

Thirdly, the Hoseanic simile that involved the designation of Jahweh as husband and the children of Israel as wife, is employed also by Isaiah.

"How the faithful city has become a harlot,
She that was full of justice." (1:21)

The faithless city of Jerusalem is regarded as a zōnāh, an adulteress, who has converted from a former state of renowned loyalty. If "Jerusalem" is a metonymy for Judah,

then we may conclude that Isaiah regarded the initiation of the relationship between the Deity and the people to have been as intimate as the marital union, and as mutual in responsibility.

Lastly, there is strikingly present the touching allegory of the keeper and his vineyard.

"My beloved had a vineyard on a very fertile hill...
For the vineyard of the Jahweh of hosts is
the house of Israel,
And the men of Judah are his pleasant
planting. (5:1-7)

The resolution of the similes provides us with Jahweh as the keeper and Israel as the uncooperative vineyard. God at some earlier period singled out the combined people of Judah and Samaria for special providence and protection. The grapes of Israel were more tenderly cultivated than those of any other nation. The concern of the Deity was special, and intimate, and exclusive.

The spatial and temporal conditions of the divine election of Israel are not even provided implicitly by the prophet. In no genuine Isaianic passage is there reference to the departure from Egypt. The opinion or belief of Isaiah in this matter can only be surmised from the near contemporary opinions of Amos and Hosea. If they were similar or identical, then the setting of Jahweh's choice is the land of Egypt and the period the Exodus. As

for prior commitments to the Patriarchs, the view of the prophet cannot be determined, since he makes no reference to the Fathers.¹¹

JEREMIAH

The oracles of Jeremiah contain many allusions to the ancient establishment of Jahweh as the Deity of Israel and the consequent elevation of Israel to be the people of Jahweh.

Firstly, if the divine appellation, "the holy one of Israel," is considered characteristic of the diction of Isaiah, then the phrase, "Ēlōhē Jisrā'ēl (God of Israel)," may be regarded as characteristic of the idiom of Jeremiah. Virtually every oracle possesses the introduction, "Thus said Jahweh of hosts, the God of Israel," or "Thus said Jahweh, the God of Israel."¹² The implication of this title is that Jahweh is associated more intimately with Israel than with any other people. He belongs to them, because they, unlike the other nations, have adopted him as the object of their worship and service. Moreover, the prophet frequently uses the complement of the above appellation when referring to his people ("rammī," et sim.).¹³ Just as Jahweh was chosen the God of Israel, so was Israel chosen the people of Jahweh. He had adopted them as the object of his providence.

Secondly, Jeremiah asserts that Israel in her youth was betrothed to Jahweh. Employing the Hoseanic simile, he speaks tenderly in the name of God of his people as a bride in the wilderness overcome with love for her new husband.

"I remember the devotion of your youth,
your love as a bride.
How you followed me in the wilderness,
in a land not sown." (2:2)

Jahweh had taken Israel to wife before she came to the land of Canaan, and she, out of her affection, had assumed this status willingly. The arrangement had been mutually consented to.

Elsewhere, the prophet denounces the sin of the Southern Kingdom as the sin of harlotry and adultery.

"You have played the harlot with many lovers;
And would you return to me (Jahweh)? (3:2)

Jahweh, the indignant husband, has rejected Judah, because she has polluted herself with other gods, to whom, by the marital status which she had anciently required, she was forbidden.

Thirdly, the people of Israel according to Jeremiah, became in their youthful days the exclusive possession of the Deity. "Israel was holy to Jahweh," (2:3), states the oracle. The status of holiness (qōdeš) is for persons or objects complete and sole possession by a divine being, possession that implies the denial of the

use of that person or object for the service of anyone except the god himself.¹⁴ Israel as the people of Jahweh was made available to the service of that Deity alone. In fact, this character of holiness is very much akin, if not identical, to the status imposed upon a woman by marriage, as alluded to above. Just as the holy person may not engage in relations with strange gods, so may not a wife engage in relations with strange men. Interestingly enough, the Mishnaic Hebrew term for betrothal is qiddušin, a ceremony whereby the maiden becomes the exclusive possession of her future husband. Moreover, the oracular verse cited before (2:3), which asserts the holiness of Israel, follows directly the reference to that people as newly wed to Jahweh.

Fourthly, and most important of all, Jeremiah affirms explicitly that a bērith or covenant was entered into by both God and Israel at the time of the Exodus from Egypt. When the slave-owners of Jerusalem proceed to re-enslave all the men and women whom, out of fear, they had pledged to free during the first Babylonian siege, the prophet reminds them of their obligation under a covenant made with their fathers anciently.

"I made a covenant with your fathers when I brought them out of the land of Egypt..."
(34:13)

And when Jeremiah oracularly refers to a future covenant

which the Deity will enter into with Israel, he refers to it as a bērith hādāšā, a new covenant, which will be

"...not like the bērith which I made with their fathers when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt..." (31:31)

The character of mutual consent and responsibility which is present in the ancient covenant is illustrated by a statement from the prophet's Temple Sermon. It is a reference to certain words of God made at the time of the Exodus (7:22), and although the word bērith is not employed in the context, the coincidence of time and the nature of the words quite logically associate it with the covenant.

"Obey my voice (says Jahweh), and I will be your God, and you will be my people." (7:23)

If Israel will make Jahweh its God, then Jahweh will make Israel his people. This familiar condition of mutual service was considered by Jeremiah to be an essential element of the Exodus compact, and its importance was reaffirmed in similar style by the Deuteronomic writers who may have been his contemporaries (Deut. 26:16-19).

The time and place of God's covenant with the Hebrew people, as conceived by the prophet, are clearly associated with the liberation from Egypt, as is indicated by the first two covenant passages cited above (34:13; 31:31).

With regard to earlier commitments made to the Patriarchs, which provide motivation for the Deity's

covenant, Jeremiah is silent. In no genuine Jeremianic passage do we find any reference to the personalities of the Patriarchs. The names "Israel," "Jacob," "Judah," and "Ephraim"¹⁵ are used exclusively as denotations of peoples or tribes, and not as references to historical individuals. It is quite possible that Jeremiah acknowledged the reality of the Patriarchs, and believed that they had been devotees of Jahweh, and had enjoyed a special relation with him. But his oracles are silent in these matters. The first historical event he alludes to in the history of Israel is the Exodus from Egypt and with this deliverance he associates a covenant of election.

EZEKIEL

Our first Exilic prophet devotes three elaborate oracles (16:20;23) to the early history of his people. As a consequence, he makes several explicit references to the election of Israel by Jahweh, in addition to his implicit allusions. First of all, he suggests the past formula of mutual adoption by referring frequently to Jahweh as the God of Israel¹⁶ and to the children of Israel as the people of Jahweh.¹⁷

Second, like Hosea, he seems to be enthralled by the simile of Jahweh's marriage with Israel. In two oracles he refers to God's passionate espousal of the nation. In

the first, he alludes to Jahweh's romance with Jerusalem, which name may be regarded as a metonymy for Judah, the surviving of the two Hebrew Kingdoms. Jerusalem, much to our astonishment, is given a fairly shabby pedigree. Her father was a despised Amorite, and her mother, an equally despised Hittite (16:3,45), both classifications associated with the Pentateuchally outlawed seven Canaanite nations (Deut. 7:1,2). At birth she was unloved and abandoned in the field.

"And as for your birth, on the day you were born, your navel string was not cut, nor were you washed with water to cleanse you, nor rubbed with salt, nor swathed with bands. No eye pitied you, to do any of these things to you out of compassion for you; but you were cast out on the open field, for you were abhorred on the day you were born."
(16:4,5)

At that time Jahweh entered into no relationship with her but permitted her to grow to maidenhood wild and free (16:6,7).

"...and you grew up and became tall and arrived at full maidenhood¹⁸; your breasts were formed, and your hair had grown, yet you were naked and bare." (16:7)

When she reached the age of love,

"I (Jahweh) spread my skirt over you, and covered your nakedness. Yes, I swore to you...and you became mine." (16:8)

God thus betrothed her, and she became wholly his. A special, and intimate, and exclusive relationship was established between them. Jerusalem as the bride of Jahweh belonged to and could serve no other deity.

In the second oracle, the prophet refers to the tragic marriage of Jahweh to two women, who were children of the same mother (23:2). Ohoba and Oholibah were their names, Samaria and Jerusalem their symbolic reference, respectively (25:4). Their past was far from proper. In their youth they were notorious prostitutes in Egypt.

"They played the harlot in Egypt; they played the harlot in their youth; there their breasts were pressed and their virgin bosoms handled." (23:3)

It was there, apparently, that Jahweh betrothed them and made them his own possession (23:4). In this simile, too, an intimate and exclusive relationship is declared to have been established.

The third series of references to a past adoption are those concerning a bērīth or covenant to which both the Deity and Israel were parties. In the poetic history of Jerusalem (16) Ezekiel refers to a bērīth which Jahweh made with the people at the time of their betrothal to him. The marriage and compact were coincident and were confirmed by the oath of God (16:8). Similarly, when our prophet refers to a future covenant which the Deity will establish with Jerusalem, he states, in the name of God, that this new relationship will be effected out of remembrance for a past bērīth, which was made in the days of the people's youth (16:60). The character of the mutual pledges in this early covenant is indicated by a reference to the oath of Israel associated

with it, which serves as a complement to the oath of God already cited (16:8). The promise of Jahweh to accept Israel as his "wife" and cherished possession, is paralleled and conditioned by the promise of the people to accept Jahweh as their God, with all its implications of obedience and faithfulness.

The place and time of the Deity's initial choice of the Hebrew people, as conceived by Ezekiel, are difficult to ascertain. In one oracle of the prophet Jahweh says,

"On the day when I chose Israel, I swore to
the seed of the house of Jacob, making
myself known to them in the land of Egypt..."
(20:5)

In this assertion the time of selection was the period prior to the Exodus, and the place the land of Egypt. In another oracle, when reference is made to the ancient betrothal of Samaria and Jerusalem by Jahweh, the place of this event is declared to be the land of their early harlotry, namely, Egypt. If we consider these two assertions alone, then we may conclude that, according to the prophet, Jahweh first adopted the Hebrews during their sojourn in Egyptian country.

However, other statements imply the contradiction of this conclusion. Firstly, the symbolic history of Jerusalem and Judah (16) makes no reference to the Egyptian sojourn. Likewise, it describes the origins of the people to be in the land of Canaan (16:3) where Jahweh presumably betroths them. Whether the reference to the abandonment of

Jerusalem by its mother and its subsequent destitute condition (16:4,5) is an allusion either to the period of Egyptian slavery or to the wilderness sojourn is difficult to ascertain. Perhaps, it is even senseless to attempt to detect specific historic references in the wild and passionate imagery of the oracle.¹⁹

Secondly, the prophet elsewhere makes mention of "the land which I gave to my servant Jacob" (37:25). If the name "Jacob" here refers, not to the corporate personality of the Israelite people, but to the Patriarch himself, then the conclusion must be that Ezekiel acknowledged a commitment to the progenitor of the race prior to the Egyptian sojourn.

Thirdly, Abraham is once mentioned as receiving for his possession the land of Israel, presumably, as a gift of Jahweh (33:24).²⁰ If Abraham was regarded by the prophet as the father of the Hebrew people,²¹ then the Deity's first election of the nation may, in the opinion of Ezekiel, have been traced back to that Patriarch, the commitment to whom would have provided a motivation for Jahweh's redemption of Israel from Egypt. However, whether the Egyptian betrothal was regarded by the prophet as the initiation of intimate relations, or merely their confirmation, it remained in the mind of Ezekiel the first dramatic event in the joint career of Jahweh and Israel.

DEUTERO-ISAIAH

The Babylonian prophet of universal salvation makes many explicit references to the choosing by Jahweh of Israel as his people. Firstly, he suggests the complementary adop-

tion of the Deity by the nation through the frequent assertion that Jahweh is the God of Israel.²² Moreover, he, like Isaiah of Jerusalem with whom he is identified in orthodox circles, is fond of the phrase and divine appellation, "the holy one of Israel,"²³ which implies that Jahweh is the chosen object of national devotion and veneration. Secondly, he suggests the election of Israel by Jahweh through many references to that people as the people of Jahweh.²⁴

Thirdly, he describes the special status of Israel or Jacob as the chosen of Jahweh. Tenderly he speaks of the intimate relationship which God has established with his people, and of the providential acts which he plans for them. However, the past election of the nation to be the people of God means to this prophet something quite different from, and more dramatic than, the conceptions of the earlier prophets. For Deutero-Isaiah, who endorsed passionately the doctrine that Jahweh was a universal God eagerly seeking universal recognition (45:23), it was unreasonable to conclude that the Deity would be satisfied only with the veneration of Israel. The ancient choice of that nation was intended, not to secure the devotion of only one people, but to effect the conversion of all men (42:6; 49:6). The purpose of the divine election was not to insure merely national salvation but to prepare the way for universal redemption. Therefore, the prophet refers, in the name of the Deity, to Israel not only as "my

people" but especially as "my servant."²⁵ The privilege that was bestowed upon the nation was not their exclusive elevation to Divine favor, but rather their unique status as mediators between Jahweh and the other peoples in the task of making all men his devotees. Israel was to be a "light to the nations" (42:6; 49:6).

When Deutero-Isaiah refers to the past election by God of his people, he does not regard the adoption as primarily "betrothal,"²⁶ as did many of the Pre-Exilic prophets and Ezekiel. Rather does Jahweh "call" or "summon" Israel to his service.²⁷ The status acquired by the nation through election was not so much that of wife to husband but that of minister to king, servant to master. The act of adoption was the act of appointment. The people had been appointed to a task bestowed upon no other nation. That was the character of their intimacy with Jahweh.

The time and place of the initial choosing of Israel, in the opinion of the prophet, appear to be associated with the very inception of the people. If the speaker in 49:1-5 is the nation and not an individual, then the following two statements are relevant.

"Jahweh called me from the womb,
From the body of my mother he named
my name." (49:1)

and

"And now Jahweh says who formed me from the
womb to be his servant." (49:5)

According to these assertions, the election of Israel dates from its very beginnings. In fact, there was no time when the people was separated from, or not joined, to Jahweh. Two conclusions are possible. First, that the Deity chose Israel from birth but did not make His will known to the nation until a later time. Or second, that Jahweh made known his choice to the people at its very inception.

The second conclusion is reenforced by two references to the Patriarch Abraham, who may be regarded as the progenitor of the nation.

"But you, Israel, my servant, Jacob, whom I
have chosen,
The offspring of Abraham, my friend;
You whom I took from the ends of the earth,
And called from its farthest corners,
Saying to you, 'You are my servant,'
I have chosen you and not cast you off." (41:8,9)

and

"Look to Abraham your father,
And to Sarah who bore you;
For when he was but one I called him,
That I might bless him and make him many." (51:2)

In the former oracle the Patriarch is identified as a former friend of God. If the clause, "you whom I took, etc.," may be regarded as modifying the name "Abraham" with whom Israel as his seed is identified, then the statement, "you are my servant," may be appropriately associated with the Patriarch. In the latter oracle, Abraham is clearly designated as one whom God has called or chosen. Therefore, it is certainly conclusive that, in the opinion of Deutero-

Isaiah, the original election of Israel by Jahweh to be his people occurred at the time of Abraham. Moreover, this divine choice was presumably revealed to the Patriarch, since he is regarded as an intimate of God (41:8).

With regard to the place of Jahweh's election of the Patriarch, the setting is suggested by the clause, "you whom I took from the ends of the earth" (41:8). If, as we have suggested, the clause refers in the text to Abraham, then "the ends of the earth" may refer to the place of the Patriarch's nativity, namely, Ur of the Chaldees, from which place, according to the Hexateuchal accounts,²⁸ Abraham was summoned by God.

Deutero-Isaiah is the first of the prophets to clearly associate the initial election of Israel by God with the figure of Abraham. Moreover, the divine choice of the Patriarch is mentioned to the exclusion of any explicit reference to the Exodus bērīth, which may have been regarded by him as a confirmatory election. The implication of this exclusive concern with the Abrahamic covenant is that the prophet regarded the commitment of Jahweh to the Patriarch not merely as the initial step in the adoption of Israel, but also as the most significant step.

CONCLUSION

The prophetic beliefs and opinions concerning the pre-Conquest election of Israel by Jahweh, which we have just investigated, are indications that the following historical traditions existed among the people of Israel during the eighth, seventh, and sixth centuries.

To the period of the eighth century (Amos, Hosea, Isaiah) the existence of the following traditions may be ascribed.

A tradition, clearly reflected in the opinions of Amos and Hosea, that, in pre-Conquest days Jahweh had adopted Israel to be his people, and Israel, in turn, had adopted Jahweh to be its God. The presence of this tradition at the time of Amos and Hosea indicates that the belief in the pre-Conquest mutual election of Jahweh and Israel arose no later than the middle of the eighth century.

A tradition reflected in the opinion of Amos and, perhaps, of Hosea, to the effect that the period of the Exodus had been the time when Jahweh first established intimate relations with Israel. The presence of this tradition at the time of Amos implies that

it arose no later than the middle of the eighth century. Moreover, the absence in the writings of the eighth century prophets under consideration of any clear reference to any contrary tradition, namely, one which maintained that Jahweh had had intimate relations with Israel prior to the Egyptian sojourn, suggests that such a tradition was either non-existent or incipient in the eighth century. However, this conclusion is merely a conclusion from silence.

To the period of the late seventh and early sixth centuries (Jeremiah and Ezekiel), the existence of the following traditions may possibly be ascribed.

A tradition, perhaps reflected in the statements of Jeremiah, and identical with the second of the eighth century traditions cited above, to the effect that Jahweh first knew Israel intimately at the time of the Exodus. The presence of this tradition at the time of Jeremiah (and its presence is only probable) would imply that such a belief had persisted down to the beginning of the sixth century.

A tradition, perhaps reflected in a statement of Ezekiel, which (if it existed) was a rival to the one mentioned above, to the effect that the first intimacy of Jahweh with Israel had been established at the time of the patriarch Abraham.

To the period of the late Exile (Deutero-Isaiah), the following tradition may be ascribed.

A tradition, clearly reflected in the opinions of Deutero-Isaiah, that the original election of Israel by Jahweh had occurred, not at the time of the Exodus from Egypt, but at the earlier time of Abraham, the presumed progenitor of the nation. (The possessors of this tradition may have regarded Ur of the Chaldees as the setting of the divine election of Abraham and his descendants). Thus, according to this view, there had been no time in the past when Israel had not enjoyed intimacy with Jahweh. The presence of this tradition at the time of Deutero-Isaiah, and the absence of any mention of it in the writings of the earlier prophets under consideration, suggest that it arose at some time between the end of the eighth century and the middle of the sixth

century. If we may regard the statement of Ezekiel, alluded to above, as indicating the existence of a similar tradition at the time of that prophet, then the lower time limit for the emergence of this tradition may be pushed back to the beginning of the sixth century.

CHAPTER II

JAHWEH PROTECTED ISRAEL

The nation of Israel, as the people of Jahweh, as the chosen object of his care and protection, was considered to be the recipient of many pledges of divine providence. All the Hexateuchal accounts refer to the commitments, conditional or otherwise, undertaken by Jahweh in his role as protector of Israel. Abraham was promised that the land of Canaan would be the possession of himself and the people of whom he would be the progenitor (Gen. 12:7; 13:14; 17:8), that his descendants would be as numerous as the sands of the sea and the stars in the heavens (Gen. 22:17), that through him all the nations of the earth would be blessed (Gen. 12:3), and that the chosen people would be redeemed from a land of bondage (Gen. 15:14). To Isaac (Gen. 26:3-5) and Jacob (Gen. 28:13,14) most of these pledges were confirmed. To Israel in the wilderness were pledged a land flowing with milk and honey (Deut. 27:3), devastation of enemies (Ex. 23:22; Deut. 28:6), freedom from disease (Ex. 23:25), bountiful harvest (Lev. 26:4), ample rains (Deut. 11:14), security from the ravages of wild beasts and war (Lev. 26:6), the status of creditor (Deut. 28:12), and the fertility of both man and domestic animal (Deut. 28:11).

Moreover, not only were these providential commitments made by Jahweh, but also the various Hexateuchal accounts

are replete with references to their fulfillment. Israel was redeemed from Egyptian bondage (Ex. 13), became a numerous people (Num. 1;26), was protectively guided in the wilderness (Num. 9:15-23), was sustained in the desert through miraculous gifts of food and water (Ex. 16;17), entered the promised land (Josh. 3), and destroyed her enemies (Josh. 4-12).

The various items of divine providential promise and the various events which are associated with their fulfillment by Jahweh in the early history of Israel are the matters with which we are concerned in this chapter. Two questions will guide us in our investigation. First, what pledges or promises did each of the prophets under consideration believe that Jahweh made, during the period of Israel's early history, to provide and care for the nation? And, second, what providential acts did each believe that Jahweh performed in fulfillment of these promises?

AMOS

The prophet Amos makes no explicit mention of any providential promises made by Jahweh in ancient days. However, the general protection of God is implicit in Jahweh's election of Israel, an election which Amos acknowledged.

With regard to specific providential acts performed by Jahweh, the prophet makes mention of only one, namely, the Exodus from Egypt.

"Hear this word that Jahweh has spoken against you, O people of Israel, against the whole family which I brought up out of the land of Egypt." (3:1)

and

"Did I not bring up Israel from the land of Egypt?" (9:7)

Interestingly, the providential character of this act is not clear in the statements of Amos. Whether he associated bondage and wretched conditions with the Israelite sojourn in Egypt and thus regarded the action of Jahweh as a redemptive act, or whether he believed the Exodus to have been merely a divinely instituted change of residence, is not specified in our texts. In fact, the continuation of the second verse cited above suggests the second alternative.

"Did I not bring up...the Philistines from Caphtor and the Arameans from Kir?" (9:7)

The contrast of Egypt with Caphtor and Kir, which were presumably not places of bondage for the Philistines and Syrians, but, merely, places of nativity, indicates a similar role for that country. If so, then Amos may not have associated any evil with the Israelite sojourn in the land of Egypt nor regarded the Exodus as a redemptive act. However, the evidence is too scanty to provide any definite conclusion.

HOSEA

Hosea, like Amos, makes no clear reference to any divine providential promises other than the pledge for general protection implicit in Jahweh's "betrothal" to Israel. He does suggest, though, a possible commitment to the Patriarch Jacob when he declares,

"He (Jacob) met him (God) at Bethel,
And there he (God) spoke with him."¹ (12:5)

If this verse is to be associated with the incident recorded in Gen. 28, then, perhaps, the promise of the land of Canaan to Jacob may be implicit in it. However, as noted before, the derogatory references to the Patriarch to be found in the context of the above statement, make such a conclusion unlikely.

Three providential acts by Jahweh are noted by Hosea in references to the early period. First, the Exodus is affirmed through the tender

"When Israel was a child I loved him,
And out of Egypt I called my son." (11:1)

However, whether this action by Jahweh is to be considered a providential and redemptive act the context does not disclose. Perhaps, both Hosea and Amos regarded the land of Egypt, not as a "house of bondage," but, merely, as a place of origin.

Second, Jahweh's protective care in the wilderness is acknowledged.

"I am Jahweh your God from the land of Egypt...
 It was I who knew you in the wilderness, in
 the land of drought;
 But when they fed and were satisfied..." (13:5,6)

Reference is made here to divine provisions of both food and water in the desert. Whether this mention of provision is an allusion to such events as the cleft rock at Meribah (Ex. 17:6,7) or the manna and quail (Ex. 16:13) cannot be determined.

Third, the general providence of Jahweh toward Israel in its early years may be suggested by the following reference to Ephraim.

"Yet it was I who taught Ephraim to walk;
 I took them up in my arms²..
 I led them with cords of a man, with bands
 of love,
 And I became to them as one who eases³ the
 yoke on their jaws,
 And I bent down to them and fed them." (11:3,4)

God cared for Ephraim, or Israel, from its very inception. Motivated by love and compassion, Jahweh served as a tender father to his people in its youth.

ISAIAH

As it is with Hosea and Amos, so is it with Isaiah. The only reference to past divine providential promises is the pledge of general protection implicit in the adoption of Israel by God. However, the prophet does acknowledge the performance of past divine providential acts which may be associated with the early history.

First, in a denunciation of the rebelliousness and ingratitude of his people, the prophet states oracularly,

"Sons have I reared and brought up,⁴
But they..." (1:2)

The past care of Jahweh for Israel was the protective care of a father for a son, a providence similar to that suggested by Hosea's description of Ephraim's rearing.

In the simile of the keeper and the vineyard, Isaiah, too, poetically, and without specification of individual acts, praises the past indulgence of God toward his people.

"My beloved had vineyard on a very fertile hill,
He digged it and cleared it of stones,
And planted it with choice vines,
He built a watchtower in the midst of it,
And hewed out a wine vat in it..." (5:1,2)

Jahweh the keeper had provided in the past more than generously for his vineyard Israel. His protective care had not been the least, but the most, that a God could extend to his people.

"What more was there to do for my vineyard
That I have not done for it?" (5:4)

That this ultimate in providential care was, in the opinion of Isaiah, characteristic of Israel's earliest history may be reasonably assumed.

With regard to specific divine acts associated with an historical time and place, Isaiah makes mention of

one which occurred during the conquest of Canaan. In declaring sentence against Judah, the prophet asserts

"For Jahweh will rise up as on Mount Perazim,
He will be angry as in the valley of Gibeon,
To do his deed - strange is his deed!
And to do his work - alien is his work!" (28:21)

The strange deed of God will be the future destruction of Israel in the same way that he had in the past ravaged the enemies of his own people during times of national peril. The reference to Mount Perazim is not relevant to our study, because it concerns the post-Conquest discomfiture of the Philistines by David and his army (II Sam. 5:20). However, the mention of Gibeon is, most likely, an allusion to the dramatic defeat of the Amorite alliance by the Israelite host under Joshua, a defeat mentioned by the narrative in the book of Joshua (Josh. 10:1-14). The Gibeonites, who had secured the protection of Israel through deception (Josh. 9), had incurred by that act the enmity of their fellow Canaanites, who banded together to punish the treacherous city. Joshua, warned by the Gibeonites of the enemy advance, marched with his troops from Gilgal to Gibeon, and there defeated the armies of the Amorite cities. The role played by Jahweh in this battle is, according to the narrative, connected with three significant actions. First, he threw the enemy into panic (Josh. 10:10); second, he threw down stones from heaven (Josh. 10:11); and third, and most dramatic of all, he made both the sun and the

moon stand still at the request of Joshua, for the purpose of prolonging daylight (Josh. 10:12,13). The dreadful carnage resulting from these three interventions by God, the last of which is terrifyingly unique, is most likely the reason for its mention by Isaiah. Whether the prophet possessed a tradition concerning the battle, which was identical to, or differing in detail from, the existing narrative in the book of Joshua cannot be determined. All we can ascertain is that he most likely acknowledged the existence of that event (since no other notable divine providence is connected with the city of Gibeon in any record that has been preserved), and that Jahweh's intervention on behalf of Israel was of a very dramatic character.

JEREMIAH

The prophet Jeremiah is the first of the prophets to make explicit mention of a providential promise made by Jahweh to Israel. This commitment is the pledge of the land of Canaan. Two references to that pledge are made.

"...and if you do not...then I will let you dwell in this place, in the land that I gave of old to your fathers for ever." (7:5-7)

and

"Turn now, every one of you, from his evil way and wrong doings, and dwell upon the land which Jahweh has given to you and your fathers from of old and for ever." (25:5)

The use of the phrase "for ever (ʿad ʿōlām)," suggests not only the deed of Jahweh in having given the land, but

the commitment of Jahweh to continue to insure residence; although "for ever" and the conditional character of the commitment as suggested by "if you don't..." and "turn now" seem somewhat inconsistent.⁵ However, whatever the inconsistency, the pledge is acknowledged together with its fulfillment.

The original recipients of this promise are only obscurely suggested by the word "your fathers." It is possible that Jeremiah intends to include the Patriarchs in that designation. However, we must remember that in no genuine Jeremianic passage is there reference to the personalities of these men.⁶ It is more likely that he intends to designate the wilderness ancestors of Israel as suggested by the phrase, "a covenant with your fathers when I brought them out of the land of Egypt." Thus, the original promise of the land would, quite reasonably, be associated with the mutual pledges of the early covenant.

Two providential acts are cited by Jeremiah which may be associated with the implicit promise of God to serve as the benefactor of Israel, the promise implicit in his adoption of the people. First, he several times acknowledges the divine execution of Israel's exodus from Egypt (2:6; 7:22; 34:13). Interestingly, he is the first of the prophets under consideration to identify explicitly the Exodus with a redemptive act.

"Thus says Jahweh: I made a covenant with your fathers when I brought them out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." (34:13)

In the opinion of Jeremiah, Egypt had not been merely a place of sojourn for Israel, but also a country where that nation had been enslaved. Thus, in accordance with the general tradition of the Pentateuch,⁷ he regarded the intervention of Jahweh to have been an act of salvation.

Second, the prophet makes mention of the protection of God during the wilderness sojourn. Two roles are attributed to Jahweh. He was guide and sustainer.

"... Jahweh ...
Who led us (Israel) in the wilderness,
In a land of deserts and pits." (2:6)

He was also the destroyer of Israel's wilderness enemies.

"I remember...
How you (Israel) followed me (Jahweh) in the wilderness, in a land not sown.
Israel was holy to Jahweh, the first fruits of his harvest;
All who sought to eat of it became guilty, evil came upon them..." (2:2,3)⁸

EZEKIEL

In the oracles of Ezekiel are to be found several references to early divine providential promises. First, there are allusions to the promise implicit in Jahweh's "betrothal" and covenant with Israel, that is, the commitment to a general providence.⁹ Second, there is the pledge to give and to enable Israel to possess the land of Canaan.

"On the day when I chose Israel, I swore to the seed of the house of Jacob, making myself known to them in the land of Egypt... On that day I swore to them that I would bring them out of the land of Egypt into a land that I had searched out for them, a land flowing with milk and honey, the most glorious of all lands." (20:5,6)

Jahweh made a pledge to Israel in the land of Egypt to give that nation "the most glorious of all lands," namely, and, obviously, the land of Canaan. Two important items should be noted in the above text. First, the promise of the land was made inside the Egyptian country. And, second, the promised land is not identified as the land of the fathers or the Patriarchs, but rather, as a new land which Jahweh "had searched out for them." A likely implication of this second item is that, in the opinion of Ezekiel, no earlier land commitment to the progenitors of the race had been made.

However, certain other statements by Ezekiel cast suspicion on the validity of this implication. First, Ezekiel associates the land of Canaan and its possession with the figure of Abraham.

"Abraham was only one man, yet he got possession of the land; but we are many; the land is surely given us to possess." (33:24)

This assertion is a boastful cry by the people of Israel denounced by the prophet. Yet, in quoting it, Ezekiel reveals some of his own historical opinions. Interestingly, as was noted in an earlier chapter, Abraham is not here

identified as a progenitor of Israel. One would expect an appellation, such as "our father" to precede or follow the citation of his name. Nor is the claim of the people to the land connected with their being the legitimate heirs of the Patriarch. Rather is their claim based, according to their words, on the contrast between their numbers and the singular possession of the land by a former owner Abraham. Therefore, it is quite possible that Ezekiel regarded Abraham as an ancient Canaanite figure, and not the ancestor of Israel.¹⁰ However, the evidence is too scanty for definite conclusions.

Second, in a prediction of Israel's future, the prophet divines,

"They shall dwell in the land where your fathers dwelt that I gave to my servant Jacob..." (37:25)

If the name "Jacob" here refers to the Patriarch and not to the nation of Israel collectively, as suggested by the distinction made between Jacob and "your fathers," then we may conclude that Ezekiel recognized a pledge of the land to Jacob. However, the name may very well be merely a personification of the nation, as suggested by the preceding use of the names "Joseph" and "Judah" (37:15-20) in the same context.

The only conclusion possible from the vague and seemingly contradictory statements that we have just

investigated is no conclusion. Perhaps, Ezekiel acknowledged Abraham as the progenitor of the nation, and associated with him a divine pledge to give possession of Canaan to him and his descendants. Perhaps, he regarded Jacob as the first ancestor of the people and associated such a pledge with him. Perhaps, on the contrary, he conceived the first promise of the land to have been made to Israel in Egypt. Where Ezekiel is not clear, we cannot make him so.

With regard to providential acts performed during the pre-Conquest history of Israel, the prophet acknowledges two such benefactions. First, he affirms the Exodus.

"So I (Jahweh) led them out of Egypt..." (20:10) However, he nowhere specifies whether the purpose of the Exodus was urgently redemptive. He does assert in a verse already cited (20:6) that Jahweh brought Israel out of Egypt in order to give the nation a superior land, an action which is certainly providential. But he does not explicitly state that Jahweh's providence was twofold, that is, providing a new land and redemption from bondage. In fact, in all his references to the Egyptian sojourn, it is idolatry and not slavery that is the curse of Israel.

This concern with the nation's idolatry in Egypt serves as a prelude to the prophet's conception of God's major providence in the wilderness, the second of his

benefactions. In the narrative of the wilderness sojourn (20) Ezekiel makes no mention of gifts of food and water received by the nation during their desert travels. Rather does he devote his narrative to acts of rebellion against certain statutes and ordinances which he had delivered to the people when he first brought them to the wilderness.

"So I... brought them into the wilderness.
I gave them my statutes and showed them by
ordinances, by whose observance man shall
live." (20:10,11)

It is these very laws which constitute the major providence of Jahweh. Although the phrase, "by whose observance man shall live," implies that the observance of the statutes will please God who will grant life, and the failure to observe them will displease God who will insure death, the phrase has also the implication that the fulfillment of the laws is life-giving, is directly beneficial. The statutes are good in themselves, without respect to Jahweh's pleasure or displeasure. They are not merely arbitrary demands made upon a people committed to obey; they are genuine gifts. That is why, when Jahweh seeks to punish or frighten his people, he later gives them "statutes that were not good and ordinances by which they could not have life" (20:25). The use of the phrase "not good" is significant. The second body of statutes were intrinsically bad. That is why they were punishment. The first body of

statutes were intrinsically good. That is why they were providential. In fact, this belief in the intrinsic merit of Jahweh's legislation is echoed by the Deuteronomic evaluation,

"And what great nation is there, that has statutes and ordinances so righteous as all this law which I (Moses) set before you this day?" (Deut. 4:8)

The redemption from Egypt was for Ezekiel, primarily, a redemption from superstition. The promulgation of laws in the wilderness was not so much the statement of Israel's fee for divine providence, as it was a very real part of that providence. Israel was a superior nation, not only because it had been given a superior land, but also, and especially, because it had been given a superior constitution.

DEUTERO-ISAIAH

The early divine providential promises are associated by Deutero-Isaiah not with the period of the Exodus, to which he makes only one obscure allusion, or with the wilderness sojourn, which is similarly ignored, but rather with the figure of Abraham to whom the prophet assigns the original divine election

"But you, Israel, my servant, Jacob whom I
have chosen,
The offspring of Abraham, my friend;
You whom I took from the ends of the earth,
And called from its farthest corners,
Saying to you, 'You are my servant,'"

I have chosen you and not rejected you.
 Fear not, for I am with you,
 Be not dismayed, for I am your God." (41:8-10)

If the clause, "you whom I took from the ends of the earth and called from its farthest corners," is a reference to the exodus of the first Patriarch from Ur of the Chaldees, then Israel, "the offspring," is here identified with Abraham the progenitor of the nation.¹¹ Accordingly, then, the words of providential promise cited above may be considered to have been, in the opinion of Deutero-Isaiah, delivered to Abraham by Jahweh. The pledge is fairly vague, merely suggesting the general and continued protection of God. "You are my servant," has providential implications which are amplified in the following passage,

"O that you had hearkened to my commandments!
 Then your peace would have been like a river,
 And your righteousness like the waves of the
 sea,
 Your offspring would have been like the sand,
 And your descendants like its grains;
 Their name would never be cut off or destroyed
 from before me." (48:18,19)

These conditional gifts of God cited above, namely, peace and innumerable offspring, are associated by implication with divine promises made in the past. In fact, the connection of these pledges with Abraham is suggested by the similes, "like the sand," "like its grains," which are reminiscent of Pentateuchally recorded promises concerning offspring made to the Patriarch (Gen. 22:17).

The promise to Abraham of a numerous progeny, as

suggested above, is made explicit by the following reference,

"For when he (Abraham) was but one I called
him,
That I might bless him and make him many." (51:2)

With regard to past providential acts performed by Jahweh during the pre-Conquest period, in accordance with the general pledge of protection made to Abraham and his descendants, three specific benefactions are mentioned by the prophet.

First, there is reference to the "redemption" of Abraham himself from Ur of the Chaldees. If, as we have noted before,¹² the clause, "whom I called from the ends of the earth," is an allusion to the departure of the Patriarch from Chaldea in order to enter into new possession of the land of Canaan, which Jahweh intended to bestow upon him, then, certainly, Deutero-Isaiah acknowledged the former occurrence of this providential act, and the validity of the tradition which asserted it. It may very well be possible that the tradition arose, appropriately, in the setting of the Babylonian Exile, in the very land of Chaldea, where the prophet presumably preached.

Second, there is the allusion to the redemption of Israel at the Red Sea (Ex. 15:26-31).

"Was it not thou that didst dry up the sea,
the waters of the great deep;
That didst make the depths of the sea
a way for the redeemed to pass over?" (51:10)

This verse is the only reference to the Exodus from Egypt made by the prophet, although there is one mention of Israel's sojourn in that country (52:4).

And third, there is mention of God's providence in the desert with especial emphasis on provision for water.

"They thirsted not when he (Jahweh) led them
through the deserts;
He made water flow from the rock;
He cleft the rock and the waters gushed out."
(48:21)

Jahweh's guidance of his people in the wilderness is here distinguished by a miraculous event, which may quite properly be identified with the event at Massah and Meribah as recorded in the Pentateuchal accounts (Ex. 17:2-7).¹³ According to these accounts, Jahweh, through Moses and his rod, brought forth water from a rock.

An interesting divine appellation employed by Deutero-Isaiah frequently suggests his emphasis on the providential character of God's relationship to Israel. Jahweh is many times designated by the prophet as the "Gō'ēl," or "Redeemer," of Israel.¹⁴ This title is very proper in the setting of comfort and consolation created by the intention of the prophet, who, as we have noted, emphasized, in a time of distress for his people, their unique election by Jahweh, and his protective care.

CONCLUSION

The prophetic beliefs and opinions concerning the providence of Jahweh toward Israel in pre-Conquest days, which we have just investigated, are indications that the following historical traditions existed among the people of Israel during the eighth, seventh, and sixth centuries.

To the period of the eighth century the existence of the following traditions may certainly be ascribed.

A tradition, reflected in the opinions of Amos and Hosea, that Jahweh had brought the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt. The presence of this tradition, at the time of Amos and Hosea indicates that it arose no later than the middle of the eighth century.

A tradition, reflected in a statement of Hosea, that Jahweh had provided for Israel during a pre-Conquest wilderness sojourn. The presence of this tradition at the time of Hosea indicates that the belief in a divinely guided wilderness sojourn arose no later than the middle of the eighth century.

To the period of the late seventh and early sixth centuries the existence of the following tradition may certainly be ascribed.

A tradition, reflected in a statement of Jeremiah, that the Exodus of Israel from Egypt had been a redemption from bondage. The presence of this tradition at the time of Jeremiah, and the absence of any mention of such a tradition in the writings of any of the eighth century prophets under consideration, may indicate that the view which associated the Hebrew sojourn in Egypt with enslavement arose at some time during the seventh century.

To the same period the existence of the following traditions may possibly be ascribed.

A tradition, perhaps reflected in the statements of Jeremiah, that the first promise to Israel of the land of Canaan was made to the generation of the Exodus. The presence of this tradition at the time of Jeremiah would indicate that a view which did not associate promises of the land with Patriarchal figures persisted until the beginning of the sixth century.

A tradition, perhaps reflected in the statements of Ezekiel, and perhaps a rival to the one cited above, to the effect that the promise of the land of Canaan had been extended by Jahweh to two Patriarchal figures, Abraham and Jacob. The possible presence of this tradition at the time of Ezekiel, and the absence of any clear reference to such a belief in the writings of the eighth century prophets under consideration (the reference of Hosea to Jacob is obscure), may imply that the view which associated the divine promise of the land with the Patriarchs arose at some time between the end of the eighth and the beginning of the sixth centuries. However, this conclusion is based on very limited evidence.

To the late Exilic period the following tradition may be ascribed.

A tradition, reflected in the statements of Deutero-Isaiah, that Jahweh performed in the wilderness certain providential "miracles," such as dividing the waters of the Red Sea and cleaving a rock to bring forth water. The existence of this tradition at the time

of Deutero-Isaiah indicates that the belief in the "miraculous" intervention of God during the Exodus and wilderness periods arose no later than the late Exilic period.

To the late Exilic period the existence of the following tradition may possibly be ascribed.

A tradition, perhaps reflected in a statement of Deutero-Isaiah, that the Patriarch Abraham was providentially summoned by God from Ur of the Chaldees. The possible presence of this tradition, at the time of Deutero-Isaiah, and the absence of any reference to such a belief in the writings of any earlier prophet under consideration, may indicate that the tradition of the Babylonian nativity of Abraham and the providential call of Jahweh to the Patriarch in Babylonia arose at some time between the beginning and the end of the Exilic period. However, this conclusion is based on a very limited evidence.

CHAPTER III

JAHWEH COMMANDED ISRAEL

Jahweh as the God of Israel, as the chosen object of its devotion and veneration, was, quite naturally, the legislator par excellence of his people. In each and every Hexateuchal account of the early history of the Israelite nation, he is associated with the function of law-giving. In J he is the author of a wilderness decalogue (Ex. 34:17-26). In E he is accredited with the mišpāṭim of the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 21-23). In D he is the father of many ritual and ethical commandments (Deut. 12-26). In H he is the source of the "life-giving" statutes and judgments (Lev. 17-26). In P he is associated with the intricacies of priestly and tabernacle legislative detail (Ex. 25-31; Lev. 1-16, etc.).

Virtually, all these early divine commandments are associated with the wilderness bērith, the fulfillment of which is the condition for the continued providence of Jahweh. However, P attaches certain laws to the later desert sojourn (Num. 15;18;19;27-30;36) or, in the case of circumcision, to the figure of the Patriarch Abraham (Gen. 17:10-14). In the opinion of the Hexateuchal writers, Jahweh had early in his relation specified, either briefly or extensively, the items of conduct and practice which

would please him, and those which would displease him, that is, obligatory and prohibited acts, respectively.

The "historical" items with which we are concerned in this chapter are the laws, statutes and commandments delivered by Jahweh to that people prior to its settlement in the land of Canaan. Two questions will be our guide in the ensuing investigation. First, what demands, if any, did each of the prophets under consideration believe that God made upon the people of Israel before the time of the final Conquest? Second, if he acknowledged that such demands had been formulated by Jahweh, when and where did he believe that such legislation had been delivered?

AMOS

The prophet Amos makes only one explicit reference to divine legislation presented to Israel in the period preceding the Israelite settlement in Canaan. It is not a positive, but a negative reference. That is, it asserts what God did not command, rather than what he did command.

"Did you bring to me sacrifices and offerings the forty years in the wilderness, O house of Israel?" (5:25)

This verse has been variously interpreted. The Massoretes through their vocalization of hzbhīm as hazzēbhāhīm possibly rendered the verse declarative rather

than interrogative.¹ "Sacrifices and offerings you brought to me..." was, perhaps, their interpretation. Others, recognizing its rhetorically interrogative character, translated, "Did you bring to me...?", meaning thereby, "You brought sacrifices and offerings, but not to me, rather to other gods."²

However, these interpretations are pious and artificial. The verse must be understood within its context (5:21-24). Since it follows a denunciation of sacrificial worship, it can hardly be, as the Massoretes may have supposed, a declarative statement indicating the ancient authority of animal offerings. Nor can it be irrelevantly construed as a reference to early apostasy. Rather must it appropriately be considered as a question rhetorically asserting that the sacrificial worship of Jahweh was not observed during the forty year wilderness sojourn preceding the Conquest. The clear implication of such a statement is that, since such offerings had not anciently been given in the desert, where Israel had first known Jahweh intimately, they had not been divinely commanded. The authority of the wilderness bérith is here being cited, in order to demonstrate that animal and meal offerings had not been desired by God at the time of his establishment of covenant relations with Israel, nor had they been specified as conditions for his continued patronage.

Moreover, Amos' question is only relevant if there existed a tradition contemporary to his which involved the contradictory of his statement, namely, that Jahweh had commanded sacrificial worship in his ancient covenant with the nation. This tradition is reflected in each of the Pentateuchal codes, where animal and cereal offerings are declared obligatory.³ Even in the reputedly oldest legal document of the Pentateuch, a zebhab is regarded as mandatory (Ex. 34:25).⁴ Thus, the claim of Amos stands in glaring contradiction to the tradition of the most ancient stratum of the covenant stipulations, as well as to the later elaborate sacrificial prescriptions of P (Lev. 1-7, etc.).⁵

With regard to a positive statement of the prophet concerning what God did command in the wilderness, as contrasted with what he did not command, perhaps the verse preceding that just cited is relevant.

"But let justice roll up like waters,
And righteousness like a mighty stream." (5:24)

Since this hortation stands in contrast to the preceding denunciation of sacrificial worship which Amos did not consider divinely ordained, it is a justified inference that righteousness and justice as defined by Amos in other oracular indictments (namely, impartial judgment (5:7), prohibition of bribery (5:12), alleviation of poverty (2:7))

were considered by him to have been specifically commanded by Jahweh in the wilderness. However, there is no evidence to indicate whether Amos is arguing from an ancient covenant code or merely from the nature of the God whom Israel had adopted.

HOSEA

Hosea, as we have noted before, recognized that a bērith had been entered into by Jahweh and Israel at some time in the past, presumably, at the time of the departure from Egypt. He threatens oracularly,

"Because they have broken my bērith,
And transgressed my tōrah." (8:1)

The word tōrah is here used in parallelism with berith. Whether it refers to an ancient body of law associated with the wilderness covenant, or to more recent oracles, is difficult to ascertain. Elsewhere, the priests are denounced.

"My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge.
Because you have rejected knowledge,
I reject you from being a priest to me.
And since you have forgotten the tōrah
of your God,
I also will forget your children." (4:6)

The people are deprived of the knowledge of God's will, not because the priests are unable to secure present tōrah, with which they are not here associated, but rather because they have forgotten the past tōrah. Whether this past tōrah is the early covenant code, or merely a collection of oracles derived by priestly predecessors, is not disclosed by the context.

In a condemnation of the people of Israel Hosea complains,

"There is no faithfulness or kindness,
And no knowledge of God in the land;
There is swearing, lying, killing, stealing,
and committing adultery..." (4:1,2)

The knowledge or understanding of Jahweh's desire is here associated with the prohibition of five actions which correspond to five negative commandments in the covenant decalogue of the Deuteronomic code (Deut. 5:6-21). It is a possibility that both Hosea and the Deuteronomist, presumably a century and a half later, were relying upon similar or identical traditions concerning a covenant code divinely promulgated during the wilderness day. However, it is also quite possible that the Ten Commandments did not precede in time the message of Hosea and condition it, but rather that they and many other parts of the Deuteronomic covenant tradition were anticipated by that prophet and those who preached similarly.

An explicit or implicit demand made by Jahweh upon Israel in the wilderness days is disclosed by the prophet's conception of the relationship which God established with his people at that time. According to the Hoseanic simile, which we have already discussed, Jahweh was married to Israel. The obligation of that nation to her God is the same as that of a wife to her husband. Just

as a wife may not have intimate relations with any man other than her husband, so may Israel not place herself at the disposal of any deity other than Jahweh. The demand of God, at the time of his "betrothal" to his people was not merely for special devotion or service but for exclusive obedience. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," is the clear implication of the marriage simile. In the mind of Hosea the prohibition by Jahweh of the worship of other deities was as old as the adoption of Israel by God. It was a command assuredly dating from the time of Israel's exodus from Egypt.

What God did not command anciently, as contrasted to what he did command, is suggested by the following oracle.

"For I desire steadfast love and not sacrifice,
The knowledge of God rather than burnt offerings." (6:6)

Jahweh does not desire sacrificial worship, and, apparently, had never commanded it. Although Hosea does not state whether he is divining this indifference of Jahweh to animal offerings merely from his present understanding of the nature of God, or whether he is citing a current tradition of a wilderness covenant, his assertion must be understood in the context of a similar and more vehement denunciation made by his contemporary Amos. That prophet, as we have discovered, explicitly stated that sacrificial worship had not been part of Israel's original service of Jahweh in pre-Settlement days, in order presumably to refute the

tradition that it had been. It is a justifiable inference from the fact that both Hosea and Amos prophesied in Israel contemporaneously, and from the fact that both condemned the religion of sacrifices, that Hosea possessed the same tradition concerning his nation's wilderness sojourn that Amos did. Hosea, apparently, like Amos, stood in opposition to a current popular or priestly claim that associated the temple offerings with divine legislation in the immediate post-Exodus period.

ISAIAH

The prophet Isaiah makes no explicit reference to demands made, or legislation promulgated by, Jahweh in pre-Conquest days. However, there are several implicit references to such items.

Firstly, there is the simile of the vineyard and its keeper. Jahweh complains,

"What more was there to do for my vineyard,
That I have not done in it?
When I looked for it to yield grapes,
Why did it yield wild grapes?

And now I will tell you what I will do to
my vineyard.
I will remove its hedge and it shall be
devoured...

For the vineyard of Jahweh of hosts is
the house of Israel,
And the men of Judah are his pleasant planting;
And he looked for mišpat (justice), but, behold,
mišpaḥ (deviation);⁶
For ṣēdāqā (righteousness), but, behold,
ṣē'āqā (a cry)." (5:4-7)

The keeper holds his vineyard responsible for its wild grapes, and, in the resolution of the simile, Jahweh holds Israel responsible for deviation from justice, and for the cry of the oppressed. Responsibility and consequent punishment are only relevant if the nation knew in advance that which Jahweh expected of it. Therefore, we may reasonably conclude that such a warning had been given. Perhaps, it had been proffered at the time of the "keeper's" adoption of his "vineyard" for special care, that is, at the time of Jahweh's adoption of Israel as his people. However, it is not wise to force the vague metaphors of Isaiah's poetry to yield specific references to time or place. Yet, it is very possible that the prophet believed that the two expectations of God with regard to his "vineyard," namely, justice and righteousness, as defined clearly in his other oracles (e.g., impartial judgment, abstaining from bribes (7:22,23), prohibition of economic aggrandizement (5:8), relief of the poor (3:15) widows, and orphans (1:17)), had been specifically commanded by Jahweh during the pre-Settlement days of his people.

With regard to what Jahweh had not commanded, during the early days of Israel, Isaiah ventures his opinion implicitly.

"What to me is the multitude of your sacrifices?
says Jahweh;

I have had enough of burnt offerings of
 rams and the fat of fed beasts;
 I do not delight in the blood of bulls,
 or of lambs, or of he-goats.
 When you come to appear before me,
 Who requires of you this trampling of my
 courts?
 Bring no more vain offerings;
 Incense is an abomination to me.
 New moon and sabbath and the calling of
 assemblies I cannot endure;
 Fasting⁷ and solemn assembly, your new
 moons and your appointed feasts, my
 soul hates;
 They have become a burden to me;
 I am weary of bearing them." (1:11-14)

The prophet, like his contemporaries Amos and Hosea, and especially the former, here denounces the system of sacrificial worship, which popular tradition, apparently, had associated with divine ordinances. The use of such a phrase as "lō' hāphastī (I do not delight in)," and such a word as "tō'ēbhā (abomination)," in reference to the items of the sacrificial offerings, are sufficient evidence that Isaiah could not have conceived that Jahweh had at any time in the past commanded the presentation of such gifts. Although he makes no mention of the pre-Conquest period of Israelite history, this denial of divinely ordained sacrifices would, quite logically, apply to it.

In vehemently attacking the rationale of the sacrificial system, by disassociating the offerings from the pleasure of God, Isaiah is sharing in a tradition suggested more explicitly by Amos, namely, that the former divinely established worship in the wilderness bore no

similarity to the present temple ritual. The near coincidence of the periods of prophecy of the three men, Amos, Hosea and Isaiah, adds probability to the existence of a common covenant tradition which they each possessed.

However, Isaiah, in addition to denouncing the sacrificial system, proceeds to attack the divine authority of the various established festivals and holy days. He employs oracularly such expressions of detestation, as "lō' ūkhal (I cannot endure)," and "šānē'ā naphšī (my soul hates)," in reference to them. Obviously, he regards these sacred days as really possessing no sacred character at all, as having at no time been ordained by divine decree. In fact, Jahweh, in the Isaianic oracle just cited, seems deliberately to emphasize "your new moons" and "your appointed feasts" as contrasts to the more appropriate "my new moons" and "my appointed feasts," more appropriate, that is, if such holy days enjoyed divine endorsement.⁸

This opinion of Isaiah stands in sharp contradiction to the legislation of even the oldest of the Pentateuchal codes. Even the decalogue of Ex. 34 establishes three festivals (18,22) and the Sabbath (21). The Book of the Covenant (Ex. 23:12-17) and D (Deut. 16:1-17) make similar provisions. As for H and P, the Sabbath day alone, which Isaiah treats so contemptuously, is elevated to supremacy among divine institutions (Gen. 2:1-3; Ex. 31:12-17; Lev. 19:3).

Moreover, if Isaiah regarded the festivals and Sabbaths as possessing no significant authority, and if he shared a common historical tradition with both Amos and Hosea, then it is very likely that they, too, entertained the same belief. In fact, if Amos 5:21 is a denunciation of feasts and solemn assemblies per se, and not merely a discrediting of the offerings presented on those occasions,⁹ then Amos, too, like Isaiah, explicitly denied their sacred character, and implicitly denied their early establishment by Jahweh.

JEREMIAH

In the tradition of the three prophets we have already discussed, Jeremiah affirms what Jahweh did not command during the period of Israel's pre-Conquest career, and does so with specific references to time and place. In his Temple Sermon he declares,

"Thus says Jahweh of hosts, the God of Israel:
Add your burnt offerings to your sacrifices,
and eat the flesh. For in the day that I
brought them out of the land of Egypt, I did
not speak to your fathers or command them
concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices."
(7:21,22)

Jeremiah here asserts that at the time of the Exodus from Egypt, that is, at the time of Jahweh's bērith with Israel, when certain demands were made by God upon the nation, among these demands were to be found no laws concerning "burnt offerings and sacrifices." The sacri-

ficial system, as observed in the Jerusalem Temple, had no connection with the ancient covenant demands made by Jahweh as conditions for his continued adoption of Israel as a people. Like his prophetic predecessors, Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah, Jeremiah was by his assertion, attempting to deny the validity of the contemporary tradition which affirmed that sacrificial worship had been part of the bérith legislation, a tradition certainly fostered by the populace who patronized the Jerusalem sanctuary.

In the statement following Jeremiah's denial of the early divine sanction for sacrificial worship, he affirms the contrast to what God did not command, by asserting what he did command.

"But this command I gave them, 'Obey my voice, and I will be your God and you shall be my people; and walk in all the way that I command you, that it may be well with you.'" (7:23)

Obedience to God's "voice" and to whatever he may command is, according to Jeremiah, the genuine demand that Jahweh made upon Israel at the time of the Exodus. However, the vague and general character of this law makes it an almost irrelevant contrast to the preceding denunciation of sacrifice, unless we realize that it is not intended to be exhaustive of Jahweh's covenant stipulations, but merely intended to be an affirmation that, although sacrifice was not commanded, other things were.

With regard to specific laws which Jahweh did

command in pre-Conquest days, Jeremiah makes clear reference to a detailed item of legislation promulgated by God at the time of the Exodus bérith. In fact, he is the first of the prophets to make so specific a reference. The setting of this allusion was the prophet's denunciation of the Jerusalem slave owners following the withdrawal of Babylonian troops during the siege of 587.

"Thus says Jahweh, the God of Israel: I made a covenant with your fathers when I brought them out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage saying, 'At the end of six years each of you must set free the fellow Hebrew who has been sold to you and has served you six years; you must set him free from your service.'" (34:13,14)

This oracle affirms that at the time of the early covenant, Jahweh made the provision that all Hebrew or Israelite slaves were to serve their fellow countrymen only six years. At the end of this period of time, they were to be released from bondage. This law is almost a complete duplication of a provision to be found in two of the Pentateuchal codes, the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 21:1-3), and that of Deuteronomy (Deut. 15:12). However, there is one important variation in the law of the former from that of the Jeremianic citation, a variation which would mitigate against their identification. The Book of the Covenant provides only for the seventh year release of male Hebrew slaves, and not for that of females. Although Jeremiah makes no reference to the freeing of female Hebrews

in his statement of the law, he clearly intends to include them under the benefits of the law by his preceding denunciation of those who had pledged and failed to release both their male and female slaves (34:9). Therefore, we may reasonably conclude that the covenant provision he cites is the law as found in the Deuteronomic code, in which the grant of freedom is bestowed upon both sexes.

This interesting association of the prophet with D is reenforced by other striking similarities. Firstly, Jeremiah makes mention of a law concerning divorce and remarriage which appears in the D code. In his condemnation of Israel as a faithless wife to Jahweh he asks,

"If a man divorces his wife and she goes from
him,
And becomes another man's wife,
May she return to him?" ¹⁰ (3:1)

This rhetorical question implies the recognition by the prophet of the validity of the law which prohibits the return of a woman to her first husband after a divorce from her second (Deut. 24:1-4). This regulation is uniquely Deuteronomic, being present in no other Pentateuchal code.

Secondly, in his Temple Sermon, Jeremiah suggests his familiarity with the Deuteronomic decalogue when he says,

"Behold, you trust in deceptive words to no avail. Will you steal, murder, commit adultery, swear falsely, burn incense to Baal and go after other gods that you have not known..." (7:8,9)

At least five of the Ten Commandments are here referred to. Significantly, the Decalogue, according to the D writers, was the essential part of the wilderness covenant provisions.¹¹

Thirdly, in the same sermon, the prophet makes reference to three legislative concerns typical of Deuteronomy.

"For if you truly amend your ways and your doings, if you truly execute justice one with another, if you do not oppress the alien, the fatherless or the widow ... and if you do not go after other gods to your own hurt ..." (7:5-7)

The concern with justice, the welfare of the orphan and the widow, and, above all, with loyalty to Jahweh is characteristic, although not exclusively so, of Deuteronomic legislation.

Fourthly, the style of the Jeremianic oracles and the style of the D writers in some instances bear striking similarity. Both are fond of the use of the covenant formula, "You shall be my people and I shall be your God," and variations thereon.¹² The employment of such phrases as "obey my voice," et sim.,¹³ and "walk in the way that I shall command you," et sim.,¹⁴ is characteristic of both.¹⁵

Fifthly, the promulgation of the D code is usually associated with the religious reformation executed during the reign of Josiah, with the full endorsement of the king.¹⁶

Since Josiah and his religious advisors were contemporaries of Jeremiah, and since the prophet spoke affectionately and approvingly concerning Josiah (22:15-16), as contrasted to the denunciations by him of that king's successors,¹⁷ Jeremiah's approval of the D legislation is suggested.

We might, therefore, quite reasonably conclude, in view of the many items of identity and similarity possessed by Jeremiah and Deuteronomy, that the prophet acknowledged that the provisions of the D code had been delivered as covenant provisions at the time of the Exodus.

However, certain evidence makes the validity of that conclusion somewhat questionable. Firstly, the vehement claim of Jeremiah was that Jahweh had certainly not commanded at the time of the birth any legislation concerning sacrifices or burnt offerings. This assertion is a clear contradiction of the claims of the D writers, one of whose primary concerns was to emphasize the importance of the Jerusalem sanctuary and its sacrificial worship (Deut. 12). For the D writers, the system of periodic sacrifices at one altar had been divinely instituted in the early wilderness days of Israel's career.

Secondly, Jeremiah associates falsehood with the work of the scribes, who, like Shaphan, were presumably active in the execution of the Josianic Reformation (II Kings 22:1-13).¹⁸

"How can you say, 'We are wise, and the law of Jahweh is with us?' But, behold the false pen of the scribes has made it into a lie."
(8:8)

The wise men of Jerusalem are denounced for pretension. They claim to possess the law of Jahweh. However, according to Jeremiah, they merely possess a law falsely attributed to God by the action of the scribes. This denunciation of a contemporary written code of law may very well be a denunciation of the reputedly contemporary D code, which, as we have noted above, contained sacrificial provisions offensive to Jeremiah.¹⁹

The above evidence casts considerable suspicion on the validity of the thesis that Jeremiah recognized the D code as the early covenant code of Israel. However, we may certainly conclude that he endorsed an historical tradition which associated many of the items of the D code with the ancient berith, which was entered into at the time of the Exodus.

EZEKIEL

The prophet Ezekiel makes clear reference to early legislation promulgated by Jahweh. He associates divine demands with three periods in Israel's pre-Conquest career: (1) the sojourn in Egypt; (2) the early wilderness years; (3) the late wilderness years.

1) Ezekiel is the first prophet to associate explicitly divine legislation for Israel with the land of Egypt, while the Israelites were still residing there.

"Thus says the Lord Jahweh: On the day when I chose Israel, I swore to the seed of the house of Jacob, making myself known to them in the land of Egypt... And I said to them, 'Cast away the detestable things your eyes feast on, every one of you, and do not defile yourselves with the idols of Egypt...' (20:5-7)

On the very day of God's adoption of Israel as his people, he forbade the worship of the Egyptian deities, or implicitly, the worship of any deity but himself; and, quite naturally, prohibited the idolatrous practices associated with these other gods. The *gillūlm* of Egypt were legally banned from the life of Israel.

This explicit demand for exclusive worship by Jahweh while the Hebrews were still in Egypt finds no parallel in any of the Pentateuchal accounts. Rather is the law associated with the wilderness berīth legislation (Ex. 20:3; etc.). However, since Ezekiel regards Jahweh's "betrothal" of Israel to have taken place in the land of Egypt,²⁰ it is only natural that the implication of this "betrothal," namely, the exclusive worship of Jahweh, should be associated with it.

2) In the second period, that is, the early wilderness years, Israel received from God certain "statutes and ordinances."

"So I led them out of the land of Egypt and brought them into the wilderness. I gave them huccōthai (my statutes) and showed them mišpātai (my ordinances), by whose observance man shall live. Moreover, I gave them my sabbaths, as a sign between me and them, that they might know that I Jahweh sanctify them." (20:10-12)

Immediately following the departure from Egypt, somewhere in the wilderness, Jahweh delivered a body of legislation containing "huccīm" and "mišpātim," and distinguished by the provision for the observance of the Sabbath.

Now there is one Pentateuchal code, namely, the Holiness Code or H (Lev. 17-26), which is characterized by the frequent use of the two words "huccīm" and "mišpātim" in conjunction one with the other,²¹ and by the exclusive possession of the phrase, "my huccīm and my mišpātim by whose observance a man shall live."²² Moreover, it is distinguished by the employment of the term "sabbēthōthai (my Sabbaths),"²³ and the declaration, "I am Jahweh."²⁴ Interestingly, all of these items are to be found frequently in the oracles of Ezekiel,²⁵ and all but the last are evident in the 20:10-12 cited above.²⁶

Moreover, there is the striking identity of many legislative items of the H code with many of the laws implicit in the denunciations of Ezekiel. Thus, the concern with the Sabbaths, the great emphasis on ritual cleanliness characterized by abstaining from incest and adultery, and

opposition to the oppression of the poor and to the benefits of usury, are among the major similarities of H to the message of Ezekiel.²⁷

Now the H code is associated by a verse either original or appended to it with the wilderness Sinaitic legislation (26:46). It is a very justifiable inference from the notable similarities of Ezekiel's words and the H code that the statutes and ordinances mentioned by the prophet as having been delivered in the wilderness are to be identified with the legislative tradition underlying the H code. If such is our inference, then we may conclude that the various H laws concerning ritual cleanliness, Sabbath observance, and ethical responsibility, were, in the main, believed by Ezekiel to have been commanded by Jahweh in the period immediately following the departure from Egypt.

With regard to the hierarchy of the laws, in the view of the prophet, it is important to note that in Ezekiel's listing of the early wilderness commandments, he specifies the Sabbath provision as contrasted to his general reference to other legislation collectively as "statutes" and "ordinances" (20:7). Moreover, he displays great interest in, and vehemently denounces, the continued profanation of that day by his people. For Ezekiel, unlike for Amos and Isaiah, the Sabbath was both commanded in the

wilderness, and regarded by Jahweh as one of the chief, if not the supreme of his institutions, even as the very sign of the covenant (20:12).

3) The third and last period of pre-Conquest legislation is associated by Ezekiel with the children of those who had participated in the Exodus, and who, like their fathers, were rebellious and apostasizing. Jahweh had spared their lives for the sake of his reputation. Moreover, apparently determined to cure their faithlessness, he proceeded to do so in a strange way.

"Moreover, I gave them statutes that were not good and ordinances by which they could not have life; and I defiled them in their very gifts, in making them offer by fire all their first-born, that I might horrify them; I did it that they might know that I am Jahweh."

Jahweh deliberately, almost unbelievably, promulgated for Israel a body of laws which he knew to be evil and conducive to death, and not life. The divine purpose for such action is fairly obscure in the text, but the intention of God seems to have been to so frighten and horrify the nation by the consequences of his new legislation, that, out of fear, Israel would come to recognize that Jahweh, and Jahweh alone, was God.²⁸

This reference to divine laws given with almost perverse intention, finds no parallel in any of the Penta-teuchal accounts. It is singular and bizarre, but, above

all, shocking. The attributing of Jahwistic sanction to the sacrifice of the first-born through fire, which is the only specific law of the new code cited in the text, has serious implications. If the sacrifice is intended for Jahweh (the text does not indicate the divine recipient), then this provision stands in contradiction to the law demanding the redemption of first-born sons to be found in several Pentateuchal codes (Ex. 34:20; Num. 3:41; 8:18). If the sacrifice is intended for another deity like Molech, whose worship involved such bloodshed, then this provision stands in contradiction to the express prohibition of such Molech worship found in the very H code with which we associated the good and life-giving statutes and ordinances of the second legislative period. (Lev. 18:21; 20:2) In any case, Ezekiel acknowledged that child-sacrifice had possessed divine sanction from the days of the wilderness. However, in his opposition to the law, he portrays God himself as one displeased with such offerings, but tolerating a present evil in order to attain an ultimate good. Apparently, the prophet recognized that such a law had been abrogated by revelations subsequent to the wilderness period, including his own, and had stood all the time in contradiction to an original good statute and ordinance. His clear disapproval of the practice would indicate such a belief.

DEUTERO-ISAIAH

Deutero-Isaiah makes no explicit mention of laws commanded by Jahweh in the pre-Conquest days of Israel's sojournings. In fact, as we have noted, he makes only one reference to the Exodus (51:10), and one to the wilderness history (48:21); that is, he makes only two fairly obscure references to the two periods of the early career of Israel with which the earlier prophets had associated the promulgation by Jahweh of certain legislation. Furthermore, he makes mention of no legislative items which, either singly or collectively, are distinctive of any one Pentateuchal code. Therefore, we are unable to ascertain what divine laws or demands he attached to the period between the Exodus and the Conquest.

However, the prophet does speak explicitly of the election by Jahweh of Abraham and his seed Israel, and does mention the purpose of that choice.

"Behold my servant, whom I uphold,
My chosen, in whom my soul delights;
I have put my spirit upon him,
He will bring forth justice to the nations." (42:1)

Israel was commissioned to effect universal justice.

"I am Jahweh, I have called you in righteousness,
I have taken you by the hand and kept you;
I have given you as a covenant to the people,
a light to the nations;
To open the eyes that are blind,
To bring out the prisoners from the dungeon,
From the prison those who sit in darkness."
(42:6,7)

Israel was commissioned to effect the liberation of mankind from darkness and blindness, a liberation, which apparently meant the conversion of all nations and all peoples from the darkness and blindness of false religion and idolatry to the light and salvation of Jahweh.

These two vague commissions may be translated into positive divine commands. That is, God demands of Israel that it devote itself zealously to bringing about the total conversion of mankind to Jahwism and to insuring the consequent benefits of such a universal transformation.

However, the prophet does not disclose whether these demands were ever revealed explicitly to Abraham or to his pre-Conquest descendants. He only affirms that Jahweh presently is revealing his intention with regard to Israel. In fact, the prophet never condemns his nation for past failure to understand or fulfill its mission to other peoples. Nor does he attribute past divine punishment to such neglect. Rather does he associate the mission with the future and with the assured providential assistance of Jahweh. It is possible that Deutero-Isaiah believed that the intention of God with regard to Israel's service was never clearly disclosed to the first Patriarch, perhaps never clearly disclosed until his own dramatic revelation of Jahweh's desire at the propitious time of his people's exile and dispersion. However, the evidence

permits no definite conclusion in this matter. Whether the prophet believed that God had explicitly informed Abraham that he and his descendants were to be missionaries of salvation to all the nations, or whether he believed that, in Patriarchal days, Jahweh had never directly, but only implicitly, revealed his desire that Israel concern itself with universal redemption, the oracles of Deutero-Isaiah do not specifically indicate.

CONCLUSION

The prophetic beliefs and opinions concerning commandments given by Jahweh to Israel in pre-Conquest days, which we have just investigated, are indications that the following historical traditions existed among the people of Israel during the eighth, seventh and sixth centuries.

To the period of the eighth century the existence of the following tradition may certainly be ascribed.

A tradition, whose existence is clearly indicated by its rejection by Amos, to the effect that sacrificial worship in the form of animal and cereal offerings had been ordained by Jahweh in pre-Conquest days. The presence of this tradition at the time of Amos indicates that the belief in the wilderness origin of the sacrificial system arose no later than the middle of the eighth century.

To the period of the eighth century the existence of the following traditions may possibly be ascribed.

A tradition, perhaps reflected in a denial by Isaiah of divine sanction to the established holy days, to the effect that certain of the official holy days, including, perhaps, the pilgrim festivals, the Sabbath, and the new moons, had been ordained by Jahweh in

pre-Conquest days. The possible existence of this tradition at the time of Isaiah may indicate that the belief in the wilderness origin of certain holy days arose no later than the middle of the eighth century.

A tradition, perhaps reflected in the demands of Amos, Hosea and Isaiah, to the effect that Jahweh had commanded in pre-Conquest days something other than sacrifices, such as, the practice of impartial justice, relief of the destitute, abstaining from murder, lying, and adultery, et sim.

To the period of the late seventh and early sixth centuries the following tradition may be ascribed.

A tradition, whose existence is clearly indicated by its rejection by Jeremiah, and which is similar to the first eighth century tradition cited above, to the effect that sacrificial worship had been ordained by Jahweh at the time of the Exodus bêrith.

A tradition, reflected in the statements of Jeremiah, that Jahweh had promulgated at the time of the Exodus covenant a specific legal code, containing at the least, a provision for

the manumission of both male and female Hebrew slaves after six years of bondage, and, perhaps, including prohibitions against the worship of other gods, adultery, murder, stealing, false swearing, and the return of a twice divorced woman to her first husband. The presence of this tradition at the time of Jeremiah indicates that the belief in the pre-Conquest promulgation of such a code arose no later than the beginning of the sixth century.

A tradition, reflected in the statements of Ezekiel, that Jahweh had promulgated in the wilderness at the time of the Exodus a specific legal code of statutes and ordinances, perhaps written, which included as one of its most important provisions the ordinance of the Sabbath, and which, perhaps, contained laws banning incest and the oppression of the underprivileged. The presence of this tradition at the time of Ezekiel indicates that the belief in the wilderness establishment of such a code arose no later than the beginning of the sixth century.

A tradition, reflected in a strange admission by Ezekiel, that Jahweh had ordained in wilderness days the practice of sacrificing the first-born male child. The presence of this tradition at the time of Ezekiel indicates that the belief in the pre-Conquest commandment by God of infant sacrifice persisted as late as the beginning of the sixth century. Moreover, the very admission by Ezekiel of the divine origin of this practice, even though he believed that Jahweh had always disapproved of it, may suggest either the antiquity of the above tradition or its general acceptance.

To the period of the late Exile the existence of the following tradition may be ascribed.

A tradition, reflected in the statements of Deutero-Isaiah that Jahweh, at the time of Abraham, had commissioned, perhaps only implicitly, the Patriarch and his descendants-to-be for a mission of salvation to all the peoples of the world. The existence of this tradition at the time of Deutero-Isaiah, and the absence of any reference to such a tradition in the writings of the earlier prophets

under consideration may indicate that the view which regarded Abraham and his descendants as destined to be a blessing to the nations arose at some time between the beginning of the sixth century and the end of the Exile.

FINAL CONCLUSION

In concluding our investigation, we shall attempt to provide a comprehensive view of all the developments in the traditions concerning the early relationship of Jahweh and Israel, which have been indicated in the conclusions of the three preceding chapters.

The following traditions arose no later than the middle of the eighth century.

The tradition that at some time before the Conquest Jahweh chose Israel to be his people, and Israel in turn chose Jahweh to be its God.

The tradition that God had brought Israel out of the land of Egypt.

The tradition that Jahweh first established intimate relations with Israel at the time of the Exodus from Egypt.

The tradition that Jahweh had provided for Israel during a pre-Conquest wilderness sojourn.

The tradition that sacrificial worship in the form of animal and cereal offerings had been ordained by Jahweh in pre-Conquest days.

The following tradition possibly arose no later than the middle of the eighth century.

The tradition that certain official holy days, including, perhaps, the pilgrim festivals, the Sabbath, and the new moons, had been ordained by Jahweh in pre-Conquest days.

The following tradition possibly arose at some time between the end of the eighth and the end of the seventh centuries.

The tradition that the Exodus from Egypt had been a redemption from bondage.

The following tradition possibly arose at some time between the end of the eighth and the beginning or middle of the sixth centuries.

The tradition that Jahweh had first established intimate relations with Israel, not at the time of the Exodus, but at the time of Abraham.

The tradition that Jahweh had promised the land of Canaan to Abraham and Jacob.

The following traditions arose no later than the beginning of the sixth century.

The tradition that Jahweh had promulgated at the time of the Exodus covenant a specific legal code, containing, at the least, a provision for the manumission of both male and female Hebrew slaves after six years of bondage, and, perhaps, including prohibitions against the worship of other gods, adultery, murder, stealing, false swearing, and the return of a twice divorced woman to her first husband.

The tradition that Jahweh had promulgated in the wilderness at the time of the Exodus a specific legal code of statutes and ordinances, perhaps written, which included as one of its most important provisions the ordaining of the Sabbath, and which, perhaps, contained laws banning incest and the oppression of the underprivileged.

The following tradition possibly arose between the beginning and the end of the Exilic period.

The tradition that Jahweh, at the time of Abraham, had commissioned, perhaps only implicitly, the Patriarch and his descendants-to-be for a mission of salvation to

all the peoples of the world.

The following tradition arose no later than the late Exilic period.

The tradition that Jahweh had performed in the wilderness such "miracles" as dividing the waters of the Red Sea and cleaving a rock to bring forth water.

It is our sincere hope that some of the conclusions which we have here listed may be employed to advantage in the dating of anonymous passages in Scripture.

INTRODUCTION

Footnotes

1. Is. 40-55 is generally regarded to be the work of one late Exilic personality. Cf. R. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament (New York: Harper and Bros., 1948) pp. 453-4.
2. Those verses will be considered original or primary in the writings of six prophets which have been listed as such by Sheldon Blank, the referee of this thesis. Cf. the follow-works by Blank: Introductions and Critical Notes to Isaiah 1-39 (H.U.C., 1950); Text Notes on Isaiah 40-66 (H.U.C., 1949); Introductions and Critical Notes to Jeremiah (H.U.C., 1954); Introductions and Critical Notes to the Portions of Ezekiel Read in Class (H.U.C., 1942-3); Amos (mimeographed sheet) (H.U.C., 1955). As to Hosea, concerning whose oracles Blank has published no opinions, the decisions of R.H. Pfeiffer will be employed as criteria. Cf. Pfeiffer, op. cit., pp. 566-73. The following passages will be regarded as secondary and irrelevant to our investigation in Is. 1-55 and the books of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, and Amos:

Is. 1:1,10,25-28; 2:1-5,20-22; 3:10,25; 4:2-6; 5:30; 7:1-16; 8:5,9,21-23; 9:1-6; 10:20-26; 11-13; 14:1-28,32; 15; 16; 17:7,8,12-14; 18:3,7; 19; 20:2; 21; 22:6; 23:15-18; 24-27; 28:5,6,23-29; 29:7,8,16-24; 30:18-33; 31:5,7; 32:1-8,15-18,20; 33-39; 44:28b; 47:3a; 48:22; 51:11.

Jer. 1:1-3; 2:4,5a; 3:2b,5a,14-18,25; 4:27b; 5:18,19; 7:10b,30-34; 8:14b,15,17,19b; 9:8,11-13; 10:1-16,25-25; 11:1-15,17; 12:11b,14-17; 14:1,7-10,19-22; 15:4; 16:10-15,18-21; 17:2,5-13,19-27; 18:12; 20:12-13; 22:8-9; 23:3-8,18-20,34-40; 25:4,6,7,11b,12,14-38; 26:5; 27:7; 28:16b,17; 29:10,11,14,16-20; 30:8-11,22-25; 31:13,22-25,37-39; 32:16-44; 33; 34:4,5; 35:15; 36:8b; 37:1-7a; 38:14-27; 39:1,2,4-10,16b; 40; 41; 44:3-6,8,10-15,22-25,28a; 46-52.

Ez. 1:2,3,9,25; 5:3,4a,17; 7:14b; 17:22-24; 20:29,34,39b-44; 21:30-37; 23:36-49; 25-32; 34:17-24; 35; 38-48.

Hos. 1:7; 2:1-3,13b,20,23-25; 3:5; 4:3,5,10b,11,12b,16,19; 6:1-3,11b; 7:1a; 11:10,11; 12:1-15; 14:2-9.

Amos 1:9-12; 2:4,5,7b,9-11(?); 4:13; 5:8,9,13(?),26(?); 6:10(?); 8:14a(?); 9:5,6,8b,9-15.
3. In the course of the ensuing study the following unique transliterations will be observed: ê for sêwa; â for hâtêph-pathah; ë for hâtêph-sêghöl; ô for hâtêph-qāmeš.

Chapter I

Jahweh Chose Israel

Footnotes

1. The word bêrith denotes an alliance or compact either between men (Gen. 14:13; II Sam. 5:3; etc.) or between God and man (Ex. 19:5; Deut. 4:13; etc.). In the latter case the initiation of the alliance or compact may be characterized by a ceremony such as a sacrifice (Ex. 24:5-9). Cf. BDB, pp. 136-7.
2. The conditional character of Jahweh's pledge to Israel is best illustrated in Deut. 26:16-19.
3. It is possible to translate, "raq 'ethkhem jâda'tî mikkôl mišpêhōth hā'ādāmā," as "you only have I known of all the families of the earth." However, the context of 9:7 makes such a translation unlikely. The min of "mikkôl" is comparative, not partitive. Cf. J. Morgenstern, Amos Studies (Cincinnati: H.U.C. Press, 1941), pp. 41-42.
4. Amos, however, never employs that word in any genuine passage (1:9 is both a reference to a bêrith between two human parties and secondary). Yet he certainly acknowledges the existence of the relationship it denotes.
5. Isaac: 7:9; 7:16 (Amos is the only one of the six prophets under consideration to mention the name "Isaac"); Jacob: 3:13; 6:8; 7:2,5; 8:7; 9:8; Israel (use with reference to the nation too frequent to require citation).
6. In 13:4 the preposition mē of mē'ereš mišrājim is temporal, indicating the anterior limit of a continuous period of time. Cf. BDB, p. 581.
7. Cf. R.H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament (New York: Harper and Bros., 1948), pp. 570-1.
8. The MT reads "immānū (with us)." However, it makes more sense to read "immō (with him)" as found in the Septuagint.
9. The use of ammī: 1:3; 3:12; 3:15; 10:2.
10. 1:4; 5:19; 5:24; 10:17; 30:11; 30:12; 30:15; 31:1.
11. Although he frequently mentions the name "Israel," he uses it only as a personification of the nation. The

name "Jacob" appears only once (8:17), and is similarly a personification. The names "Abraham" and "Isaac" are never employed.

12. 7:3,21; 9:14; 13:12; 16:9; 19:3,15; 21:14; 24:5; 27:4,21; 28:2,14; 29:4,8,21,25; 32:14,15; 34:2,13; 35:17,18,19; 37:7; 38:17; 39:16; 42:15,18; 43:10; 44:2,7,11,25.
13. 2:11,13,32; 5:31; 6:14,26; 7:12; 8:7,11; 9:6; 13:11; 18:15; 23:13,22,27,32; 29:32; 31:7.
14. The basic meaning of the root qdš was "separation," or "withdrawal," which yielded, ultimately, "separation from profane use." Cf. BDB, p. 871.
15. The names "Abraham" and "Isaac" are never employed by Jeremiah. The matriarch Rachel is once referred to by the prophet (31:14), in a poetic context. If this reference is a reference to an historic matriarchal personality, then perhaps Jacob, as the corresponding historic patriarchal personality, was acknowledged by Jeremiah as the ancestor of Israel and the object of divine election. However, this conclusion is based on hardly more than conjecture.
16. 20:5,7,19,20; 34:30.
17. 13:9,10,19,21,23; 14:8,9; 36:8,20; 37:12,13.
18. In MT the phrase ba'ādī 'āgājīm makes no sense and involves an obvious dittography. It can quite reasonably be amended to bē'iddīm.
19. The absence of any clear reference in Ez. 16 to the Egyptian sojourn, as in Ez. 20; 23, may be due to the fact that the prophet is alluding in his simile to the city of Jerusalem specifically, and not to the people of Judah (Israel) as a whole. Cf. J.P. Hyatt, Prophetic Religion (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1947), p. 83.
20. Although this reference occurs in the quotation of a popular opinion, the historical opinions implicit in the quotation were, most likely, entertained by Ezekiel as well as by those whom he quoted.
21. 40:1,9; 41:10,13,17; 43:3; 45:3,15; 48:1,2,17; 51:20; 52:12; 54:6.
22. 41:14,20; 43:3,14; 45:11; 48:17; 49:7; 54:5.
23. 40:1; 43:20; 47:6; 49:13; 51:14,16,22; 52:3,4,5,6; 53:8.

24. 41:8,9; 44:1; 45:4.

25. He does, however, suggest the marriage simile (50:1;
54:5).

26. 41:9; 49:1.

27. Gen. 11:28; 15:7.

Chapter II

Jahweh Protected Israel

Footnotes

1. Vid. sup., Chapter 1, note 8. However, this statement may not be Hoseanic, but part of a secondary anti-Samaritan polemic. Vid. sup., Chapter 1, note 7.
2. It is necessary, in view of the context, to amend the Massoretic "qāḥām 'al zêrō'ōthāw" to "teqqāḥām 'al zêrō'ōthāw" (as found in the texts of the Peshitta and Septuagint).
3. It is necessary, in view of the context, to amend the Massoretic "kīmērīmē" to "kēmērīm" (as found in the Peshitta).
4. Another possible translation of "giddaltī wērōmamtī" is "I magnified and prospered." This translation emphasizes the providential character of God's activity. In fact, Isaiah by using the above phrase, may have intended to suggest the double meaning of each verb.
5. It may very well be that the phrase "lēmin 'ōlām wē'ad 'ōlām" does not denote the period of time during which Jahweh's promise of the land will remain in effect, but rather denotes the period of time during which Israel will sojourn in the land if it will fulfill continually its covenant obligations.
6. Vid. sup., Chapter 1, note 15.
7. E (Ex. 3:7), P (Ex. 6:6), and D (Deut. 5:6; etc.) acknowledge the Exodus from Egypt to have been a redemption from bondage.
8. The two finite verbs of 2:3b, "le'šāmū" and "tābhō'," are imperfect in form. However, their temporal denotation must be past, and not present or future, since the present or future punishment of those who eat of Jahweh's "first-fruits," is hardly compatible with the impending doom prophesied by Jeremiah for Israel.
9. Vid. sup., pp. 18-21.
10. Perhaps, Ezekiel's reference to Abraham's singular inheritance of Canaan is to be associated with the Patriarch's singular calling mentioned by Deutero-Isaiah (Is. 41:9). If so, then Ezekiel and his contemporaries may have

entertained the view of Deutero-Isaiah that Abraham was the ancestor of Israel. Cf. G.A. Cooke, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ezekiel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937), p. 367.

11. Cf. C.C. Torrey, The Second Isaiah (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), p. 316. It is quite possible, however, that the mention of a divine calling "from the ends of the earth" is a reference to a contemporary ingathering of the exiles, and not an allusion to Abraham's exodus from Chaldea.
12. Vid. sup., p. 26.
13. Or even, perhaps, the incident at Kadesh (Num. 20:7-11) may here be referred to.
14. 41:14; 44:6; 47:4; 48:17; 49:26; 54:5.

Chapter III

Jahweh Commanded Israel

Footnotes

1. The interrogative particle before a consonant with a šēwā takes a pathah without a following dāghāš forte, except in about ten Scriptural passages. Cf. E. Kautzsch, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), p. 296. While it is quite possible, in view of the exceptions, that the Massoretes recognized the interrogative character of the verse, it is also quite possible, in view of their orthodox opinions, that they sought to remove heretical implications by transforming the interrogative particle into a definite article. Cf. W.R. Harper, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1916), p. 136.
2. Acts 7:42. By this ingenious interpretation, the verse becomes a reference to past apostasy.
3. J (Ex. 34:25); E (Ex. 23:18); D (Deut. 12; etc.); H (Lev. 17; etc.); P (Lev. 1-7; etc.).
4. The antiquity of the code in which this provision appears is generally accepted. Cf. R. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament (New York: Harper and Bros.), p. 221; and J. Morgenstern, "The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch" H.U.C. Annual, IV (1927), pp. 1-138.
5. In 4:4-5 Amos associates sacrifice with the sin of the sanctuaries at Bethel, Gilgal, and Beersheba. Whether he regarded pilgrimages to these shrines per se as evils, or merely condemned the sacrificial worship connected with these pilgrimages, cannot be ascertained from the text.
6. Cf. Koehler and Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1948-53), p. 571. It, apparently, is not a derivative of the root šph (to pour out), but is a derivative of the root pāh (to deviate).
7. In accordance with the Septuagint, we may reasonably amend ʾāwen to šōm. The presence of ʾāwen in the MT may be due to orthodox emendation. Cf. Gray and Peake, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1912), pp. 19, 20. Moreover, the Massoretic punctuation of 1:14 is incorrect. The phrase "lōʾūkhal" is necessary to complete the thought of 1:14a; and the phrase "šōm (as amended) waʾāšārā" belongs, quite naturally, to the following 1:15a.

8. Contrasts which are possibly contemporary are: haggi (Ex. 23:18), and zibbhi (Ex. 23:18; 34:25).
9. If the statement, "šānē'thī mā'astī haggēkhem, wēlō' 'arīah bē'agrōthēkhem," does not mean "I hate, I despise your festal offerings (Ex. 23:18), and I do not smell your (offerings) of solemn assembly"; but, rather, "I hate, I despise your feasts, and I do not delight in (possibly Is. 11:3) your solemn assemblies"; then, the belief of Amos that Jahweh had never ordained these holy days may be assumed.
10. It is necessary to emend "hājāšūbh 'ēlehā" to "hāthāšūbh 'ēlāw." The act of returning is not possible for the husband, since it was not he that went forth.
11. The Decalogue was delivered to Israel by Jahweh directly, (Deut. 5:4), while the statutes and ordinances were delivered through the mediation of Moses (Deut. 5:27,28).
12. Deut. 4:20 (partial formula); 26:16-20 (extended formula); Jer. 7:23; 24:7; 30:22; 30:25; 31:32.
13. Deut. 26:14; 27:10; 28:1,15,45,62; 30:8; etc.; Jer. 7:23,28; 9:12; 11:7; 18:10; 22:21; 42:13,21; etc.
14. Deut. 5:30; 13:6; 28:9; Jer. 7:23.
15. Of course, the possibility has to be acknowledged that the similarities in style between D and the writings of Jeremiah are due to a reworking of the Jeremianic oracles by a D editor. Cf. A. Bentzen, Introduction to the Old Testament (Copenhagen: Gad, 1948), I, pp. 118-9.
16. The dating of D is indicated by the similarities between the legislation of D and that promulgated during the Josianic Reformation (II Kings 22:1-23:17; II Chr. 34:35).
17. Jehoahaz: 22:11; Jehoiakim: 22:18,19; etc.; Jehoiachim: 22:24-30; Zedekiah: 32:4; etc.
18. Vid. sup., note 16.
19. 3:10 may be a further reference to the existence of D at the time of Jeremiah, and to his disapproval of parts of it. If we associate the promulgation of D with a religious reformation, then the mention of Judah's former false and half-hearted return to Jahweh may be an allusion to it.

20. Vid. sup., p. 21
21. Lev. 18:3,4,5,26; 19:8,37; 26:3,46.
22. Lev. 18:5.
23. Lev. 19:3; 26:2.
24. 18:5,6,21; 19:12,14,16,18,28,30,32,37; etc.
25. "Huccim" and "mišpātim": 5:6,7; 11:12,20; 18:9,17; 20:11,13,16,19,21; 36:26; 37:24.
 "Huccim and mišpātim by whose observance a man shall live": 20:11,13,21; et sim. (18:9,17,24).
 "Sabbēthōthai": 20:12,13,16,20,21,24; 22:8; 23:38.
 "I am Jahweh": 5:13; 6:7,10,13; 7:4,9,27; etc.
26. The possibility has to be acknowledged that the similarities in style between the H code and the writings of Ezekiel are due to a reworking of the latter's oracles by a later priestly editor. Cf. G. Hoelscher, Hesekiel der Dichter und das Buch (Giessen: A. Toepelmann, 1924), p. 31.
27. Sabbaths: Ez. 20:12,13,16,20,21,24; 22:8; 23:38; Lev. 19:3,30; 26:2.
 Abstaining from incest: Ez. 18:6; 22:10,11; Lev. 18:7-17; 20:11,12,17,20,22.
 Abstaining from adultery: Ez. 22:11,15; Lev. 20:10.
 No oppression of the poor: Ex. 18:7,16; Lev. 19:9,10,13-15.
 No usury: Ez. 18:8,17; Lev. 25:36.
28. Perhaps, according to Ezekiel, God had anticipated that Israel would not accept, but would revolt against, the new wicked regime of law. If so, then the prophet imagined that the disaster had not lain in the very observance of the new laws, but, rather, in the punishment incurred from the failure to observe them. Jahweh had perversely arranged for the justifiable chastisement of his people by establishing laws so wicked (e.g., child-sacrifice) that even they, rebellious as they were, would not abide them. Cf. G.A. Cooke, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ezekiel (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1937), p. 218.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bible

Biblia Hebraica. 3rd ed., ed. Rudolph Kittel. Stuttgart: Priv. Wuerth. Biblelanstalt, 1937.

Dictionaries and Grammars

Brown, Francis, Driver, S.R., and Briggs, Charles A. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament... Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1907.

Kautzsch, Emil. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.

Koehler, Ludwig H., and Baumgartner, Walter. Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1948-1953.

Books (Secondary)

Bentzen, Aage. Introduction to the Old Testament. Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad, 1948.

Blank, Sheldon H. Introductions and Critical Notes to... Ezekiel 1-37... Cincinnati: H.U.C., 1942-3.

----- Introductions and Critical Notes to Isaiah 1-39. Cincinnati: H.U.C., 1950.

----- Introductions and Critical Notes to the Hebrew Text of Jeremiah. Cincinnati: H.U.C., 1954.

----- Text Notes on Isaiah 40-66... Cincinnati: H.U.C., 1949.

Cooke, George A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ezekiel. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1937. (ICC, v. 18).

Gray, George B., and Peake, Arthur S. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah... New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1912. (ICC, v. 17).

Harper, William R. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1910. (ICC, v. 22).

Books (Secondary)

- Hoelscher, Gustav. Hesekiel der Dichter und das Buch.
Giessen: A. Toepelmann, 1924.
- Hyatt, J. Philip. Prophetic Religion. New York: Abingdon-
Cokesbury Press, 1947.
- Morgenstern, Julian. Amos Studies. Cincinnati: HUC Press,
1941.
- Pfeiffer, Robert H. Introduction to the Old Testament.
New York: Harper and Bros., 1948.
- Torrey, Charles C. The Second Isaiah. New York: C. Scribner's
Sons, 1928.

Periodical (Secondary)

- Morgenstern, Julian, "The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch,"
HUC Annual, IV (1927), pp. 1-138.