

STUDIES IN OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY

Presented to

PROFESSOR THEODORE H. ROBINSON
LITT.D., D.D., D.TH.

by the

SOCIETY FOR OLD TESTAMENT STUDY
ON HIS SIXTY-FIFTH BIRTHDAY

August 9th 1946

EDITED BY

H. H. ROWLEY

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH
NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

REPRINTED 1957

CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| INTRODUCTION | vii |
| By the EDITOR. | |
| THE PSALM OF HABAKKUK | I |
| By Professor W. F. ALBRIGHT, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore. | |
| THE AGE OF ZERUBBABEL | 19 |
| By Professor S. A. COOK, University of Cambridge. | |
| THE YAHWISTIC TRADITION IN THE EIGHTH-CENTURY PROPHETS | 37 |
| By Professor G. HENTON DAVIES, Baptist College, Bristol. | |
| DIFFICULT WORDS IN THE HEBREW PROPHETS | 52 |
| By Professor G. R. DRIVER, University of Oxford. | |
| SCHWERTERSCHLAGENE BEI HESEKIEL | 73 |
| By Professor O. EISSFELDT, University of Halle-Wittenberg. | |
| JONAH II. 3-10: A STUDY IN CULTIC PHANTASY | 82 |
| By Professor A. R. JOHNSON, University College of South Wales and Monmouthshire, Cardiff. | |
| UNE TABLETTE INÉDITE DE MARI, INTÉRESSANTE POUR L'HISTOIRE ANCIENNE DU PROPHÉTISME SÉMITIQUE | 103 |
| By the late Professor AD. LODS. | |
| THE "FORMER THINGS" AND THE "NEW THINGS" IN DEUTERO-ISAIAH | III |
| By Professor C. R. NORTH, University College of North Wales, Bangor. | |
| THE RÔLE PLAYED BY INSPIRED PERSONS AMONG THE ISRAELITES AND THE ARABS | 127 |
| By Professor JOH. PEDERSEN, University of Copenhagen. | |
| THE BASIS OF THE ETHICAL TEACHING OF THE PROPHETS | 143 |
| By Professor N. W. PORTEOUS, University of Edinburgh. | |
| THE PROPHET JEREMIAH AND THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY | 157 |
| By Professor H. H. ROWLEY, University of Manchester | |
| THE LITERARY STRUCTURE OF ISAIAH'S ORACLES | 175 |
| By Professor R. B. Y. SCOTT, McGill University, Montreal. | |

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| THE SERVANT OF THE LORD IN DEUTERO-ISAIAH | 187 |
| By Professor N. H. SNAITH, Wesley College, Leeds. | |
| A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE WRITINGS OF THEODORE HENRY H. ROBINSON | 201 |
| Compiled by Professor G. HENTON DAVIES. | |

THE AGE OF ZERUBBABEL

THE title of this paper forms a convenient peg upon which to hang some preliminary enquiries on which depend our ideas of the exilic and early post-exilic periods of O.T. history. The age involves questions of the first importance: the return of exiles to Jerusalem, the building of the Second Temple, the relations between Judah and her neighbours and the vicissitudes of the priests and Levites. In a word, we have the problem of the inauguration of post-exilic Judaism.

The relevant O.T. sources are, in the first instance, Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah; and we may conveniently speak of their compiler as the Chronicler. The critical questions that arise are familiar. We are no longer satisfied with the conclusion that he is usually an untrustworthy authority; of greater importance for us is the light his treatment of history throws upon his circle and age. We must start with our documents in their present form and context, following S. R. Driver's observations on the Psalter, G. B. Gray's on Isaiah, and Pedersen on the present form of JED, as preserved by post-exilic writers.¹ Throughout we should argue, not forward, from what we hold to be most early and reliable, but backward; and consequently the history and literature round about the sixth century B.C. deserve careful consideration.

The allusions in the Second Isaiah to the Exodus (e.g., xliii. 16, lii. 12 and especially lxiii. 9-14), the points of contact between the initial entry of Israel into the land of her forefathers and the return of exiles to their inheritance, and the traditions of conflicting authorities (e.g., the revolt of Korah) are enhanced when we consider the relation between (a) the record of the birth of Israel as a people and the growth of the Pentateuch, and (b) the inauguration of post-exilic Judaism and the Church of Israel. To be sure, O.T. history extends over many centuries, the dates of passages (revised or not) are frequently very uncertain, and similar situations or events could recur. But even though our material is now in a post-exilic dress, the comparison of Jubilees with Genesis sufficiently proves that elements of quite late writings may be

¹ Driver, *Lit. of the O.T.*, p. 386; Gray, *Isaiah* (1913), p. xxxii, cf. pp. 43, 277; Pedersen, *Z.A.W.*, N.F., vii (1931), p. 177 f.

of considerable antiquity, though this fact in itself does not prove their value.

The points that now arise are concerned with (i) the events in the reigns of Cyrus, Darius and Artaxerxes, (ii) the relations between Judah and (a) Samaria and (b) S. Palestine and (iii) the Temple *personnel*.

I. THE RETURN OF THE EXILES

The return of Sheshbazzar, the prince of Judah, with the temple-vessels, pursuant to the proclamation of Cyrus in the first year of his reign (E i. f., 538 B.C.), is followed by a list of the men who returned.² The altar of burnt-offerings was built by Jeshua and Zerubbabel, and they commenced to rebuild the Temple (E iii. f.). Outside assistance was refused, and, in spite of the decree of Cyrus (iv. 3, v. 13), hostile elements held up operations until the second year of Darius (520 B.C.). Then, stimulated by Haggai, Zechariah and other prophets, the Jews began to rebuild (v. 2); and opposition (this time by leading Persian officials) was overcome only when Darius confirmed the decree of Cyrus (vi. 3-5) and made a fresh one. Accordingly, in the sixth year of Darius (516 B.C.) the Second Temple was completed and dedicated (v. f.). But 1 Esdras iii. 1-v. 6, which probably represents the true LXX, tells how Zerubbabel, one of the bodyguard of Darius, wins the favour of the king, who carries out his vow to rebuild Jerusalem and the temple, and makes concessions which go beyond the promise of Cyrus (E iii. 7). Each recension has its internal difficulties, and the modern tendency is to reject *E*, although it contains a few verses which, provided we replace Darius by Cyrus, fill the present gap between E i. and ii., but were omitted by the compiler.

The account of the return of the exiles, whether in E or *E*, is confronted by the testimony of Haggai and Zechariah (i.-viii.). Intercourse between Palestine and both the Persian court and exiled Jews was at least intermittent; and some exiles could or did return under Sheshbazzar.³ But these prophets do not pre-

² Note the abbreviations E (Ezra), N (Nehemiah) and *E* (1 Esdras); the references to the last are to my introduction and notes in Charles' *Apocrypha I* (1913).

³ The statement that each man returned to his own city (E ii. 1)—after the lapse of so many years!—finds a parallel in 2 Chron. xxxi. 1b, but in a much more reasonable connexion.

suppose any important return, resettlement or rebuilding by them. Only now is Yahweh returning to Jerusalem to succour his people; Zerubbabel is hailed as a deliverer and will rebuild the temple. Internal troubles there were (Zech. viii. 10), but no external opposition; and it would seem that the work was undertaken by the Judæans themselves, whom the prophets aroused from their apathy.

The Aramaic source used by the Chronicler tells of the return of temple-vessels and the work of the Judæan "elders" (E v. 9, vi. 7 f., 14).⁴ It speaks of a continuous rebuilding since the return of Sheshbazzar (E v. 16). But although the Chronicler evidently identified him with Zerubbabel, E vi. 20, 27, 29 (but not v. 18) clearly distinguish them, and make the unnamed governor of E vi. 7 Zerubbabel. That Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel belong to the reigns of Cyrus and Darius respectively is confirmed by the Story of the Three Youths in E iii. f. Here, the praise of wine, the king and women is scarcely as edifying as the stories of Susanna and of Bel and the Dragon, which redound to the credit of Daniel. But the third speaker, after praising women—with a jesting allusion to the royal favourite, Apame⁵—goes on and wins general applause and the king's goodwill by his famous praise of Truth. Quite incidentally we learn that the speaker was Zerubbabel (E iv. 13, cf. v. 6); and he is sent back—and others with him—to rebuild Jerusalem and the temple (vv. 47–57). There would surely be no object in introducing the story unless Zerubbabel had become the hero and the leader of a return; there are inconsistencies in its present context, but they are no greater than those in E, and we need not be more surprised at its presence in E than at its omission in E.

Yet, the testimony of Haggai and Zechariah cannot be ignored; and we can only speculate whether the tolerant policy of Cyrus and other Persian kings, well known from external sources, and the favour shown to the Jews of Elephantine in the time of Cambyses,⁶ had any significance for the Jews of Judah and Jerusalem. At all events, neither the Second Isaiah nor Zechariah (ii. 9, cf. v. 8–11) regards Babylon with favour.

⁴ The reference to the men of the "captivity" in E vi. 28 is due to a misreading, and in vv. 5, 8 there is conflation.

⁵ The name may point to the time of Darius III (338–331 B.C.); see *Esdra*s, pp. 29, 31.

⁶ See Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (1923), Nos. 30, l. 13 f., 32, l. 5, and the *Cambridge Ancient History*, iv, p. 22, vi, p. 560.

Zerubbabel disappears from history, and in the seventh year of Artaxerxes Ezra, the priest, returns to reorganize religious conditions (E vii. f.). Dismayed at the extent of intermarriage, he succeeded in establishing a purged community (E ix. f.). The reading of the Law, which it had been his mission to bring (vii. 14), though placed thirteen years later (after the return of Nehemiah, N viii. ff.), would come more naturally after his arrival, so that, on hearing the Law, the leaders of the people, "after these things had been finished," approach the priest (E ix. 1).⁷ The literary problems are intricate, but the reading of the Law in the seventh month (N vii. 73, viii. 1) would be in place between Ezra's arrival two months earlier (E vii. 8 f.) and the reforms two months later (E x. 9)—provided we disregard the years!

In the twentieth year of Artaxerxes (444 B.C.), Nehemiah gained permission—the queen was also present (cf. Apame in E iv. 29)—to return and rebuild the city of his fathers, the ruined state of which had plunged him into despair. On his return he was confronted by Sanballat, Tobiah and Geshem (or Gashmu), who, incensed when he denied their right to co-operate (N ii. 20, cf. E iv. 3), regarded him as a rebel (N ii. 19, vi. 6 f.). But Nehemiah's account, partly revised and supplemented by the Chronicler, is in disorder. We have to allow for his twelve years' governorship, and for a visit to Artaxerxes (v. 14, xiii. 6)—and his return. His impressive social reforms are set forth in a chapter which breaks the account of the rebuilding of the walls (iv. 23, vi. 1), and the account of his plans for repopulating the city (vii. 1-4, xi.) separates the completion of the walls from their dedication (vi., xii.). In spite of glosses which serve to associate Ezra and Nehemiah, they work independently; though it is possible that tradition ascribed Ezra's return to Nehemiah's *second* visit. But there is a vast difference between the labours of the impulsive dictator to rebuild the city, reorganize the temple-cultus, improve social conditions and put down intermarriage, and the work of Ezra, the priest, in introducing the Law and inaugurating a purged community amid peaceful and organized conditions. Ezra surely could not have preceded Nehemiah.

The complaint to Artaxerxes in the Aramaic passage, E iv. 7-23, is significant.⁸ It refers to the rebuilding of the city, the

⁷ Cf. 2 Chron. xxxiv. 33, where the land is purged after the Law had been read. The accusation in E iv. 6 and most of *vv.* 9-11 are wanting before E ii. 18.

walls and the foundations; and the extent of the ruin presupposes a disaster that surely cannot be placed, as some scholars believe, between E x. and N i. Ezra was fortified with sweeping powers, and his divorce-measures would hardly give rise to the situation that confronted Nehemiah. A more natural position for the complaint would be during Nehemiah's first visit, which apparently had been limited (N ii. 6). Jerusalem was notoriously rebellious (E iv. 15), and Nehemiah was accused of being a rebel. Prophets were active on both sides and letters went to and fro.⁹ Coincidence or not, the name of Tobiah the Ammonite corresponds to that of Tabeel, one of the signatories of the Aramaic document.¹⁰ There is an obvious gulf between Nehemiah's difficulties before N vii. and his measures in ch. xiii. The adversaries in E iv. 7-23 made a formal complaint, and the king's answer demanded a cessation of the rebuilding until a decree should be sent. Such a decree, we may conjecture, was granted to Nehemiah on his second visit—to which one tradition may also have ascribed Ezra's journey; even if his adversaries had used "force and power" (E iv. 23), this would not account for the work that lay before him on his first visit (N i.).

As a matter of fact, while E ix. 37-55 has placed the reading of the Law (N vii. 73-viii. 13a) after E x., Josephus gives Ezra complete priority; both, along with later evidence, testify to the absence of any early fixed tradition of the course of events.¹¹ Several scholars would place the story of Ezra wholly after that of Nehemiah, namely, in the seventh year of the *second* Artaxerxes, 397 B.C.¹² Kennett would synchronize it with Nehemiah's second visit.¹³ Even if it be of little or no historical value, the story of Ezra might well be the Chronicler's view of the inauguration of post-exilic Judaism, a later parallel to the account of the discovery of the book of the Law in 2 Kings xxii.

The situation in Jerusalem at Nehemiah's first visit is of extreme historical importance. The hopes aroused by Zerubbabel

⁹ N vi. 7, 12, 14, 17, 19, cf. E iv. 5a. Tobiah's prophets might well have echoed Zech. ii. 5: did Jerusalem need a protecting wall?

¹⁰ See Kent, *Israel's Hist. and Biog. Narratives* (1905), p. 358 f. (note). The "good deeds" of Tobiah (N vi. 19)—if the text be sound—scarcely justify the view (Klostermann and others) that Tabeel was on the side of Nehemiah.

¹¹ See *Esdras*, pp. 17, 57 f.

¹² See the references in H. H. Rowley, *Darius the Mede* (1935), p. 49 n.

¹³ *Church of Israel* (1933), p. 63.

and the rebuilding of the temple had been shattered; a grave disaster had befallen the sacred city. Measures were taken by Nehemiah to rebuild the ruins, repopulate the city, reorganize the temple-worship and establish religious and social order—they are the first steps in the inauguration of post-exilic Judaism (444–432 B.C.). Moreover we may expect to find in writings of the period notes of renewed lament and bitter grief, of encouragement and undying hope. This conclusion is important for the criticism of the prophetic books.

II. JUDAH AND HER NEIGHBOURS

Zerubbabel and Jeshua refused the co-operation of the Samaritans who claimed to have sacrificed regularly to Yahweh *here*, i.e., at Jerusalem (E iv. 2 f.).¹⁴ The situation at the erection of the altar, some months earlier, is obscure; E v. 50 (a doublet) speaks of people *coming* to help. In any case we have to reckon with the age-long rivalry between north and south; and although "Judaism and Samaritanism go back to a common foundation in the circumstances of the age of the Exile in the sixth century," orthodox Judah has written our sources for the history.¹⁵ Among the colonists introduced into Samaria (2 Kings xvii. 24, 30 f., E iv. 2, 9 f.) must also be included men of the desert tribes of Tamud (later well known), Haiapha (cf. the Midianite Ephah), and the Arbai (? Arabs). An Israelite priest was sent back to Bethel (2 Kings xvii. 28), and the worship of Yahweh persisted at the high-places (v. 32 f., cf. Judah in 2 Chron. xxxiii. 17). Josiah's reforms extended to Bethel and beyond (2 Kings xxiii. 15, 19); men of the north could visit the temple (Jer. xli. 5), and the Chronicler includes men of Ephraim and other tribes among Yahweh's worshippers (2 Chron. xv. 9, xxx. 11, 18 f., xxxiv. 9).¹⁶

Jeremiah and Ezekiel by no means repudiate the north. Men like Hosea and the writers of the Elohist source E did not necessarily die out. Yahweh's continued interest in (North) Israel is stressed by the writer of 2 Kings xiii. 5, 23, xiv. 26 f. But although

¹⁴ On the text, see Welch, *Post-exilic Judaism* (1935), pp. 151 ff.

¹⁵ J. A. Montgomery, *The Samaritans* (1907), ch. iv., especially pp. 47, 61.

¹⁶ See, more fully, Oesterley and Robinson, *History of Israel* (1932), vol. i, p. 383 f., vol. ii, pp. 145 ff.

the Ephraimite figure of Joshua was the hero of a Pan-Israel, the traditions of Saul, its first great king, are subordinated to those of the Judæan David. Deuteronomy, observes Burney, originated in the prophetic school of the Northern Kingdom after its fall.¹⁷ This view is not unfamiliar; indeed, the Deuteronomic reforming movement—whether Pan-Israelite or exclusively northern—may once have demanded as the central sanctuary, not Jerusalem, but Shechem, the scene of Joshua's covenant.¹⁸ In any case, in Deuteronomy and D. compilations, and in the account of Saul and the northern monarchy, we may recognize a process during which northern material was taken over by the south, and mutilated, revised or supplemented in favour of Judah and Jerusalem. It is a historical process that precedes and extends beyond the age of Zerubbabel.

This age was one of sweeping changes over a wide area. The old *Wellbild* lay in ruins; a new one was arising.¹⁹ Desert tribes were entering Palestine, and T. H. Robinson does not exaggerate when he observes that "the situation does not differ very greatly from that of Israel in the first generations after their entry into Canaan."²⁰ And it is in this period that "a movement of Jerahmeelites and Calebites into the neighbourhood of Bethlehem is most likely to be placed."²¹

Ever since Wellhausen's dissertation in 1870 on the Judæan genealogies in 1 Chron. ii. and iv., it has been recognized that they represent a sadly depleted Judah largely made up of the two semi-Edomite clans in question. These had their earlier seats in S. Judah (1 Sam. xxvii. 8, 10, xxx. 14, 29, cf. xv. 6), but subsequently moved north towards Jerusalem. The relevant material has been exhaustively handled by Ed. Meyer and B. Luther, who stress the political and cultural importance of a S. Palestinian or Edomitic bloc. Meyer notes also that, not only were the Rechabites associated with the south, but Calebite names can be traced among the men who helped Nehemiah, in a

¹⁷ *Judges* (1918), p. xlvii.; cf. Kennett (since 1905), esp. the article reprinted in *Church of Israel*, pp. 73-98; also Welch, *Deut.: the Framework of the Code* (1932), e.g., p. 201, "the Code of Deut. is the enduring monument to the effect produced by the prophets of N. Israel."

¹⁸ Josh. xxiv.; see Bentzen, *Die Josianische Reform* (1926), pp. 84 ff.

¹⁹ Kittel, *Gesch. d. Volkes Israels*, iii (1927), p. 41.

²⁰ *History of Israel*, i (1932), p. 383; similarly Winckler, *Keilinschriften u. d. A.T.* (1903), p. 151.

²¹ G. A. Cooke, *Ezekiel* (1936), pp. xxxvi, 384. Cf. G. F. Moore, *E. Bib.*, art. "Caleb," and Montgomery, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

list conspicuous for the absence of names of exiles who had returned (Neh. v.).²²

Next to be noticed is the relative paucity of specifically (North) Israelite tradition and the prominence of material that is (a) not so much Judæan as non-Israelite, (b) Pan-Israelite or (c) representative of a southern point of view.²³ Meyer dates the incorporation of Edomitic elements into Judah at the rise of David (pp. 442 ff.) ; and both A. R. Gordon and Gressmann recognize Kenite or S. Palestinian material introduced at or before the time of Saul.²⁴ The Rechabite movement at the rise of Jehu is regarded as a nomadic reaction against the culture of the day, and Morgenstern definitely finds a Kenite source.²⁵ The prominence of Jacob's brother Esau (Edom), Israel's debt to Kenites and Midianites, Yahweh's association with Sinai and Horeb (Deut. xxxiii. 2, Jud. v. 4, Hab. iii. 3, cf. v. 7), not to mention the revelation to Elijah at Horeb, with literary points of contact with Moses at Horeb (1 Kings xix. 8 ff., Exod. xxxiii. 18-xxxiv. 8)—here is material which, of whatever date or dates, we now owe to post-exilic compilers. Moreover, besides material with at least semi-Edomite associations, we have to deal with traces of traditions of a separate movement from Kadesh into Palestine (especially Num. xxi. 1-3). The prominence of Caleb, "my servant" (Num. xiv. 24, cf. Abraham, Gen. xxvi. 24, and Moses, Num. xii. 7) and the promise of an inheritance to Caleb and his seed point to a specifically "Calebite" tradition older than his appearance as a representative of Judah (Num. xxxiv. 19) and his subordination to Joshua (xiv. 6-15).²⁶

²² See I.N. (*Israeliten u. ihre Nachbarstämme*, 1906), esp. pp. 398 f., 399 n. 1, 409, 429 n. 5 ; and Meyer, *Gesch. d. Allertums* (2nd ed., 1931), ii, pp. 2, 215 f., 237 ff. The Rechabites were still independent in Jeremiah's day (ch. xxxv.). Wellhausen's argument (referred to in the text) has been generally regarded as conclusive ; and I am quite unable to understand Noth's early date for 1 Chron. ii. and iv., viz. soon after the death of Solomon (Z.D.P.V., 1932, pp. 97-124).

²³ Meyer, I.N., pp. 472, 478 ; Luther, *ibid.*, p. 159. On the difference between this recognition of Calebite, Jerahmeelite and related material and Cheyne's sweeping textual Jerahmeelite theory, I may refer to *Ency. Brit.* (11th ed., 1911), art. "Jews," p. 387.

²⁴ Respectively, *Early Traditions of Genesis* (1907), pp. 74 f., 168, 188 ; and Z.A.W., xxx (1910), pp. 15, 26, 29.

²⁵ I.N., pp. 84 f., 136 ff. ; Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 299, 350, 369 ff. ; Morgenstern, *Amos Studies* (1941), I, pp. 196, 254 f., 293 ff. Cf. also Menes, B.Z.A.W., 50 (1928), and Pfeiffer, Z.A.W., N.F., vii (1930), pp. 66-73, and his *Introduction to the O.T.* (1941), ch. iii.

²⁶ Burney (*op. cit.*, p. 45 f., cf. p. 341), too, speaks of a "Calebite" tradition. See also my *Critical Notes on O.T. History* (1907), ch. vi and p. 134 f.

External or desert influence was not confined to any one period ; and, besides the entry that stands at the head of Israel's history as a people and the events at the rise of Jehu, we must surely reckon also with the sweeping changes round about the sixth century B.C. Here we approach the age of D., P., and Chron., and it may well be that a recollection of more recent " wanderings in the wilderness " and the occupation of cities and vineyards (Deut. vi. 10 f., Neh. ix. 25, Ps. cv. 44, cf. Ezek. xxxiii. 24) has shaped the material they have preserved. Moreover, Burney's theory,²⁷ that a new stage in the culture of Palestine was due to the initial entry of Israel inspired by the teaching of Moses, is equally suggestive for the time of Elijah and Elisha, the Rechabites and Jehu. Nor can we ignore the possibility that at the still later period a new spirit entered and influenced the storm-swept land. In any case, the significance of that period for the growth of O.T. history and religion should not be underestimated, as is too often done.

III. THE TEMPLE PERSONNEL

The Chronicler, who is well acquainted with traditions of wars and attacks from the south,²⁸ places a semi-Edomite Judah at the head of his work, and throughout is notoriously interested in the temple-*personnel*. Of the Levitical names in general, some are Judæan (e.g., Hebroni),²⁹ and some are Edomite (e.g., Korah). The god of Edom is not pilloried as are Chemosh of Moab and Milcom of Ammon, and we encounter the gods Hadad, probably in the prominent Henadad " the favour of Hadad " (E iii. 9, N iii. 24), Kaush in Kushaiah (1 Chron. xv. 17), and the later Kos in Barkos, one of the Nethinim (E ii. 53). The connexion between Moses and his sons and Levitical and Aaronite names is well known ; but it is to be observed that Israel's debt to the southern clans is obscured. Whereas Jethro's part in advising Moses (Exod. xviii.) implies that " the Hebrew priesthood is affiliated to

²⁷ J.T.S., 1908, pp. 344 ff. ; cf. his *Judges*, p. 330 n.

²⁸ Elmslie, *Chronicles* (1916), pp. xxxiv. f., l, 257 f., 262, 287.

²⁹ Micah's Levite from Bethlehem was known to the Danites of Zorah and Eshtaol (Jud. xviii. 3), and from Bethlehem the Levite of Mt. Ephraim had taken his concubine (xix. 1). The three place-names recur in a " Calebite " list, and with Salma the " father " of Bethlehem we may compare the later Targumic term for the Kenites (1 Chron. ii. 50 ff., iv. 4).

the Midianite,"³⁰ in Deut. i. 9-18 Moses himself takes the initiative. And although the father-in-law of Moses evidently accompanied the Israelites (Jud. i. 16), the sequel to the invitation is omitted (Num. x. 29 ff.), and the stress is laid upon the ark, the Presence (Exod. xxxiii. 14), the Name (Exod. xxxiii. 21), and the seventy elders who share the burden of Moses (Num. xi.).³¹

The curse pronounced upon Simeon and Levi (Gen. xlix.) recalls Hosea's condemnation of the bloodshed of Jezreel (Hos. i. 4, 2 Kings x.). Moreover, the Aaronite Phinehas is praised for an act which ended in the massacre of the Midianites (Num. xxv., xxxi.). It was on the occasion of their murderous zeal, when Aaron had made the Golden Calf, that the Levites were instituted (Exod. xxxii. 25 ff.); and here the point is, surely, not that members of a secular tribe (cf. Gen. xxxiv.) distinguished themselves, but that those Israelites who were on the side of Moses and Yahweh now became a distinctive caste.³² They renounced family ties.³³ But it is difficult to disentangle the traditions. Moses made the ark, and the Levites were set apart to carry it (Deut. x. 8). The ornaments used to make the Golden Calf (cf. Gideon's idol, Jud. viii. 24 ff.) seem otherwise to be connected with the Tent of Meeting (Exod. xxxiii. 4-6, 7 ff.), and the latter is overshadowed in P. by the Tabernacle, in the construction of which the Calebite Bezalel took an honoured part (Exod. xxxi. 2, etc., 2 Chron. i. 5). The Golden Calf is associated with Aaron, who was saved from Yahweh's wrath by the intercession of Moses (Deut. ix. 20). But the calf-cult is otherwise associated, not with the subsequent head of the priesthood, but with the first king of the Northern

³⁰ G. B. Gray, *Sacrifice in the O.T.* (1925), pp. 207 ff. The account, whether "ancient" (Gray) or not, is at least an independent one.

³¹ Note the names Jether (Jethro), Miriam and the Kenizzite Othniel in 1 Chron. iv. 13, 17; and, with the "primitive" type of wish for the domain of Jabez, the Calebite (iv. 9 f., ii. 55), cf. the promise of an inheritance to Caleb himself in Num. xiv. 24. Smend holds that J. and E. are of Judæan priestly origin, and that we read the oldest history of Israel through "Mosaic" eyes (*Erzählung d. Hex.*, 1912, pp. 33, 352, 356, 359). On the *Lehrbuch-charakter* of the popular narratives, cf. Stier, *Gott. u. s. Engel i. A.T.*, 1934, p. 158 n. For the Calebite scribal families, see 1 Chron. ii. 55, and for the "Levitical" traditions, see Meyer, I.N., pp. 83-89, 167. We may add that Samuel's grandfather was a Jeroham or Jerahmeel (1 Sam. i. 1, LXX), and late tradition made Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah Simeonites, and Obadiah an Edomite proselyte.

³² Gressmann, *Mose* (1913), p. 212 n. 1. Cf., not the sacred tribe of the Magi, but the transition from the Brahman by vocation to the Brahman caste.

³³ So Deut. xxxiii. 9; cf. the injunction in Deut. xiii. 6 ff., and the words of Jesus, Matt. x. 35 ff.

Monarchy, whose offence it was to make priests who were not of the Levites (1 Kings xii. 31, xiii. 33).³⁴

Evidence for continued and intricate treatment of priestly and Levitical traditions is further at hand in the many allusions to disputed authority and priestly rivalry. The complaint of Miriam and Aaron against the wife of Moses (Num. xii.), the character of the "Mosaic" cults at Dan and Shiloh, and the highly composite account of Korah's revolt in Num. xvi., are to be supplemented by the condemnation of priests elsewhere.³⁵ Levi had his opponents (Deut. xxxiii. 11); but Levites are also condemned in contrast to Zadokites (Ezek. xliv. 10 ff.). Whatever be our view regarding the evidence so briefly summarized here, it is obvious that it cannot be severed from our ideas of the inner history of the age of Zerubbabel.

Material for this inner history may be found in the *dated* prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah i.-viii.³⁶ Here there is no exclusiveness of returned exiles, as in E iii.; on the contrary, Jews (? or Gentiles) will come and assist in the temple (Zech. vi. 15, cf. viii. 22, Hag. ii. 7, and Isa. ix. 13). Even in the fourth year of Darius (Zech. vii. 1; 518 B.C.) there is no hint of external opposition, as in the Aramaic document (E v. f.); the conflicts are internal (cf. Zech. viii. 10). Temple-priests could be consulted (Hag. ii. 11, Zech. vii. 3, 5); some sort of cult existed before the rebuilding.³⁷ Haggai condemns the uncleanness of "this people,

³⁴ Cf. also 2 Chron. xiii. 9 f. Besides the recurrence of the same words in 1 Kings xii. 28, Exod. xxxii. 8 ("these are thy gods . . ."), we may compare Abijah and Nadab, the sons of Jeroboam, whose dynasty was eradicated, with Nadab and Abihu, the eldest sons of Aaron, who, despite their high standing (cf. Exod. xxiv. 9), perished unmourned and without issue, for a ritual offence (Lev. x. 1-6). For another coincidence(?) may we compare the Shemaiah who favoured Jeroboam against Rehoboam (1 Kings xii. 22 ff. and LXX v. 24°) with the opponent of Nehemiah (N vi. 10 ff.)?

³⁵ Jer. v. 31, vi. 13, xxiii. 11-14, Ezek. xxii. 26, xlvi. 11, Hos. iv. 6, Lam. iv. 13, 2 Chron. xxix. 34, xxx. 3, 15, xxxvi. 14. Cf. Smend, *op. cit.*, pp. 353, 359, on the interest in priestly antagonisms, and note the not uncommon textual fluctuation where priests and Levites are concerned, e.g. Isa lxvi. 21; cf. *Esdras*, p. 17 (foot).

³⁶ Are the dates always reliable? See Welch, *Post-exilic Judaism*, pp. 162 ff., on Hag. ii. 10-14.

³⁷ Cf. Jer. xli. 5, Lam. i. 4; see Welch, *op. cit.*, p. 160 f.; Lods, *The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism* (1937), p. 208. From Zech. vii. it seems that priests from Bethel would consult those of Jerusalem. The enquiry as to fasting (Zech. vii. 1-7, viii. 18 ff.) is broken by the prophet's appeal to priests and people for justice and truth, cf. Mal. iii. 5, and especially Isa. lviii.

this folk" (i. 2, ii. 14; cf. Mal. iii. 9): sanctity is not contagious, as in Isa. lxxv. 5, etc., but the "unclean" pollutes all that it touches. Lands other than Yahweh's are "unclean" (cf. Am. vii. 17, Ezek. iv. 13, and especially Josh. xxii. 19); Yahweh is now returning to his inheritance (Zech. i. 16, ii. 11, viii. 3), but his sanctuary has not been prepared for him (cf. Ezek. xxxvii. 26-28).³⁸ The present distress has, as elsewhere, a ritual cause (cf. 2 Chron. xxxi. 10, Zech. xiv. 16 f.), and conditions improve when the foundations have been laid (Hag. ii. 15-19, cf. i. 6, 9-11, Zech. viii. 9 ff.).

Meanwhile the high-priest Joshua is arraigned (Zech. iii.); as "a brand plucked out of the fire" he is one who (after Am. iv. 11) should have returned to Yahweh. The promise for the future depends on his faithfulness; and Zech. iii. 7 is, so to say, the charter of the priesthood, giving it complete control over the temple and access to the presence of Yahweh (cf. the ruler in Jer. xxx. 21).³⁹ Malachi, too, whatever its date, addresses a negligent people and priesthood; with the failure of crops it associates the failure to pay the full tithes (iii. 10 f., cf. Judith xi. 10-13). By false teaching the priests have corrupted Yahweh's covenant with Levi; but Levi shall be purged (Mal. ii. 1-9, iii. 3 f.), and the true priesthood is as Yahweh's Messenger or Angel. Intermarriages defiled the covenant of the priesthood (N xiii. 27 ff., cf. E x. 18 f.), and a difficult passage (Mal. ii. 10-16) condemns both (lay?) intermarriage and divorce.⁴⁰

In Zech. vi. 9-15, on the occasion of the visit of some exiles (?) from Babylon, the high-priest is told that the Shoot (cf. iii. 8) is to rebuild the temple. Zerubbabel is not named; but the promised "counsel of peace" between them points to the healing of some breach. The passage ends abruptly (*v.* 15*b*, contrast, e.g., Jer. xvii. 24). A joint rule also seems to be implied by the two olive branches in Zech. iv., where, however, *vv.* 6-10*a*, which concern Zerubbabel alone, are of independent origin. We may compare the association of David and the Levites in 2 Chron. xiii. 8 ff. (also in Jer. xxxiii. 14-26, wanting in LXX) and the royal and priestly families in Zech. xii. 12 ff. On the other hand,

³⁸ In Josh. v. 2-9 the Israelites must be circumcised before entering the land promised by Yahweh to their forefathers.

³⁹ Note the Chronicler on Uzziah's sin (2 Chron. xxvi. 18, xxvii. 2) and Nehemiah's reluctance to enter the temple (Neh. vi. 11).

⁴⁰ Joshua, according to the Targum on Zech. iii. 3, is to expel his sons who had taken women unfit to be the wives of priests.

the promise to the Davidic house alone is familiar, e.g., Jer. xxiii. 5 (the righteous Shoot),⁴¹ xxx. 9, Ezek. xxxvii. 24; and with Zech. xii. 8 (the house of David as the Angel of Yahweh) contrast Joshua in Zech. iii. 7 and the divine priesthood in Mal. ii. 7 (there is no Davidic figure in Malachi). The text of Zech. vi. 9-15 is in a mutilated state; it ignores Zerubbabel and is thus in harmony with the later supremacy of the high-priest.

In view of this evidence it is difficult to believe that the last word has been said on the criticism of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi. Some have felt tempted to date Malachi and the Trito-Isaiah in the time of Zerubbabel.⁴² On the other hand, according to E vi. 14 (see E vii. 4) the temple was built by the decree of "Cyrus, and Darius, and Artaxerxes king of Persia." The list E ii., if authentic, would be unsuitable for Nehemiah's purpose (N vii.), and it includes him among the twelve leaders of the return (see on E v. 8); in N xii. 47 he and Zerubbabel are combined. Naturally there might be several occasions when the temple and its *personnel* needed attention; and when we consider the variety of traditions and the intricacies of the criticism both of Ezra-Nehemiah and of the prophetic writings, we cannot be surprised that many problems of O.T. history and religion still elude an acceptable solution.

IV. THE AGE OF ARTAXERXES

For the time of Artaxerxes we are on firmer ground. The city was in a state of ruin, the temple neglected (N xiii. 11, cf. x. 39). The people were oppressed by their own brethren and by the Persians; heavy tribute was exacted, and they were as servants in their own land (N v., ix. 36 f., cf. Isa. lxii. 8 f., lxxv. 21 f., Lam. v. 8). With Nehemiah's zeal for the Sabbath (N xiii. 15 ff., cf. x. 31), compare Isa. lvi. 1-8, lviii. 13; and with the Tyrian traders (N xiii. 16), contrast the exultation of Tyre in

⁴¹ Skinner thinks that a date more nearly contemporary with Zerubbabel is "conceivable" (*Prophecy and Religion*, 1922, p. 312 n.).

⁴² On the criticism of Is. xl.-lxvi. there is considerable variety of opinion: see Welch, *op. cit.*, pp. 113 f., 241 f.; and cf. his *Work of the Chronicler* (1939), p. 156; Sidney Smith, *Isa. xl.-lv.* (1944), pp. 4 f., 89 f.; Eissfeldt, *Record and Revelation* (ed. H. W. Robinson, 1938), p. 96 f., and his *Einleitung i. d. A.T.* (1934), pp. 371 ff., esp. p. 387. (Cf. also p. 632, n. 2, where Eissfeldt suggests that there is an apparent confusion of Zerubbabel and Nehemiah in 2 Macc. i.)

Ezek. xxvi. 2 with the promise in Zech. xiv. 21*b*. Nehemiah's enemies are not Persian officials, but men of Moab, Ammon and Edom (Gashmu the Arabian); they are the three foes in Judith vii. 8, 18.⁴³ For Moab and Ammon, compare the nationality of the murderers of Joash in 2 Chron. xxiv. 26 (not in 2 Kings xii. 21). Tobiah, the Ammonite, bears the name of a later powerful family on the Hellenist side; and the earlier enmity of the Ammonite Baalis and Ishmael of the seed-royal (Jer. xl. 14-xli. 18) is significant.⁴⁴ There were grave internal differences, and this would not be the only occasion when prophets took sides (N vi. 7-14).⁴⁵ And, as for the part played by Edom and the later Idumæans, it is pertinent to look back to the Edomite Doeg who slew the priests of Nob (1 Sam. xxii.), and forward to the slaughter of the high-priests Ananus and Jesus by the Idumæans and Zealots.⁴⁶

Attacks upon Judah and Jerusalem were not rare,⁴⁷ and both the disappearance of Zerubbabel and the hostility to Nehemiah are, not unreasonably, to be attributed to political rivalry (cf. N ii. 19, vi. 6-8, E iv. 13). An Edomite attack is explicitly mentioned in E iv. 45, 50, when the Chaldæans desolated Judæa; and, in fact, for Syria (Aram) in 2 Kings xxiv. 2 some would read Edom. But the text is supported by Jer. xxxv. 11; and Edom, where some Jews had taken refuge (*ibid.* xl. 11), joined in the league against Babylon (*ibid.* xxvii. 3). Edomites take the place

⁴³ Cf. also 2 Chron. xx. 10, and the recurrence of the three (together with other foes) in the newly discovered Hebrew roll of the defeat of the "children of darkness" by Israel, the "children of light."

⁴⁴ It may not be a coincidence that Tobiah, who is among those honoured in the obscure passage which now ignores Zerubbabel (Zech. vi. 10, 14), is also the name of Nehemiah's adversary, who had priestly connexions (N. vi. 17 f., xiii. 4, 7 f.) and of one of the families expelled from the priesthood (E. ii. 60, N. vii. 62); another family bears the name Delaiah, which is also that of a son of Sanballat (cf. N. xiii. 28) mentioned in the Elephantine papyri.

⁴⁵ Cf. E. iv. 5, and the part played by "false" prophets in the conflicts among Jews, Idumæans and Zealots in Jos. *War*, i. xviii, 1, § 347, ii, xiii, 4 f., § 259, vi, v, 2 f., §§ 285 f., 288.

⁴⁶ Jos. *War*, iv, v, 2, §§ 314 ff. Did the Zealots ever fancy a connexion between the name of the Kenites (קניזי), which the Targum avoids, and their own (קניזי)? See above, p. 27, n. 29. When Josephus (*War*, iv, vi, 3) mentions the belief that internal sedition would bring the temple to ruin we may compare Lam. iv. 13 ff., where also Edom is condemned and threatened with punishment (v. 21 f.). It may also be added that a Zerahite held a prominent civil post in Nehemiah's day (N xi. 24); but N xi. 6 omits the statement in 1 Chron. ix. 6 that this semi-Edomite clan (Meyer, I.N., p. 350) dwelt in Jerusalem, and also the presence of men of Ephraim and Manasseh (1 Chron. ix. 3).

⁴⁷ Cf. Elmslie on 2 Chron. xx. 37, xxi. 16 and *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, iii, p. 367.

of Amorites in *E* viii. 69 (*E* ix. 1); but in *N* xiii. 1-3 (cf. Deut. xxiii. 7) they are not excluded from the community, like Ammon and Moab, unless they are among the "mixed multitude" (מִצְרַיִם). Yet Edom's "unbrotherly" hostility is fiercely condemned. She had exulted over Zion's sufferings and had harried her refugees (*Ps.* cxxxvii. 7, *Ob.* 10-15).⁴⁸ But she was doomed (*Lam.* iv. 21 f., *Isa.* xxxiv. 5-8). The Trito-Isaiah knows of the desecration of the city after a brief occupation (*lxiii.* 18), and of her ruined walls (*lxiv.* 9 ff.).⁴⁹ But Yahweh's anger would pass (*liv.* 7 ff., *lx.* 10 f.), she would no longer be helpless (as in *lix.* 16 f.) and forsaken (*lxii.* 4, 12); the day of vengeance was at hand (*lxiii.* 1-6). The respite came (? *E* ix. 8 f.), and Edom was destroyed (*Mal.* i. 2-4). There had been a fresh disaster to Jerusalem before Nehemiah arrived. Had Edomites burnt the temple and occupied cities (*E* iv. 45, 50)?⁵⁰ Was Nehemiah, as his name suggests, the "comforter" sent by Yahweh (cf. *Isa.* li. 3, lii. 8 f.)? So, his return and rebuilding lead to suspicion and enmity, to the official intervention (*E* iv. 7-23), and, finally, to his second return, this time in a stronger position (p. 23 above). But *Esdra*s has placed this Edomite attack before the return of Zerubbabel in the reign of Darius I, the predecessor of Artaxerxes I; whereas Torrey, quite independently, while rejecting the story in *E* iii. f., throughout identifies the king with Darius II (423-404), who is the immediate predecessor of Artaxerxes II (404-359 B.C.)!⁵¹

Jerusalem, whether Benjamite (*Josh.* xviii. 28, *Jud.* i. 21) or Judæan (*Josh.* xv. 63), had close Samaritan and semi-Edomite neighbours. A late interest was taken in the genealogies of Judah and Benjamin (*1 Chron.* ii., iv., viii.), and no doubt also in their traditions. The list of Judæan names in *N* xi. 25-31 is certainly suspicious;⁵² but can we believe that the circumscribed Jerusalem of *N* iii. represents the effective area from 586 B.C. to the Maccabæan period? There is, as yet, no Samaritan schism,

⁴⁸ Cf. Amalek in Deut. xxv. 17 ff.

⁴⁹ See the commentaries on these passages, also L. E. Browne, *Early Judaism* (1920), pp. 124-133.

⁵⁰ See *Esdra*s, p. 13 f., Kennett, *Church of Israel* (1933), p. 61; S. H. Blank, *Heb. Union Coll. Annual*, xi (1936), pp. 171 ff., 182, 192; also Morgenstern, *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, x, p. 356.

⁵¹ Note the order of Darius II to the Jews of Elephantine in 419 B.C. in the so-called "Passover" papyrus (Cowley, No. 21).

⁵² When Batten (I.C.C., p. 274) suggests that the men who "encamped" (*v.* 30) had recently arrived, was it to re-occupy the cities seized by Edom (*E* iv. 50)?

but there is emphasis on ritual "cleanness" and the priesthood (p. 29 f., cf. also Isa. lxvi. 20, Zech. xiv. 21). The Jews of Elephantine (in 411-408 B.C.) appealed vainly to Jerusalem for help; and, as is well known, later, at all events, serious priestly conflicts rent the Jews.⁵³ The Jews were becoming the people of the book⁵⁴; but the story of the rise of an exclusive post-exilic Judaism is incomplete unless we recall the longing for the return of exiles from afar, from Elephantine (Syene, Isa. xlix. 12) and the distant Sardis (Sepharad, Ob. 20).⁵⁵

V. CONCLUSIONS

It must be freely admitted that, despite the labours of a long line of scholars—and notably of C. C. Torrey, to whom so much is owed—the problems (especially that of the identity of the Persian kings) still await a satisfactory solution. The biblical sources are excessively complex. In the light of Haggai and Zechariah we must make up our minds regarding the return of Sheshbazzar and of Zerubbabel and the rebuilding of the Temple. Next, we cannot suppose that the conditions in Jerusalem on Nehemiah's first visit date from the fall of Jerusalem in 597 and 586. Even if N i. ff. are to be read after E vii.-x., they cannot represent the result of Ezra's initial reforms. Some recent attack must be postulated, and in it Edom appears to have been prominent. Moreover, the steps taken by the officials in E iv. 7-23 can be read most naturally along with N vi., as Kent suggested (see n. 10). Ezra cannot be fitted in before the advent of Nehemiah. Tradition possibly associated his work—whatever be its true historical value—with Nehemiah's *second* visit; and only subsequently were attempts made to introduce him, partly (as in E vii.-x.) or wholly (as in Josephus), before Nehemiah.

Some fresh disaster (? c. 485 B.C.) and Nehemiah's extensive reorganization constitute events which cannot be ignored. Nehemiah it was who inaugurated post-exilic Judaism, and while Ben-Sira (xlix. 13) names him (as a builder of the walls) but

⁵³ Can Zech. xiv. 18 (the family of Egypt) refer to Elephantine? Also, if the name of Nabal the Calebite befitted his nature (1 Sam. xxv. 25), do the "dogs" (כלבים) in Isa. lvi. 10 f. hint at that clan?

⁵⁴ Cf. Gray, *Sacrifice in the O.T.*, p. 238.

⁵⁵ Cf. the Lydian-Aramaic bilingual from Sardis and the mention of Lud in Isa. lxvi. 19; see J.H.S., xxxvii (1917), pp. 77 ff., 219 ff., and Torrey, A.J.S.L. xxxiv, pp. 185 ff. Note also the generous spirit of Isa. lxvi. 21.

omits Ezra, later tradition, on the one hand, ascribed to him the building of the Temple—the *Third* Temple (2 Macc. i. 8), and, on the other, increasingly magnified the debt of Judaism to Ezra.⁵⁶ It has, indeed, seemed possible to construct a series of references to the new disaster in Is. xl.–lxvi. (p. 33), but the criticism of the prophetic writings becomes more intricate than ever if we have to recognize shocks, comparable to those after 597 and 586, but surely far more distressing, coming as they did after the rebuilding of the Second Temple under Zerubbabel.

Meanwhile, we have further to reckon with (a) the unwritten, but certainly not negligible history of Judah's northern neighbour after 721 and before the actual Samaritan schism, and (b) the prominence of South Palestinian and Edomitic—later, Idumæan—factors. They were men who did not suffer the Judæan exile, and therefore did not share the retrospect of those who returned. Similarly, there are indications of a "patriarchal tradition," which had no place for a descent into Egypt, an Exodus and a settlement under Joshua.⁵⁷ Both these conclusions certainly deserve more attention than they have hitherto received.

Finally, the vicissitudes of the priests and Levites present formidable problems. Skinner has suggested the possible existence of a great work on northern prophecy; and here, as elsewhere, the activity of the "sons of the prophets" may be conjectured. Moreover, a continuous history of the temple has also sometimes been postulated.⁵⁸ Nor should we fail to recall the tantalizing reference to the scribal families in 1 Chron. ii. 55 (cf. also xxiv. 6), and to supplement the advice given to Moses by the Midianite priest (Ex. xviii. 21–26, see n. 30) by the numerous references to the function of priests and Levites as administrators and teachers.⁵⁹

Space has allowed only the barest outline of the data upon which to base any reconstruction of O.T. history and religion. The "canonical" history recognizes only one great Israelite

⁵⁶ Morgenstern has confidently even ascribed the building of this Third Temple to Ezra; see H.U.C.A., xxi. (1948), p. 458.

⁵⁷ This view of Ed. Meyer is favourably regarded by the cautious Skinner in his *Genesis*, pp. xxiii, 418, 422, 450, 507, 512. Cf. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altertums*, ii (1931), p. 204, nn. 2, 3; also *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, ii, p. 359 f.

⁵⁸ See Skinner, *Kings* (Century Bible), p. 29, and cf. J.Q.R., April 1908, p. 617 f.

⁵⁹ 2 Chron. xv. 3, xvii. 7–9, xix. 8–13, xxxi. 4, xxxv. 3, E viii. 16, N ix. 7 also Deut. xvii. 9, xxxi. 9–13. Cf. esp. Smend's work, above, nn. 31, 35.

entry, one final division of the Monarchies and the exile of the Ten Tribes, one great disaster to the temple, one rebuilding and one return which became the hope of Israel. Further the scheme in Gen. vi.-xii. represents a catastrophe, an unsuccessful recovery followed by a divine judgement, the call of Abraham and the beginning of the "canonical" history of the Chosen People. This scheme may not be fortuitous if we recall the hopes of recovery aroused by Zerubbabel and the Second Temple, the failure of these hopes, the fresh disaster, and the work of Nehemiah in laying the foundation of Post-exilic Judaism.⁶⁰

To conclude, the Fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., the Exile and the Return are naturally regarded as the great turning-point in O.T. history. On closer inspection, however, these are found to be only part of events no less significant; and as this article has endeavoured to indicate in outline, it is impossible to resist the conviction that the internal developments in Palestine during the seventh to fifth centuries B.C. are of fundamental importance for our conceptions of the growth of the O.T. and the course of the religion of Israel.

S. A. COOK.⁶¹

⁶⁰ "Truth" of the Bible (1938), p. 51 f.; *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, vi, p. 197 f.; cf. (partly) Kennett, *O.T. Essays* (1928), pp. 10, 21.

⁶¹ I am indebted to the Rev. E. W. Heaton for reading the proofs of this essay and for a number of helpful suggestions and criticisms.

THE YAHWISTIC TRADITION IN THE EIGHTH-CENTURY PROPHETS

MODERN study of the Bible has achieved one of its abiding gains by setting the so-called canonical prophets of the O.T. against their social, economic and political background.¹ This study has not only given us the contemporary context of much of the material in the prophetic books, but has interpreted the place of the prophets and their contemporaries in the history of Israel as Yahweh's people.² It has further taught us to regard Israel's³ settlement in Canaan as another illustration of that transition from the Desert to the Sown,⁴ which has often been made at different times by different groups of the human race in widely separated parts of the world. Something of the uniqueness of Israel's great prophets emerges when it is realized that they are in fact offering a spiritual interpretation of that enrichment of Israel's culture which followed upon this settlement in Canaan. Yet not only is their uniqueness thus manifest but also their relevance. For it is their experience of life, their diagnosis of the general religious condition of their people, and the conclusions which they draw, especially as these are crystallized for us, not only in their own works, but also in the hortatory portions of the Book of Deuteronomy, which have become the signposts for the

¹ An exhaustive bibliography is not possible within the compass of these notes, but I would specially refer to W. R. Smith, *The Prophets of Israel*, 1882; T. H. Robinson, *Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel*, 1923; W. C. Graham, *The Prophets and Israel's Culture*, 1934, and Graham's Selected Bibliography, *op. cit.*, pp. 99-111. Similarly the references in the following notes will be illustrative and selective only.

² Cf. Amos ii. 9 f., iii. 1 f., v. 25, ix. 7; Hosea ii. 15, viii. 13, xi. 1, xii. 9, 13 (Eng.), xiii. 4 f.; Micah vi. 4 f.; Isa. v. 1-7; Jer. vii. 22, xi. 7, xxxi. 32, xxxiv. 13; Ezek. xvi., etc.

³ The term "Israel" is here used loosely of the various groups who at different times and from different directions entered Canaan to become the Israelite kingdoms of later days. Cf. G. A. Danell, *Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament*, 1946.

⁴ This well-known phrase is here used though, in Israel's case, allowance must be made for the observations of W. F. Albright, *Archæology and the Religion of Israel*, 1942, pp. 95-102. Cf. also T. H. Robinson, *op. cit.*, Chapter II and various illustrations in Peake and Fleure, *The Corridors of Time*, and especially Volume v, *The Steppe and The Sown*, 1928.

oracles" are found in Isaiah, where their nature is equally clear. In viii. 3-4 a private oracle of four words is interpreted in a partially developed public oracle following. The rhythmic sentence with its emotion-charged gutturals and sibilants, is not a summary of the message, condensed for inscription, but its primary form. How else could a prophet receive the impulse to speak a particular message, but in some word or phrase embodying the idea, however enigmatic it might be? It is a fact of our own experience that, under strong religious emotion, what comes into the mind is often a word or phrase articulating the conviction with which the emotion is associated. Sometimes, as with Jeremiah and Amos, the idea is suggested by a word similar in sound, which by chance comes into the mind. The *qayic—qēc* of Amos viii. 2 is what might be called a "primary oracle of assonance." These primary oracles not only became the text from which the public, literary oracles were developed, but were themselves sometimes published, either in writing (cf. Isa. viii. 1; xxx. 8-9; Hab. ii. 2-4), or as names given to children (cf. Isa. vii. 3, 14; viii. 3; Hos. i. 4, 6, 9). Perhaps Isaiah's own name which, like that of his children, was to be a sign and wonder in Israel, came to him in a moment of the higher prophetic ecstasy. Again, the name given by Jeremiah to Pashhur, *māgôr miššābīb*, was an enigmatic phrase which later became the text of a denunciation (Jer. xx. 3-4).

In Isa. v. 7 the play on the words *ç'dāqā—ç'āqā* recalls the "primary oracle of assonance" referred to above, and this suggests that we may look for the primary oracle to be preserved sometimes as the text or climax of a literary oracle. The *lō' ta'āminū—lō' tē'āmēnū* of vii. 9 is a probable example. In xxx. 15 *b'shūbā tiwāshē'ūn* has a kind of inverted assonance, emphatic gutturals and sibilants, and serves as a text for what follows. Other possible occurrences in 1 Isaiah are found at i. 16, 23; iii. 1; viii. 6; ix. 17; xxix. 2; xxx. 1; xxxi. 1, 2.

All of these examples have certain common characteristics—they are brief, striking, enigmatic and marked by strong rhythm, verbal symmetry, paronomasia, assonance and a preponderance of sibilant and guttural sounds. All contain the quintessence of longer oracles. It seems probable that they preserve the prophet's first articulation of the Word which Yahweh was putting into his mind and on his lips.

R. B. Y. SCOTT.

THE SERVANT OF THE LORD IN DEUTERO-ISAIAH

(a) THE SO-CALLED SERVANT SONGS

IN 1875 Duhm published his *Die Theologie der Propheten*, in which he isolated four pieces in Isa. xl.-lv., and called them the four 'Ebed-Jahve-Lieder, the Servant Songs. These four pieces are xlii. 1-4, xlix. 1-6, l. 4-9, lii. 13-14. 12. Some few scholars have argued against their segregation from the main body of the prophecy, notably Marti (1900), Giesebrecht (1902), Budde (1922) and Roman Catholic scholars generally. The great majority, however, have followed Duhm, to such an extent that the existence of the four Servant Songs has come to be regarded as one of the firm results of modern O.T. study.

Modern developments in the study of the prophets have, nevertheless, in our judgement, rendered Duhm's position much less secure than is generally recognized. The most recent view is that there is no "main body of the prophecy" in anything like the sense in which it was once the custom to use the phrase. We have learned to think of the prophetic books as "collections of independent and usually short oracles, poems and the like."¹ As we have pointed out elsewhere,² the conception of four distinct Servant Songs depended largely on the assumption that there was a main body of prophecy out of which they could be extracted. Both ideas stand or fall together. In Isa. xl.-lv. we have "a great number of separate pieces,³ in some of which there are references to the Servant, but with four of them at the end of the scale, similar enough in substance for Duhm to be led to notice them particularly and to isolate them from the rest."⁴ It is therefore not surprising that there has been considerable discussion as to

¹ O. Eissfeldt, "The Literature of Israel: Modern Criticism," in *Record and Revelation* (ed. H. Wheeler Robinson, 1938), p. 94. See also T. H. Robinson, "After Fifty Years: IV. Higher Criticism and the Prophetic Literature," in *E.T.*, 1 (1938-39), p. 200 f.

² "The So-called Servant Songs" in *E.T.*, lvi (1944-45), pp. 79-81.

³ These pieces have been worked out in detail by S. Mowinckel, "Die Komposition des deuterocesajanischen Buches," in *Z.A.W.* (1931), pp. 87-112, 242-60, and by W. Caspari, *Lieder und Gottessprüche der Rückwanderer (Jes 40-55)* (1934).

⁴ *E.T.*, lvi, p. 80.

the exact limits of these so-called Servant Songs, and that other pieces within the sixteen chapters have been proposed as additions to them. We can see now why these discussions arose. There are no four pieces which can be separated so markedly from the rest. It is wrong, therefore, to assume *a priori* that the Servant of the four pieces, either of all four or of any one of them, is different from the Servant of any of the other pieces which form the sixteen chapters. The presumption is that the prophet had substantially the same idea in all the forty-odd pieces. A difference in the identity of the Servant can be suggested only if and when the contents of any one separate and particular piece clearly demand it.

(b) THE RIGHTEOUS REMNANT

The prophets made two distinctive contributions to the development of the religion of Israel. The first is that sin merits and inevitably receives a full penalty. The second, even more important, is that this is far from being the whole of the story.

The prophets indeed were very firm in their condemnation of sin wherever it was to be found, whether amongst the mighty or amongst the humble and ordinary. Their conception of sin, however, was not a transgression of a code, but rather rebellion against a Person, and that Person Jehovah Himself. This most important point is obscured in our English Versions by the translation "transgression" for רִשְׁעָא , whereas it ought beyond question to be "rebellion." The importance of this lies in the fact that it brought the whole matter out of the realm of theoretical jurisprudence into the realm of personal relationships. This makes all the difference when the results of sin are considered. So long as sin is thought of in an abstract, theoretical, impersonal way, the predominant thought is that of strict justice with retribution accurately weighed and precisely apportioned. Justice is the woman who is blindfolded, scales in one hand and sword in the other, dealing with all offenders in an objective, impersonal way. When the bandage is removed from the eyes, the offenders are seen to be persons who must be rehabilitated into the community rather than objects on whom the proper punishment must be laid. Dealing with sinners is a different matter from dealing with sins, especially when the sinners are connected by ties of kinship and love with those whose duty it is to condemn.

This is what the prophets found. They were much more

sure of the inevitable consequences of sin when they were considering the sin of peoples other than their own. Amos, a Southerner from Tekoa, is fully convinced of the irrevocable doom of the Northern Kingdom. He comes to the conclusion, let us hope not too easily, that there is now no difference in the sight of God between Ephraim and the Ethiopians (ix. 7). Hosea, on the other hand, has great hope of Israel's ultimate restoration, though not without great searching of heart and anguish of soul. He is no whit less sure than Amos of the seriousness of Israel's sin, and no whit less sure that a dreadful retribution must follow. But he himself knew that he could never let his erring wife go, and that his love for Gomer-bath-Diblain must at last find a way of restoring her. From this personal experience of his he realized, himself an Israelite, that Jehovah's sure covenant-love for Israel must at last bring erring Israel back to Him. Discipline there must be, and punishment, but never the final extinction of love.

In the case of Isaiah of Jerusalem, we find both factors at work. He is sure of the final and complete destruction of Israel-Ephraim, but in the case of his own people of the South, he halts between two opinions. There are times when he speaks of Jerusalem and Judah in terms that admit of no relief whatever from a dreadful doom (e.g., ch. v.), but he calls his son Shear-jashub, a remnant shall turn back to God, repent (vii. 3), and in the time of ultimate crisis he is confident that Jerusalem will escape (xxxvii. 6 f.). Here we find clearly stated the doctrine of the Remnant. It arose out of human love and sympathies. It is not so much a doctrine of the head as of the heart. When we come into the realm of personal relationship, then it is that we know that, as Rashi said in his comment on Gen. i. 1, God "gave precedence to the rule of Mercy, and joined with it the rule of Justice." After all, God is no abstract concept, but a living Person. He is no impassible Absolute, but "a just God and a Saviour."

By the time we come to Jeremiah, the situation is that the prophet finds himself perforce condemning his own people, though still tender towards exiled Israel of the North, for he himself was a descendant of the House of Eli, the hereditary priests of the Ark. But Jeremiah cannot find it in his heart to condemn all the people of the south. He is sure of the survival of a faithful remnant. This remnant is the young king Jehoiachin and those

who were carried into captivity with him in 597 B.C. He thus divides Judah into two distinct sections. Those who went to Babylon with Jeconiah (Jehoiachin) are "very good figs, like figs that are first ripe," whilst those who were left in Jerusalem were "very bad figs, which could not be eaten they were so bad," xxiv. 2. The good figs are taken to Babylon "for good," "and they shall be my people, and I will be their God; for they shall return to me with their whole heart," xxiv. 5-7. The others, Zedekiah and "the residue," shall be "consumed from off the land that I gave to them and to their fathers," xxiv. 10.

We get the same differentiation in Ezekiel. The ones who "shall be my people, and I will be their God" (xi. 20) are those who were carried captive in 597 B.C. It is to these that God will give a new heart and put within them a new spirit, xi. 19. On the other hand, those who were left in Jerusalem are full of wickedness and every kind of idolatry, xi. 21; viii. Complete destruction is to be their portion, for they are "a rebellious house," ii. 6; v. 1-4, etc. etc. The restoration is for those who are far away in Babylon (xxxvii.), and on them alone will the blessings of the future fall. There is a tender one who will be cropped off from the topmost twigs of the cedar tree. It will be planted once more in the mountain of the height of Israel, and be a goodly cedar in whose shadow "shall dwell all fowl of every wing," xvii. 22 f.

To both Jeremiah and Ezekiel, then, there is a Righteous Remnant, and it consists of Jehoiachin and the exiles of 597 B.C. This explains why it is that the editor of the Books of Kings concludes with the particular happy ending which is found in 2 Kings xxv. 27-30. He concludes his long history of the people of God with the exaltation in exile of Jehoiachin, now no longer young, and with the setting of "his throne above the throne of the kings that were with him in Babylon." Here we get a semi-release from exile, and an exaltation, if not over the king of Babylon, at least over all the other kings of the heathen.

The Righteous Remnant, therefore, according to biblical tradition is, in the first degree, Jehoiachin and his fellow exiles of 597 B.C. But the tendency is to widen this group so as to include all the Babylonian exiles, i.e., to include those also who were exiled in 586 B.C. This tendency is found in Jeremiah (e.g., xxx., xxxi.) and also in Ezekiel (e.g., xxxvii. and in what appears to be an early addition in v. 3 f.). When we turn to Ezra-

Nehemiah we find that all those who were carried away by Nebuchadrezzar (Ezr. ii. 1) are included. The rigorous exclusion of "the people of the land" by Nehemiah and by Ezra had good biblical warrant. They follow the statements of Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the teaching which produced 2 Kings xxv. 27-30 as a happy ending. This is why they are careful to give full lists and genealogies of those who returned from Babylon. These alone are the people of God. The "adversaries of Judah and Benjamin" had their offer of help refused by "the children of the captivity" (Ezra iv. 1). This attitude is maintained throughout Ezra-Nehemiah, and it is to be seen in some elements in Isa. lvi.-lxvi.

Our contention is that the Servant of the Lord in Isa. xl.-lv. fits exactly into this orthodox setting, that Deutero-Isaiah is true to his predecessors Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and in turn is followed faithfully by his post-exilic successors who returned to Jerusalem. The Servant of the Lord in Deutero-Isaiah is in the first place Jehoiachin and the exiles of 597 B.C., but there is the same tendency as in Jeremiah and Ezekiel to shade off into the whole of the exiles, i.e., to include also those who were exiled in 586 B.C. This tendency explains why the Servant is always in exile, is sometimes distinguished from the exile as a whole (the "we") and yet at other times seems to be identified with them all. The prophet naturally finds it difficult to maintain the distinction, especially since it really was already a generation old, so that in his early post-exilic successors the distinction has altogether gone, and all who return are the people of God.

Further, we find also this prophet to be essentially nationalistic in attitude. He is actually responsible for the narrow and exclusive attitude of post-exilic days. The so-called Universalism of Deutero-Isaiah needs considerable qualification. Not a little of it seems to be due to a mistranslation in our English Versions at xlix. 6, in the phrase "a light to the Gentiles." The Hebrew is *אוֹר לְגוֹיִם*, which means "a light of (the) Gentiles," this being the translation of the phrase at xlii. 6. The meaning is not the same, as we shall see below. The whole prophecy is concerned with the restoration and exaltation of Jacob-Israel, the Servant of the Lord, the Righteous Remnant, and any place which the heathen have in the new order is entirely and debasingly subservient. We have not the space to discuss this thesis in relation to the many previous discussions of the subject, and must be

content to illustrate it from the pieces which make up the sixteen chapters of the prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah.

(c) NOTES ON ISA. XL.-LV.

xl. 1-2. We follow the Septuagint (first hand of Sinaiticus) and Vulgate in taking עַמִּי (my people) to be a vocative. It is "my people" who are to comfort Jerusalem. Her long travail is over, the punishment for her iniquity is accepted, and she has received quittance for her sins. The root נָחַם means comfort out of sorrow, not consolation in the midst of continuing sorrow.⁵ It is important also not to say that Zion-Jerusalem is "an ideal representation of the people." Zion-Jerusalem throughout is the city itself, left desolate and bereaved of the people of God, the city that suffered the loss of her children, solitary and alone. "My people." are the exiles, with whose imminent return the prophet is almost exclusively concerned.

xl. 27-31. Jacob-Israel, away in exile, is weary and out of heart, conscious only of weakness and ineptitude. Ezekiel had proclaimed that God would bring to new and vigorous life even the dry and dead bones of Israel ("our hope is lost; we are clean cut off," xxxvii. 11). So here the prophet says that though human strength fails (even lusty youths shall faint for weariness), yet those who rely on God shall exchange (יְהַלְכֻם) strength. The word "their" is an unwarranted intrusion into the English Versions and entirely misleads the English reader. Instead of human strength, they will receive the strength of God. They will grow eagles' wings, and then they will run and walk without faintness or weariness.

xli. 1-5. It is customary here to see a reference to Cyrus and his victorious march. This is largely under the influence of *xlv.* 1-4, and the assumption that everything outside Duhm's four pieces is a unity. There is no need to assume any reference to Cyrus. The "one from the east" who is raised up by Jehovah is exiled Israel, returning as conqueror. Nations are to be given to him, and God will make him to rule over kings, cf. *Isa.* liii. 12; *xlix.* 23.

xli. 8-13. Here Jacob-Israel is the Servant whom God has chosen, cf. *Jer.* xxx. 10 f. In *Isa.* xli. 9: "Thou art my servant, I have chosen thee and not cast thee away," we have a deliberate rebuttal of the idea that exile meant rejection for the exiles as

⁵ "The Meaning of 'the Paraclete,'" in E.T., lvii (1945-46), p. 48 f.

the people of His choice. It is a defence of the exiles similar to that made by Ezekiel in xi. 14-16, and similar also to the diffidence which lies behind the "blindness" of exiled Israel in Isa. xlii. 18-25. Once again in this piece (xli. 11 f.) Israel is the conqueror who will overcome all that strive against him.

xli. 25-29. Here again there is no need to assume a reference to Cyrus, for it is Jacob-Israel who is the conqueror. In xlv. 4 the statement says of Cyrus that "I have called thee by thy name." Here the one that is raised up from the north-east is "one that calleth upon my name." There is a great difference between the two statements, especially since in the piece which is clearly concerned with Cyrus it is said that he never knew God (xlv. 4). Further, the "behold, behold them" (if the reading is sound) shows that the one who is raised up to come from the north and east (the direction of Babylon from Palestine according to route and direction) is a company of people whose approach the herald (xli. 29; xl. 9-11) is to proclaim.

xlii. 1-4. This is the first of Duhm's Servant Songs. It opens with two words "my-servant" and "my-chosen," cf. xli. 8, where the identification Israel-Jacob is made, as here also in the Septuagint. This piece tells of the Servant on whom the spirit of the Lord will be put. We find the same quiet submission as in other pieces, but a change with respect to the future. He will dispense justice to the Gentiles. It is customary to assume a special meaning here for דִּין, analogous to the Arabic *din*, which means both a system of customs and true religion. This interpretation depends upon the acceptance of a Deutero-Isaianic universalism, but if he is seen to be an essentially nationalistic prophet, then the word means the execution of justice, דִּין דִּין (true justice) as the piece itself says, almost in the sense of strict retribution, perhaps even a Carthaginian Peace. The Servant is the wick, now dimly burning, but he will not burn dimly (v. 4, EVV. "fail," but see R.V. margin. The root is *k-h-h*, as in the phrase "smoking (dimly burning) flax") till he has established justice in the earth, cf. Isa xxviii. 17; Exod. xv. 25. Similarly he is the "bruised reed" (v. 3), but he will not be bruised henceforth till he establishes justice in the earth. Further, it is by no means essential that the root לָו should be translated "hope." It is true that most often in Hebrew the root means "wait expectantly" rather than "wait with dread," but the meaning "hope" tends to be late. The Syriac root

means "grow weak" and in the Aphel "despair." * We, therefore, translate "wait" with the inference "in dread."

xlii. 6-9. The Lord has called "in righteousness" (cf. *xli.* 2) one who is given "as a covenant of (the) people." It is legitimate to insert the definite article, since it is a characteristic of the prophet's style to omit it, most of the cases where it is now found in the Massoretic Text being instances where a vowel only is required (e.g., with the inseparable prepositions). The same phrase is found at *xlix.* 8, where it is clear that the Servant's mission is limited to his own people. This is in accordance with the general usage whereby עַם (singular) means "the people Israel," and גוֹי (sing. or plur.) means "the Gentiles." If the phrase אֹר נְרִים (light of Gentiles) were not found here, then the phrase "covenant of the people" would be seen to have reference to Israel alone. It would therefore involve the recognition of the Servant in the narrower interpretation of the term, as the means by which exiled Israel might be restored to Zion-Jerusalem. Verse 7 refers to release from exile under the figures of opening blind eyes and prisoners being released from dungeons and the darkness (hence the figure of blindness) of prison-houses. This is confirmed by the first hand of Codex Sinaiticus, which reads עַמִּי (my people). The intervening phrase אֹר נְרִים is not found in LXX (Codd. A, B). It is therefore suspect, and may be a gloss from *xlix.* 6, where we interpret it to mean "a Gentile light," i.e., a world-wide light. In both this piece and in *xlix.* 8-12, the Servant is not the whole of exiled Israel.

xlii. 10-17. Like all "new songs" this is a song of deliverance. In *v.* 16 the "blind" are the exiles, brought out of darkness (cf. *xlii.* 7). They are to be brought back by a way and in paths "that they know not." Compare the same idea in *xli.* 3, where the phrase "even by a way he used not to go with his feet" is found. This phrase is, with the parallel in mind, not so much of a difficulty as when *xli.* 1-5 is interpreted of Cyrus.

xlii. 18-25. In this piece we have the beginning of the unfolding of the mystery of the servant's suffering. Much confusion has been caused in interpretation by the assumption that the word "blind" has the same meaning here as in *v.* 16. The two verses are in distinct pieces. In the first piece "the blind"

* Cf. *Bar Hebræus*, ed. Bruns and Kirsch. p. 403. אֵינֵנוּ מְצַדֵּקִים "and they despaired of help."

are the exiles, but here they are those who do not understand the real significance of the exile experiences. The word עִוְר (blind) has been the link word of the two pieces; there is no other immediate connexion. The blindness of the Servant in this piece consists (*v.* 20) in the fact that in spite of all he has seen and heard, he is still blind and deaf to the true meaning of it all. Everything has happened to make God's law great and glorious. It has all been "for His righteousness' sake." But how can that be? Here is a people robbed and spoiled, imprisoned, captive, exiled. Surely these are the rejected ones. The answer is that God Himself gave Jacob-Israel for a spoil to the robbers, and He well knew what He was doing. Duhm and Cheyne objected to the whole answer as an interpolation. We would excise the phrases "and they would not walk in his ways, and did not hearken to his law" (*v.* 24). Both are good Deuteronomic phrases and neither is Deutero-Isaianic. The change of persons is also eliminated, and we are left with the statement that "we" have sinned, and the Lord poured His wrath upon the Servant, i.e., the (innocent) servant suffered for the sins of the rest. The prophet is speaking as one of the general body of the people as in *liii.* 4-6. Jacob-Israel (the Servant) never realized this, and did not understand its significance.

xliii. 1-7. This piece tells of God's saving work on behalf of exiled Jacob-Israel. He will give other peoples in exchange for them. There is no universalism here. The prophet's interest is in the redemption of exiled Israel, and in Israel's exaltation at the head of the Gentiles.

xliii. 8-13. The Servant is identified with the witnesses, the blind and deaf exiles who now have eyes and ears, those who are to be the Lord's instrument in the confounding of the heathen.

xliii. 14-21. God once rejected Ephraim and chose Judah. So now he has rejected Judah and has chosen the Servant, i.e., the Jacob-Israel in exile; cf. *vv.* 20 f.: "my people, my chosen: the people which I have formed for myself, that they might set forth my praise."

xliii. 22-28. We take this piece to be the charge against the pre-exilic Jacob-Israel, who did not call upon God and was weary of Him. The pronoun אֲנִי is emphatic because of its position. We therefore regard the piece as a statement that the pre-exilic people did sacrifice, but not to Jehovah. Skinner,⁷ for instance,

⁷ *Isaiah* (Camb. Bible), ii, p. 48.

rejects this on the ground that such an antithesis is foreign to the context, but if these are all short pieces, then there is no previous context, and this is the first line in a new piece. The "yet" of R.V. is due to the assumption that the chapter is all of one piece and that there is a close connexion between *vv.* 21 and 22. This is not the case. The difficult *v.* 23b can now mean that though Israel was enslaved by offerings and wearied with incense, yet it was not Jehovah who was the cause of this. The end of *v.* 24 is a condemnation of the people for their sins. Then, as always in Deutero-Isaiah, the charge of sin is immediately followed by the declaration of forgiveness. The last two verses (reading a strong-*vav*) tell how God destroyed the sacred princes and reduced Jacob-Israel to destruction and great reproach.

xliv. 1-5. The old Jacob-Israel of the previous piece has been rejected, but now a new people of God has been created, "Jacob my servant," "Israel-Jeshurun whom I have chosen." This one and that one shall now be called by the name of the people of God, chosen and called by Him now.

xliv. 21, 22. Here Jacob-Israel, newly formed to be the Servant of the Lord, is identified with the wider group of exiles, i.e., the group which elsewhere are the "we" which have sinned, *liii.* 4-6; *xlii.* 24.

xlv. 11-13. It is not necessary to assume that Cyrus is intended here. Once again we hold that the one who is raised up in righteousness is the victorious Servant, the new Jacob-Israel (*xli.* 1-3, 25-27), the "my sons" of *xlvi.* 11 of whom the Lord bids this question be asked. It is the returning Jacob-Israel who will have his paths made straight, as in the piece *xl.* 3-7. It is the Servant who will build the city, as indeed they ultimately do, *Neh.* *iii.* It is the Servant in the narrower sense, because of his patient endurance of undeserved suffering who causes the exiles to be set free (the form of the verb is causal, not permissive). The assumption that Cyrus is to build the Temple comes in part from *xliv.* 28, because of the way in which לֵאמֹר (*saying*) there follows the reference to Cyrus. But Septuagint and Vulgate have קִיֵּיִם (that saith) as at the beginning of the verse.

xlvi. 18-25. Verses 22 and 23 are usually taken to be firm evidence of the prophet's universalism, but they can be so interpreted only if they are taken out of their context in this piece. The call is to those "that are escaped of the nations," and the conclusion of the piece is that "in the Lord shall all the seed of

Israel be justified (צִדִּיקוֹ come to be in the right, become prosperous, victorious, be vindicated) and shall boast themselves." We understand this last phrase to refer to the proud, perhaps arrogant, boasting of a conquering Israel, and *v.* 23 to refer to the humble subservience of the heathen, cf. *xlix.* 23. Verse 22 refers to all the scattered Israelites amongst the heathen everywhere, cf. *xlix.* 6; *xliii.* 5, 6.

xlvi. 3-7. This is the piece in which the change-over is clearest from the narrower idea of the Servant to the wider view which would include the exiles of 586 B.C. also: "O house of Jacob and all the remnant of the house of Jacob."

xlviii. 1-11. This piece is directed to "the house of Jacob that call themselves by the name Israel and have come forth out of (Hebrew has "the waters of"; Septuagint omits, and Targum has "the seed of") Judah." They call themselves "of the holy city," and "brace themselves on the God of Israel," but it is all false and without justification. The prophet declares that God now has created something new, not known before, but they have neither heard nor understood. This was only to be expected, because they were bound to deal treacherously, being rebels from the womb. These eight verses are most naturally to be taken to refer to those who were left behind in Jerusalem after the first deportation, who claimed, as we have seen (see note on *xli.* 8-13 and its reference to *Ezek.* xi. 14-16), to be the true people of God. The last three verses of this piece (9-11) say that because of His Name's sake, God will not wholly cast even these off, but will refine them in the furnace of affliction; i.e., some of them will come to belong to the new Jacob-Israel, the righteous Remnant already in Babylon.

xlviii. 12-19. Mowinckel regards these verses as one piece, but, in our judgement, they consist of a number of very short pieces. The rhythm is continually changing, and the pronouns vary throughout. The first piece is *vv.* 12-13, and next *vv.* 14-15. In this latter piece the prophet utters his surprising ("who among them (or 'you') has announced these things?") announcement, which is that "the Lord loved Him (Jacob-Israel). He (i.e., God) will accomplish His purpose on Babylon, and (Hebrew has 'his arm,' but Septuagint has 'on the seed of') on the Chaldæans." Verse 15 is again separate. God proclaims "I, even I, have spoken; yea I have called him (Jacob-Israel), and I have brought him (out of Babylon), and I (after Septuagint,

Targum and Syriac) will prosper his way." Verse 16 is a short mutilated fragment, unless 16b is also another mutilated piece. Two other pieces remain, *v.* 17 and *vv.* 18-19, though it is doubtful whether this last piece is Deutero-Isaianic at all.

xlvi. 20-21. The Lord has redeemed his servant Jacob from Babylon. Here the Servant includes all those that returned. Verse 22 is a pious addition.

xliv. 1-6. The second of Duhm's Servant Songs. The Servant declares his mission to the heathen. He is a secret weapon, efficient and sharp. In *v.* 3 the identification is made with Israel. All who hold to an individualist interpretation excise the word "Israel," allegedly on metrical grounds. Its presence is certainly fatal to any individualistic theory. We find no grounds for its omission. The fact that one or two adherents to the "collective" interpretation would omit the word is neither here nor there. Textually the omission is supported by one Hebrew MS., cod. 96 in Kennicott's list, a MS. "with very many variations" (*plurimas habet variationes*) as Kennicott describes it. The metrical evidence is weak in the extreme, since the number of beats in the last half of the lines of this piece is decidedly irregular (3:4; 3; 2; and 3, if the word is retained). And further, if *v.* 4 is to be retained within the rhythmical scheme, with its four two-stresses, then on what grounds is any change to be made in *v.* 3? To continue: the Servant complains of his fate. He is wearied, exhausted, and all for nothing, but he still is confident that he can leave his vindication to God. The answer comes. God formed the Servant to bring back Jacob-Israel. The two names are synonymous in Deutero-Isaiah. He does not use Jacob for the south and Israel for the north. Follow therefore the *Qre* and read יָב with a *vav*, and not with an *aleph*. This is the honourable calling of the (despised) servant, and it is in God's strength that he will accomplish it. But it is far too small a thing to bring back only all the Babylonian exiles (the tribes of Jacob and the preserved of Israel). The servant's mission is to be "a light of Gentiles," i.e., a light throughout all the Gentile lands "that my salvation may be to the end of the earth," i.e., my salvation of Israel, since this is the only salvation in which the prophet is interested. The Servant will be a light to guide every Israelite wanderer home. His mission is to gather in all exiles wherever they may be scattered.

xliv. 7-13. The Lord speaks to the Servant, "to him that

despised life (self), abhorred of the heathen, slave of rulers," i.e., despondent, defeated, exiled and captive Jacob-Israel. The tables will be turned. He will re-establish the homeland. Kings and princes will stand in honour and bow down in obeisance. All the scattered sons of Israel will return—from far, from the north and from the west, from the land of Sinim (? Syene, Assouan).

xlix. 14-21. Desolate Zion is astonished at the number of her new children. She had been bereaved, and "solitary" (נְלוּמָה means without husband and so without any chance of bearing children). The two words which make Zion herself an exile, namely נִלָּה and טוּרָה, are not in the Septuagint and are evidently out of rhythm with the rest.

xlix. 22-23. Here especially we have the complete abasement of the heathen before Israel. Gentile kings and queens shall be their nurses to carry them home, and shall lick the dust off their feet. Read אִיִּים (islands, i.e., the heathen) in *v.* 22 with LXX for עַמִּים.

l. 4-9. The third of Duhm's Servant Songs. The Servant proclaims his innocence. He was never rebellious against God, nor did he turn away backward from Him. He submitted to dishonour, but he knows that God will vindicate him soon.

l. 10. A general call to all the exiles to listen to the servant. Verse 11 is generally recognized to be an addition.

li. 4-6. It is best to read עַמִּים (peoples) and לְאֻמִּים (nations) in 4a after the Syriac. The passage tells of the judgement which God is about to bring upon the heathen. They will wait for Him and His strength (lit. "arm"), but with dread rather than in hope and trust.

li. 12-16. When the exiles have been freed and the restoration in the new age is accomplished, then God will be able to say to Zion, no longer desolate, "Thou art my people."

lii. 13-14. The Servant shall prosper and be highly exalted. He shall cause many nations to leap up (i.e., to their feet, suddenly and astonished to leap to their feet in respect, Job xxix. 8) and kings shall refrain from talking (cf. Job xxix. 9, "refrained talking, and laid their hand on their mouth") in subservient homage.

liii. 1-13. A new piece begins here, with the root שָׁמַע as the link-word. Israel now is speaking. "We" reckoned nothing of the Servant. He was uncomely, despised, ceased from amongst men; knowing sickness and sorrow—all of which we take to be descriptive of the exile and its shame and sorrow. But now we

see that it was our griefs and sorrows he was bearing. "We" were the guilty ones, not he. All "we" have gone astray, every one his own way (i.e., rebels from God), and the Lord laid on him the results of the iniquity of us all. And so he was led away, unresistingly, a helpless victim, taken away by coercion and harsh judgement, vanished from his dwelling place, smitten for the rebellion of my people, cut off from the land of the living, buried amongst rich oppressors and all the time guiltless and without a word of deceit. (Death and burial are a figure for the exile, cf. Ezek. xxxvii.) But all this bruising and affliction of the Servant was the Lord's will. If (v. 10) you realize that he (שָׂרָף) with suffix is frequent in Deutero-Isaiah for the pronoun) is an אֲשָׁרָף (the rendering "guilt-offering" is a post-exilic ritual meaning. In pre-exilic times the word means "compensation, quit-tance, substitution"), i.e., that his bearing of the punishment sets you free, then the Servant will multiply, live long, and the Lord's will will prosper in his keeping. God will see the Servant's travail and will be satisfied by his knowledge.⁸ My servant, the righteous one (unless this is a dittography, three MSS. omit it—126, 355, 490 in Kennicott's list, all reasonably good), will make the many prosperous, for their punishments he is bearing. Therefore (the ultimate destiny of the Servant, for which the prophet longs and prays) will I (God) divide him a portion with the many, and with the strong he shall divide spoil . . . , i.e., the Servant will prosper and become one of the great ones of the earth.

The remainder of the pieces in the sixteen chapters are full of exultation and joy. The destiny is fulfilled and all nature rejoices.

NORMAN H. SNAITH

⁸ Cf. *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament* (1944), p. 92.