

Canadian Society of Biblical Studies

BULLETIN

No. 1.

September, 1935.

CONTENTS

TWO UNCHARTED LEAVES OF GOSPEL PARCHMENT MINISCULE MSS.

By the Rev. Canon G. Abbott-Smith, D.D., D.C.L.,
Diocesan Theological College, Montreal.
(Presidential Address.)

EUSEBEIA, PIETY, GODLINESS.

By the Rev. Sir Robert A. Falconer, K.C.M.G., D.D.,
Toronto.

UNIVERSALISM AND PARTICULARISM IN ISRAEL.

By Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath,
Holy Blossom Congregation, Toronto.

This Bulletin contains the substance of three papers read before the Society at its Third Annual Meeting, on May 1, 1935, at Emmanuel College, Toronto.

CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

Executive Committee.

1935-36.

Honorary President

SIR ROBERT A. FALCONER, K.C.M.G., D.Litt., LL.D., D.D., Toronto.

President

PROFESSOR H. L. MACNEILL, Ph.D., LL.D., McMaster University,
Hamilton.

Vice-President

THE REV. PROVOST F. H. COSGRAVE, M.A., D.C.L., Trinity College,
Toronto.

Secretary-Treasurer

THE REV. PROFESSOR R. B. Y. SCOTT, Ph.D., Divinity Hall,
3520 University St., Montreal.

THE REV. PRINCIPAL R. DAVIDSON, Ph.D., D.D., Emmanuel College,
Toronto.

THE REV. PRINCIPAL H. A. KENT, D.D., Queen's Theological College,
Kingston.

THE REV. PROFESSOR R. K. NAYLOR, B.A., Diocesan Theological
College, Montreal.

Two Uncharted Leaves of Gospel Parchment Miniscule Mss

We have not yet reached any certainty with regard to the text of the New Testament in many instances. We probably never shall, but we are making progress in that direction all the time and are enormously better equipped for its study than any of our predecessors. The T. R. which practically held the field for more than three centuries and a half, was based on a single Greek manuscript of the tenth century known as Minuscule No. 2. That manuscript contained the traditional text which had general currency from the fourth century onward. It was the manuscript furnished, with some corrections, by Erasmus to his printer. The subsequent editions of Elzevir and Stephanus were based on Erasmus and thus the T. R., so called by Elzevir, "A text now received by everyone", held sway till the modern critical editions began to appear. All Biblical scholars have a general knowledge of the different classes into which textual authorities divide the manuscript material for purposes of criticism. The largest class, which includes the great majority of manuscripts, is the latest, representing the standard text adopted by the Byzantine Church, which continued, with certain variations and developments, to be the traditional text from the fourth century onwards. For purposes of criticism this type of text is valueless. Behind this standardized and conflated type of text there are several older groups, traceable to the second century. Arrangement of these has been modified since Hort's time. His "neutral" group, (led by B and Aleph) is really a subdivision of the Alexandrian, containing the purest copies in that group, copies which escaped, it is claimed, most of the editorial revision which characterizes the Alexandrian texts. Hort's "Western", on the other hand, (called, as Hort himself recognized, by a misnomer), is a group of local texts among which, beside the genuinely "Western" texts, at least two Eastern types appeared, originally current in Coesarea and Antioch. Perhaps the most interesting recent development has been the emergence of the Caesarean Group, which comprises two recently discovered manuscripts, the Koridethi Manuscript (Theta) and the Washington Manuscript (W), as well as two formerly known groups of minuscule manuscripts, Family 1 and Family 13—and which has recently had the important accession of the Chester Beatty Papyri.

The two parchment leaves which I propose to examine now will serve to some extent to illustrate the somewhat sketchy and elementary survey of the documents which I have just given. These two leaves came into the possession of one of our younger clergy, Rev. Gordon Phillips, who recently presented them to the Diocesan College. One leaf contains Matthew V, 30b to 47a; the other Luke VI, 33b to 46a. They were given to Mr. Phillips as part payment on commission for assisting in the sale of some manuscripts some years ago when he was a student in Montreal. He had called on a Greek who was said to have some old books in his possession and at once recognized the character of these New Testament manuscripts, the value of which had not been realized by the man into whose possession they had come. He claimed that they had been brought from Mount Athos and that he had obtained them from a Greek Bishop in Constantinople. The Gospel codex to which the Matthew leaf belonged was sold, I discovered only the other day, to McGill University, and that from which the Lucan leaf was taken, to the University of Chicago. How many leaves were extracted before the sale was made, I do not know, but I hope to be able to examine the McGill manuscript later on. For convenience, we will call the Matthew fragment A, and the Lucan fragment B. Fragment A is in appearance the older of the two. Sir Frederick Kenyon, to whom I submitted a photograph, suggests the eleventh century, probably the latter half. It is neatly written in fine characters, two columns of twenty-two lines to a page. The chirography of the two leaves is similar, but the Matthaean scribe, though painstaking, is the less skilful of the two. He has drawn vertical lines with a sharp instrument to the right and left of each column, and horizontal strokes as a guide to every second line. The forms of the letters, where these vary from the normal, are found in Greek manuscripts from the second century onwards. The more noteworthy are Beta, which resembles the letter "u" in English script without the upward stroke; Epsilon, when not normal, as in manuscripts from the sixth century onwards, has the upper half extended above the line, somewhat resembling the letter "b"; Eta resembles a small capital "H"; Lambda, the small "i" of English script with the upstroke; Nu, the English "v" with upstroke; Omega, sometimes normal, often appears like the figure 8 laid on its side; Iota subscript is not used. A verse division is made by medial period marks. Paragraphs are marked by capitals in red ink, always, as in the older uncials, at the beginning of a line. Ammonian sections are given in red in the margin. Fragment A has few deviations from T.R. The only variations observable in these two pages are

one mis-spelled word and one noteworthy variant. In verse 46, line 21 of the verso, "friends" appears instead of "brethren."

Fragment B, assigned by Sir Frederick Kenyon to the early 12th century, is the more interesting of the two. The Characters are larger, bolder and more evenly written. This scribe also has made use of guiding lines, both vertical and horizontal, the latter marking the upper side of each line of script. His verse divisions are indicated by large red medial periods and his paragraphs by capitals. He also has the Ammonian sections in red, and twice he marks the beginning of a portion, as of a church Gospel lection, by an abbreviated *archen* in red. He, like the scribe of A., provides the abbreviated *anos* for "man" as well as the usual *KS.* for "Lord." In this fragment of 48 lines, there are some twenty variations between the T.R. and the Critical Texts. In only eight of these the copyist follows the received text, as he also does in his spelling, but in twelve he departs from it, and there are a few interesting variants which show that, in the manuscript from which this leaf was taken, there appears to have been a good deal of mixture. Judging from this one leaf, the whole MS. ought to be well worth collating. If this MS. or its exemplar had been used by Erasmus instead of minuscule 2, the subsequent history of the text would have been quite different and the revision required by modern editors would not have been so extensive as it was.

READINGS

Verse	Received Text	Leaf "B".
34	<i>daneizete</i>	<i>daneisete</i> (B, aleph, bf, Vilg., Ch. B)
"	<i>apolabein</i> (<i>labien</i> , B, aleph, W.)	* <i>apolambanein</i>
"	<i>humin charin estin</i>	<i>charin humin estin</i> (Df)
35	<i>tou Hupsistou</i>	omit <i>tou</i> (B, al.)
36	<i>oun</i> (Theta)	omit <i>oun</i> (B, al., W, Ch. B)
37	Kai (primo)	*omit (P)
"	<i>Kai ou me</i> (B, al., Theta)	ib. (<i>hina me</i> , ADW)
38	<i>pep. Kai ses. Kai</i> (Theta)	<i>ses. pep.</i> (DW, fam. 1) (omit 2nd <i>Kai</i> , B, al., W, fam. 1)
39	<i>eipe de</i>	ib. (<i>eligen</i> , D, fam. 13)
"	omit <i>Kai</i>	<i>Kai</i> (B, al., W, Theta, fam. 13)
"	<i>pesountai</i>	<i>empesountai</i> (BD, al., W)
41	<i>ti de</i>	*omit <i>de</i>
42	<i>ligein</i>	* <i>eipein</i>
"	<i>toi adelphoi sou, Adelphe</i>	*omit (D omits <i>Adelphe</i>)
43	<i>Palin</i> (B, aleph, LW, fam. 1, 13)	omit (ACD, al.)
44	<i>trugosin staphulen</i> (AE, Vulg)	<i>staph. trug.</i> (BW, al., fam. 13)
45	<i>lalei to S. autou</i> (BDW, Theta, Ch. B., fam. 1)	<i>to S. lalei</i> (G.b)

*Readings peculiar or almost so, to leaf "B".

G. ABBOTT-SMITH.

Eusebeia, Piety, Godliness.

Eusebeia is one of the ruling terms, along with its associated forms, *eusebeo*, *eusebos*, *theosebeia*, in the Pastoral Epistles. Elsewhere in the New Testament, these words, except *eusebos*, are found only in Acts and 2 Peter.

Eusebeia, *sebeo*, *semnos*, all have the same root. *Eusebeia* expresses a fundamental idea in religion, awe in the presence of the supernatural, reverence by the worshipper for the Divine majesty; this reverence involves readiness to obey the Divine will. In Sophocles, reverence to the Gods (*eusebein ta pros tous theous*) is man's highest duty, and from it flows all virtue. It shows itself in outward acts of service (*thuoussa kai eusebousa tois theois*) as well as in living and acting piously and dutifully in all relations, with filial respect towards parents and loyalty to all who deserve it. (Antig. 731). *Dusebeia*, impiety, associated in Aeschylus with *hubris*, insolence, follows on *koros*, a state of material prosperity or avarice. He who performs the duties of religion becomes *semnos*, worthy of respect, constraining deference by the gravity of his character. This Greek ideal of the religious man was seen in Socrates: 'So pious and devoutly religious that he would take no step apart from the will of heaven; so just and upright that he never did even a trifling injury to a living soul; so self-controlled, so temperate, that he never at any time chose the sweeter in place of the better; so sensible and wise and prudent that in distinguishing the better from the worse he never erred.' (*Memorabilia*, iv. 8. 11, as in Adam, *The Religious Teachers of Greece*, p. 352.).

By the Peripatetics *diesidaimonia* is contrasted with *eusebeia*. The Stoics taught that essential *eusebeia* was of the spirit, but they did not, as a rule, refuse to observe the outward service to the Gods as commonly practised. In hellenistic inscriptions, *eusebeia* denotes not only 'operative, cultivate piety', but whatever springs from reverence for the will of God. It goes often with *arete*, virtue, *dikaiousune* justice, *kalokagathia* goodness, as being conduct well pleasing to God. It is used also of loyalty to the emperor.

'Classical Greek has no word which covers religion as we use the term. *Eusebeia* approximates to it, but in essence means no more than the regular performance of due/worship in the proper spirit, while *hosiotes* describes ritual purity. The place of faith was taken by myth and ritual. These things implied an attitude rather than a conviction.' (Noek, *Conversion*, p. 10.).

In the Greek tradition *eusebeia* has a fuller content than our 'religion'. 'Piety' is a better translation, with its connotation, 'habitual reverence and obedience to God, and faithfulness to the duties naturally owed to parents and relatives, superiors, etc.' (*Shorter Oxford Dict.*). By etymology, 'godliness' is nearer the

root idea, and in both 'godliness' and 'piety' there is a suggestion of worship. In Latin *pietas* approximates closely to *eusebeia*: closer than *religio*. 'The quality known to the Romans as *pietas*, rises in spite of trial and danger, superior to the enticements of individual passion and selfish ease. Aeneas's *pietas* became a sense of duty to the will of the gods, as well as to his father, his son, his people; and this duty never leaves him.' (Warde Fowler, *Religious Experience of the Roman People*; see also *Death of Turnus*, pp. 146ff.).

Turning now to the use of the word in Jewish writings. It is rare in the LXX, occurring only five times, the adjective ten times, the verb only once, *theosebeia* with its adjective five times. In Isa. xi. 2 *eusebeia* is the translation of *yir'ath*, 'the fear of the Lord giving itself up to adoration', and it is accompanied by the spirit of knowledge. This 'fear of the Lord' (often better translated 'reverence', G. F. Moore) is equivalent to the words of Mic. vi. 8: 'to walk humbly with thy God', i.e. to respect Jahwe's claims, and to fulfil without question the justice and mercy which He demands of man. In Job xxviii. 28 *theosebeia* the 'fear of the Lord' is 'wisdom', and is a practical departing from evil.

The words are seldom found also in Wisdom, Sirach, 2 and 3 Macc. But in 4 Macc. *eusebeia* occurs forty-seven times, *eusebos* eleven times, *eusebeo* five times, *theosebeia* four times and *theosebēs* twice. In this book, therefore, quite a new situation arises. The author was probably a Pharisaic Quietist, writing from Alexandria in the first half of the first century A.D. The Law in its ritual aspect dominated the Jewish piety of that period; but this writer holds by the four cardinal Greek virtues, which are to be cultivated by instruction and discipline in the Law. The fundamental note of the book is that *ho eusebes logismos*, 'pious reason', is mistress of the passions, and 'piety' lies in the active obedience, even to persecution, of the Law: 'Those who with their whole heart give heed to piety, alone are able to overcome the passions of the flesh, in the faith that like our patriarchs, Abram, Isaac and Jacob, we are not dead to God but live to God. For is it actually possible that anyone who philosophises piously according to the complete rule of philosophy, who believes also in God, and who knows that it is blessedness to endure any affliction on behalf of virtue, will not get mastery over his passions by his piety?' (vii. 18-22). Stoic influence is seen in v. 22-25 where Eleasar says to the tyrant Antiochus: 'Thou mockest at our philosophy, as though it is owing to lack of reasonable consideration that we direct our lives by it; but it teaches us self-restraint (*sophrosune*), so that we can control all our pleasures and passions, and it gives us practice in courage (*andreia*) so that we can willingly endure pain, and it disciplines us in righteousness (*dikaiousune*), so that in all moods we may act with moderation; it instructs us in godliness (*eusebeia*), so that we may worship the only living God in a manner befitting His majesty.'

As might be expected this common hellenistic word occurs frequently in Philo and Josephus.

It is remarkable that a word with such a history and found so often in contemporary language occurs so seldom in the New Testament. In Acts it appears in iii. 12: 'as though by our own power or *godliness* we had made him to walk'. The populace thought that Peter and John had become channels of divine power by reason of their piety, but the apostle disclaims any meriting cause with God from his own good works; only faith brought healing to the man. Cornelius (Ac. x. 2, 7) is 'a *devout* (*eusebes*) man, and one that feared God with all his house, who gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway', a fine example of a Gentile, who though not circumcised took part in the worship of the synagogue, sharing its belief in God and following His moral law, though debarred from full fellowship with the Jews. These 'godfearers' (*hoi sebomenoi ton theon*, xiii. 43, 50, xvi. 14, xvii. 4, 17, xviii. 7, had found in Jehovah the true God, and worshipped Him in truth, though they had not assumed the full obligations of the Jewish Law. The verb *eusebeo* appears in xvii. 23: 'what ye *worship* in ignorance', an 'unknown god'. There were also in Athens, *sebasmata*, sacred places or objects for worship, such as temples, altars, idols. The verb *sebomai* occurs in Ac xviii. 13, where the Jews charge Paul with alienating the Jews from true worship based on the Law; and in xix. 27 it is applied to the worship of Artemis. Thus in Acts the fundamental idea of the words derived from the root *seb* is piety based upon reverence for and worship of God, as in the hellenistic world.

In Rom. i. 25 Paul uses *sebazomai*, a rare form of *sebomai*, the only occurrence of either word in his epistles, of the heathen who 'worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator'.

The ten occurrences of *eusebeia*, *eusebeo*, and *theosebeia* in I Tim. are: ii. 2; prayers are to be made for all men, among them for kings and rulers, in order that 'we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and gravity'. This linking of *eusebeia* and *semnotes* is familiar in Greek usage. ii. 10; 'which becometh women professing godliness (*theosebeian*), 'following (ver. 9) 'that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefastness (*aidos*) and sobriety (*sophrosune*); these last two terms are nearly synonymous in hellenistic Greek, though the former involves also an attitude towards God. iii. 16; 'great is the mystery of godliness'; the motive power for *eusebeia* is in the mystery of a Person who became incarnate, was proclaimed among the nations, believed on throughout the world, and triumphantly received up into glory. iv. 7, 8; 'exercise thyself unto godliness. . . godliness is profitable for all things, having promise of the life which now is and of that which is to come'; for this the Christian must labour and strive, setting his hope on the living God who is the Saviour of all men.

v. 4; 'let them learn first "to show piety" towards their own family'; a classical use of *eusebeo* for the loyal performance of family obligations.

vi. 3; 'the doctrine which is according to godliness'; sound doctrine is in accord with the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and

to His teaching Christian piety will conform. Wicked teachers make only a pretence of piety (2 Tim. iii. 5). A life of piety and sound doctrine go hand in hand.

vi. 5, 6; 'godliness is a way of gain . . . but godliness with contentment is great gain'; true *eusebeia* will keep the man of God from the love of riches into which the false teachers fall; he will, with a sufficiency, find in his piety real wealth.

vi. 11; 'follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness'; godliness, a comprehensive activity of the Christian life seems out of place in this list of virtues; it is omitted from the similar list in 2 Tim. ii. 22. It is evidently not an equivalent for faith.

The two occurrences in 2 Tim. are:

iii. 5; 'holding a form of godliness, but having denied the power thereof'; of people who seem to have professed the Christian religion.

iii. 12; 'all that would live godly (*eusebos*) in Christ Jesus'.

Those in Titus are:

i. 1; 'the knowledge of the truth is according to *godliness*'; true knowledge of the faith shows itself in piety.

ii. 12; 'we should live soberly and righteously and godly in this present world'. It is remarkable how much more prominent the idea of 'piety' is in 1 Tim. than in the other two Pastorals.

While the words as used in these epistles, are true to their historic meaning, and are associated with virtues which were held in the highest regard in the contemporary non-Christian world, they differ from the Greek and the Jewish conceptions both in their motive power ('without controversy a great mystery') and in the absence of any appeal to the moral law either as written on the heart, or in the Mosaic code. The 'commandment' (vi. 14) is a new law, healthy doctrine based on the Gospel. In 1 Tim. the heart of *eusebeia* is the conception of God. He is the one and only God, a Being of supreme majesty and unapproachable glory, to whom all honour is to be paid (i. 17, ii. 5, vi. 15, 16); but He is also the Saviour (i. 1, ii. 4, iv. 10) as well as the Creator and Ruler of all. (vi. 13, 15). He is not a national God, nor does He belong to any exclusive mystery religion. Except, however, in the formal benediction of i. 2, there is no mention of God as Father. We hear nothing like, 'to us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto him' (1 Cor. viii. 6). nor "Ye received not the spirit of bondage again unto fear; but ye received the spirit of adoption, whereby ye cry, Abba, Father'. (Rom. viii. 15). The conception of God in 1 Tim., for all its magnificence and Christian tone, lacks the warmth of that of the Pauline divine Father who draws to Himself the love of His children. As the Creator and Saviour, dwelling in light unapproachable, He receives the adoration of those who set their hope on Him (iv. 10, vi. 17). Proportionately there is a larger Jewish element in the idea of God of

1 Tim. than of Paul; some aspects, not expressed in Pauline language, are probably emphasised to meet pagan views prevalent in the contemporary world. (vi. 15, 16, ii. 5, iv. 10).

The motive power for *eusebeia* is the historic salvation that came through the incarnation of Jesus Christ, a Man who is the Mediator between God and men; He came into the world to save sinners (i. 15, ii. 5, 6.). The drama of salvation is set forth in a creedal hymn in which the Church adores Him who is the source of her piety. Christ, the Redeemer faithful unto death in the presence of the power of Rome, made the same confession as that to which the Church still adheres (vi. 12-13).

Fine though these conceptions are, they are not so powerful as those of Paul. We miss his devotion to his Lord, and his rejoicing in fellowship with Him in the Holy Spirit. *Eusebeia* in 1 Tim. expresses itself in worship of the ascended, triumphant Christ. It is not based on the vivid mystical experience of the risen Christ, present and united with the believer through faith, but is grounded upon the historical facts of redemption, as they have been accepted by the Church.

The moral content of *eusebeia*, as outlined in 1 Tim., is based upon that of the Pauline epistles, and consists of the same essential virtues of the Christian life, faith, love, sanctification, purity, patience, meekness (i. 5, 14, ii. 15, iv. 12, vi. 11), but emphasis is also laid, as in Titus too, on sobriety, shamefastness, gravity, integrity, contentment, submission on the part of women (Pauline) and faithfulness in domestic duties. The Christian family was to be a hearth of godliness, married life to be held in honour, children to be kept under discipline, practical kindness to be shown even to slaves; all were to be contented with little of this world's goods, but if any were rich, they were to be ready to distribute to those in need. None of this was strange to the heathen moralist. The Christian was to practise that serene and self-controlled habit of life which was an ideal in the highest character of contemporary society. (1 Tim. ii. 9, 11, 15, iii. 2, 8, 11, v. 14, vi. 1, 6, 10, Tit. ii. 2-9). This character was to be won by discipline and effort. (1 Tim. iv. 8), and progress in virtue should be manifest, ideas familiar in the schools of philosophy, especially Stoicism. Like the Stoic, the Christian was to be no ascetic, but saw no value in the physical training of the athletic contests. (1 Tim. iv. 1-4, 8, 15, v. 23).

While *eusebeia* is broader than faith, involving conduct and worship as well as belief, it goes deeper than *threskeia*, i.e., religion, worship on its external side. (Ac. xxvi. 5, Col. ii. 18, Ja. i. 27). One important aspect of *eusebeia* is 'cultive piety', active reverence of God as it manifests itself in worship. In the Christian assemblies prayers are to be offered, and the reading of the Scriptures is to be practised by persons who will command respect; their direction is to be in the hands of persons of high moral character, bishops or presbyters and deacons, who will cause no reproach from outsiders to fall upon the Church. To sum up, *Eusebeia* is a rever-

ent, worshipful attitude, expressed in constant and varied prayer, in adoration of the transcendent God and Saviour of all men through Christ Jesus, as well as in obedience to His will by personal virtue and loyalty to the family and rulers. The earlier rapture of mystical faith, as it is heard in the great epistles of Paul, is passing into eclipse; creedal expression of the historic salvation accompanied by a new law of high moral conduct is tempering the first brilliancy. Gospels—either ours or their sources—of the incarnate Christ and the historic Jesus, whose words are healthy doctrine, seem to lie behind this life of practical piety. The needs of a later age are being met in 1 Timothy, as the nature of Christian *eusebeia* is unfolded; the new religion has filled the hellenistic and the Jewish conceptions of piety with renovating content, and has given the ancient word a pregnant and transforming meaning.*

R. A. FALCONER.

4
*Note.—'The Roman *pius* strictly conforms his life to the *jus divinum*; he knows the will of the gods, and adjusts himself thereto whether in the family or as a citizen of the state. The new religion was morality itself. In Christianity morality became an active *pietas* of universal love, consecrated by an appeal to the life and death of the Master. The Roman did not really know the meaning of prayer. In the new religion one striking fact was that prayer superseded the religion of ceremonies and invocation of the gods. Prayer was the motive power of moral renewal and inward civilisation, and the means of maintaining the universal law of love.' (Warde Fowler, op. cit. ch. xx).

Universalism and Particularism in Israel

In every age, the conflict between these two diverse interpretations of Judaism—the universalistic and the particularistic—has been one of the major points of contention between rival schools of Jewish thinkers. Its echo has resounded through the ages, from the period of the prophets down even to our present day, as reflected in the opposing philosophies of Jewish nationalism—Zionism—and Jewish universalism, or adjustment to environment, as in Reform. Strange to say, however, the incompatibility between these two tents is more apparent than real, for a careful analysis of their origin and growth will reveal the fact that both doctrines have played, simultaneously, a prominent part in the philosophy and writings of many of Israel's religious leaders. A correct understanding of the meaning of these terms, so frequently incorrectly and inaccurately employed, will indicate that they are not irreconcilable, nor mutually exclusive.

What, then, is understood by the words "particularism" and "universalism"? The former term might be defined in the words of Kuenen, as that religious outlook which "is confined to a single people or to a group of nearly related peoples." To employ an analogy from modern psychology, it is the same tendency, on the part of the *group*, which has been diagnosed as "introversion", with regard to the individual. It implies a turning of the interests and activities of the group inwards, directing them toward the group's welfare, devoid of any conscious regard for the world without. Now this general definition, as applied to Judaism, denotes that religious conception whereby Israel, as the people devoted to a particular deity, is concerned primarily and solely with the safeguarding and perpetuating of that relationship.

In contradistinction to this narrow and restricted viewpoint, there arose in Israel also the doctrine of universalism. This idea has usually been regarded as the direct antithesis of the above mentioned conception; as being analogous to the individual "extrovert", with gaze turned outward, with tendencies to assimilation and complete emancipation from the group. Now while in theory this may be the logical definition of the term, in practice, universalism has proved to be quite otherwise construed. It becomes rather that concept which, to use again Kuenen's apt phrase, "is born of the nation, but which rises above it". It retains its particularistic or group basis, but it transcends these limitations. It does not lose its consciousness of self by a dissipation of its group values, as does the irrational extrovert. It is, on the contrary, a combination of both types of individual into that perfect personality, which develops the self only for the purpose of enriching all. In the same way that Beethoven's music is universal though arising out of a

"well-marked ethnic group", so universalism, a world-embracing conception, is, none the less, not completely severed from the people who gave it birth. True universalism, therefore, is that outlook dominating, not merely separate and assimilated individuals, but even a group arisen to that ideal vision whereby it "bursts through the limits of nationality, rising above time and space" to a viewpoint or program embracing the whole of humanity. As with particularism, so here, religious universalism must include the relationship of the individual or group to the Divine, but it must proceed two steps further. The Divine, Himself, must be universal, must extend His sovereignty over all creation; and, in addition, there must be a definite relationship between the group and mankind at large. In other words, monotheism, with its absolute negation of all other deities, is the first step toward universalism. A particular group must recognize that its god is not merely superior to all others, but it must also be convinced that he is the sole divinity in the universe. Then, when this group rises to that stage of idealism wherein its purpose is to extend this religious ideal throughout the domain of man, it has attained to a universalistic conception of religion.

1. The sacred covenant concluded by the Judah tribes and later accepted by the Northern tribes as well, whereby as Montefiore puts it, out of a confused and characterless polytheism, with its incoherent and nameless gods, there now appears a group of people "to whom the will of a new and known god is solemnly announced and with whom a sacred covenant is concluded." They are now introduced to the worship of one particular and most potent deity, with whose name and general character they have become acquainted. They now acknowledge Yahweh, "originally borrowed by Moses from the Kenites", as an exclusive and sole deity, not of the universe, but of the tribes which have entered into a covenant relationship with him. Upon this occasion Yahweh was solemnly proclaimed the God of Israel, and Israel was bound to do His will; and it is in this covenant relationship entered into at this time that we find the germ of the particularism in which we are so vially concerned. It is to be admitted that an incipient particularism might be discerned in that earlier polydemonism wherein the gods are believed to be intimately related to the individuals of a certain group by bonds of blood and by actual descent from a common ancestry, or wherein the gods have dominion over a particular territory inhabited by their worshipper, or to which haunt or beat his wanderings are confined, but interesting and important as these considerations are for the early history of the doctrine of particularism, this discussion must be limited to the starting point, rather arbitrarily but necessarily selected for the purpose of this thesis, namely, the introduction of Yahweh to the people of Israel.

2. When through the military prowess of this newly acclaimed god, the land of Canaan was finally conquered and the ark of Yahweh was brought up from Kiriath-ye-arim to Jerusalem, the particularism born in the covenant concluded at Sinai was virtually

complete, and Yahweh had become the national deity of Israel as Marduk was the tutelary god of the Babylonians and Chemvoh was the god of Moab.

3. Already in the pre-prophetic period there were anticipations of a break with this particularist doctrine which posited that Yahweh's sole concern was the prosperity and welfare of his people Israel. In Micayah ben Yimlah's daring prophecy against the four hundred official prophets, in Gad's searching prediction of David's punishment at the hands of Yahweh, in Elijah's challenge of Ahab's moral turpitude, we have a radical departure from everything that had gone before. The active resistance displayed by these men to the flagrant violations of morality by persons such as Ahab and Jezebel, evinced a moral power that far transcended the limitation set by national boundaries and borders. The conflict between particularism and, at least a nascent universal morality, had begun.

4. It is with Amos, however, that the first far-reaching break with Particularism is found, although as we shall later see, it was not until many centuries later that the concept of universalism which he faintly glimpsed was fully grasped. Before Amos the bond that united Yahweh to his people could never be broken. Strained relations might ensue, which "could be compared to the misunderstandings between husband and wife (as in Hosea 1-3), who have never heard of divorce, or at least have never thought of it. The disturbance of their peaceable relations, one with the other, might be extremely painful, but, sooner or later, it would be made up." No matter how much Yahweh's wrath might be kindled against His people for a time, He would not be "angry with them for long" but on the "Yom Yahweh" He would wreak vengeance on all the foes of His people, granting victory and greater glory to Israel. (Joel 4:18). It was with this point of view that Amos differed so radically. Yes; Yahweh would manifest Himself on the "Yom Yahweh", but it would be "a day of darkness and not of light." (5:20). Because Amos now conceived of Yahweh as a Moral Being, He was independent of His relationship with Israel which had been established, in the first place, not because of any special merit on Israel's part, but as an example of "Yahweh's unfettered choice, as an instance of the free exercise of His sovereign will." Israel, therefore, could disappear from the face of the earth and Yahweh would be unaffected; He would yet exist, nay, more; be glorified and His justice vindicated, through the very destruction of His people. In his pronouncement of an absolute doom, without hope of any intercession to stay Yahweh's judgment in this message of the complete and irremedial destruction of Yahweh's people, Amos propounds a new conception, the conception of a *universal* and all-powerful god.

But there are even more indications of Amos' advance in religious thought to be found in his prophecy. Not only can Yahweh exist independently of Israel, not only can He cast off His people

because of their transgressions (2: 6f; 4:1; 5:7; 5:10, 12) and their seeking of evil rather than of good (5:14), but, by implication at least, He can take unto Himself another nation, for in nowise did Israel enjoy a special monopoly of Yahweh's favor. Although He had brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt, He had also redeemed the Philistines from Captor and the Arameans from Kir. (9:7). According to Amos' new doctrine, Yahweh's power and sway extends to the other nations, his "ethical will is imposed upon other peoples", whom He will also destroy because of their violations of His moral law: Nor this alone; as an acute observer of the movements of the nations of Western Asia, Amos could not but perceive, in the renewed activity of the Assyrian army and the impending destruction of Israel, the will of Yahweh; and thus, he perceived in Assyria a nation raised up by Yahweh "to afflict you from the 'entrance of Hamath unto the brook of the Arabah'." (6:14). Yahweh, the living and active guardian of the moral order of the world was but using this instrument for the punishment of "man's inhumanity to man."

Yet Amos recognized a special relationship between Israel and Yahweh, (2:9; 3:2), which cannot be interpreted, especially because of Israel's imminent and entire destruction, as being of universal significance. Yahweh, to be sure, is the mighty and all-powerful ruler of the nations, existing independently of Israel. His justice transcending the relationship which He had established with them. But in this sense only was Amos a universalist. He did not as yet conceive of any relationship between Israel and the other nations; he conceived of no purpose or function for it beyond obedience to Yahweh's covenant, and, since it had flouted this agreement, it was to be irreparably renounced, having no further *raison d'être*. He did not attain to a theological or absolute monotheism, but he did reach at least a "practical one, perhaps, for Yahweh, the God of Israel, is powerful enough to punish Israel for its sins. (2:6-8).

5. In Isaiah we find another important step in the development of Israel's concept of universalism. Although H. P. Smith finds in the declaration "the whole earth is filled with Yahweh's glory," (Is. 6:3), a universalism beyond anything we have found yet in Israel, it is not so much in this fact that Isaiah's contribution lay, as it is in his doctrine of the "righteous remnant" (10: 21) that is to return. In this doctrine another step is taken by Israel along the pathway leading to universalism. This is a striking modification of Amos' view of complete annihilation descending upon all, irrespective of any extenuating circumstances. The doom, according to Amos, was a purely mechanical process, an inevitable consequence of Israel's sinfulness, a direct result of Yahweh's absolute justice. It was Isaiah who first questioned the validity of such a justice and love. To him it seemed inconceivable that Yahweh should thus mercilessly destroy even the repentant or righteous few. Perhaps he was influenced in this respect by Hosea's doctrine of ultimate forgiveness. It is in this doctrine of individualism,

of the righteous few who would be spared out of the destruction of the nation, that the first impetus toward the servant idea of Deutero-Isaiah is to be found.

Isaiah's God was one whose might and power far transcended the limits of the nation. He could destroy not merely Israel, but the vast and proud realm of Assyria. Thus Yahweh might extend his reputation and name far beyond the boundaries of Israel. But Isaiah had not yet risen to that height where he conceived of Israel as His agent in the "diffusion of truth or spiritual welfare to humanity", and of this remnant as bearing His revelations to the peoples of the earth.

6. Essentially Jeremiah's doctrines were similar to those we have already treated. Both in his re-emphasis of the "*decretum absolutum*" and his conception of Yahweh as the ruler of the world who used the Chaldeans as the instrument of his wrath, he was in agreement with his predecessors. And while I disagree with Kuenen and others that a fully developed monotheism upon which an absolute universalism can alone be based can be found in Jeremiah, still there is one significant advance in his teaching. Jeremiah gave a more adequate and a more clearly defined portrayal of the remnant and its function in the future, than did any of his predecessors. To be sure, the present generation was valueless, they were the "rotten figs" of no use whatsoever (24:8f) among whom "shall be sent the sword and the famine and the pestilence till they be consumed from off the land (ibid)," but disregarding these destined to destruction, Jeremiah turned his eyes toward those who were carried away into exile. He saw in them the "good figs", the ones who after being cleansed and purified by the punishment to be inflicted upon them in exile, would return to Yahweh with their whole heart (24: 5f).

Because of the faith which Jeremiah places in this remnant composed of his few followers, but more especially of his confidence in the punitive power of the exile he entreats them to put aside all thoughts of rebellion or vengeance and to settle down in the lands assigned to them." Yahweh would make a new covenant with Israel which, in its very nature would be indissoluble, for it would be inscribed upon the heart of the people, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, and through this covenant Israel would once more become the people of Yahweh and He would be their God." (31:31-35).

There are some who conclude from this that this new covenant would not longer be confined to a single nation, but fitted and destined for 'many nations' and "the teaching of it would become needless, for it would be universally known." Kautzsche finds in this new covenant "nothing less than a distinct breaking with the conception of the religion of Israel as a merely national religion, indissolubly connected with particular outward forms of the cultus, and, above all, with a particular land. Thus the victory is finally won (says Kautzsche) over those particularistic features,

may features bordering upon nature religion which from early times had clung to the religion of Israel." In essence Kautzsche is right. This doctrine of Jeremiah's of a *restored* remnant dedicated to Yahweh in a new covenant, by which all will, innately or instinctively, "know Yahweh", without the necessity of first being taught (31:33), this together with his emphasis on individualism and a personal interpretation of religion, paved the way for the teachings of Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah, but even in such highly universalistic passages as are found in Chapters Three (esp. v. 17) and Four (v. 2), a particularism bequeathed to him by the past is still present, and Israel's glorification is marked throughout, (esp. 3:17). If the passage in Chapter 16:19 be by Jeremiah, as Dr. Bittenwieser and others strongly urge, then there is a most far-reaching universalism expressed in his writings. But such passages in Jeremiah are the exceptions rather than the rule, and thus did not issue from a clearly orientated universalism. Yet, in comparison with the clearly defined and self-consistent doctrine of Deutero-Isaiah it appears to be but an anticipation. A universalism that sought to extend Yahweh's revelation beyond the borders of Israel was struggling to the fore. The prophet felt its power and yet he had first to overcome that deeply rooted particularism with which it came into contact. Here it is that there becomes apparent and concretely visible that conflict which became so important to the subsequent history.

7. Nor did the Deuteronomic Code establish a pure monotheism nor break through the limits of particularism as some aver. Here too the same conflict of ideas is apparent, in a practical religious program seeking to embody the theoretical idealism that had been enunciated, a conciliatory attempt to combine or to bring about an alliance between priestly and prophetic theories, to introduce a binding monotheistic conception of God, through a concrete code of law and that most far-reaching of all reforms, the centralization of all ritual and worship at Jerusalem. But it did not in reality, advance beyond the concept of a "holy nation, exalted above all others (26:19)." "It did not occur to the authors of Deuteronomy that it was the duty of Yahweh's people to spread the knowledge of Him beyond the borders of Israel, or that this extended recognition, whether affected by Israel or not, was the ultimate justification of and aim of Israel's election and privilege".

"Hinted at" but not "taken up and worked out", not followed out nor perfected, are the phrases that might be applied to an estimation of the progress made toward universalism during these centuries. "Since the prophets, one and all foretold judgment, one and all believed that the effects of that judgment would be adequate and lasting," they had not as yet created a new ideal of their people's function and destiny among the other peoples of the world. Certain inconsistencies in their preaching, certain hints at a future service formed the foundation upon which their successors were to build.

8. Those who affirm only Ezekiel's particularism, lay altogether too much stress on the last nine chapters of his writing. Ezekiel, however, was undoubtedly too great a figure to be used to illustrate but this single tendency. Although he built upon foundations already laid for him, still he did advance beyond the concept of universalism held by his predecessors, and thus he was their true spiritual descendant.

What then, was the purpose of all this legislation, of all these external enactments, and of this glorious future state? In the first place, in regard to the individuals, did it mean that henceforth every person would merely concern himself with Temple ceremonial and have no other duties in life but those of worship and ritual purity? Only if we arbitrarily separate these last nine chapters from the rest of the book can we maintain such a point of view. What are those statutes of life, the doing of which would be the mark of that "new heart" and that "new spirit" which repentance and God's grace would win for Israel at last? They include, on the one hand to be sure, the avoidance of idolatry, but otherwise they are exclusively ethical. Except for his previous and pragmatic emphasis of the cult, demanded by the complete collapse of his contemporaries' faith following the exile, his program does not differ from the old prophetic preachments—to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly before God. His legalism predominates, it is true; but only because he had realized through his close contact with the people, that the prophetic program of "seek good and not evil" had not sufficed in and by itself. Yahweh was to restore His people for the sake of His reputation, to be sure; but also for a deeper and more spiritual reason: Not merely for Israel's sake, not merely for the sake of Yahweh's name, but rather that "they shall know that I am Yahweh". (38:23; 39:7, etc.).

At first glance, this phrase seems to imply the mere acknowledgment on the part of the other nations of Yahweh's power or even supremacy over the other gods. Still its constant use *in relation to Israel* as well as to the other peoples, seems to imply a deeper and broader connotation. We understand from the previous prophets what the idea of "knowing God" or "knowledge of Yahweh" really connotes, and it is not unlikely that this is what Ezekiel's aspiration actually was. To know the *nature* of a god is to know his requirements and demands. The nation knowing of Him as the greatest of the gods were *ipso facto* to acknowledge Him as their god also, and to seek His way. Otherwise, the constant use of the phrase "and they shall know that I am Yahweh" would mean very little, especially since the same words are applied to Israel, who *acknowledged* Him but did not worship Him. Israel, through its redemption, was to become thoroughly *convinced* that Yahweh is God, but surely this would not suffice; this would not satisfy Yahweh. Learning that He is God and God alone, it became incumbent upon Israel to worship Him, (and hence the chapters 40-48; for this is what Yahweh required.) Can it not be deduced, therefrom, that the same is true of Ezekiel's attitude to-

ward the other nations? Even as Israel had to be destroyed, even as other nations, as viewed by the other prophets also, had to be ravaged for not acknowledging or truly revering Yahweh, so in Ezekiel, Yahweh would have to prove by His might His *right* to be *worshipped* by all. Israel had not yet become the active agent of God, His minister to mankind, but Israel most assuredly seems to be Yahweh's passive instrument, His *oth*, through which his reputation would eventually reach all peoples.

In Ezekiel there is a most pronounced particularism, a most rigid and rigorous ritualism, but these were due primarily to his practical program and necessary compromise with the limited mental and spiritual capacity of his contemporaries. He conceived, on the one hand, of Israel as Yahweh's perpetually peculiar and particular people. His unique property, but His property only that He might use them in the furtherance of His own pursuits, which included the reestablishment of His reputation and the acknowledgment of His power by all mankind. So Ezekiel has grasped both ideas and approached a harmonization of them by conceiving of Israel as Yahweh's peculiar people, His holy nation for whose benefit He manifests His supreme power, but only that through His deeds in behalf of His nation, they may become a "correction and a sign" (5:10) to all the peoples of the earth, that they too might seek Him. Whether all mankind would then enjoy the same relationship is seemingly not considered nor adequately answered by Ezekiel. Only this much is certain: he was struggling with the problem.

9. If the ravages of the Exile produced the compromises of Ezekiel, then it was the hope of redemption during the reign of Cyrus which gave us the full flowering of this long-tended and slow-blossoming plant of universalism, as we find it in Deutero-Isaiah. He is the first of the prophets to deny, categorically and emphatically, the existence of all other deities save Yahweh. Again and again, he repeats the formula: "I am the Lord; there is none else." Yahweh is the first and the last (44:6) before Him there was no god formed and none shall come after Him. (43:10). Since this is the sole Deity he must not merely be the creator of all these things but able also to preordain all that will come to pass. (44:7; 48:3). Since He is the omniscient and omnipotent ruler of the universe, all things must necessarily come to pass in accordance with His will. A divine teleology is the inescapable corollary to these doctrines which are so fundamental to his conception of Yahweh. Yahweh, the universal God, has chosen Israel, (41:8; 43:4; 46:3), He has delivered them from Egypt; He had exiled them to a foreign land (42:24; 47:6), but now He is about to restore them. All this is but for a definite and preconceived purpose.

What, then, is this purpose for which Yahweh has chosen Israel, for which He is to restore His people despite its manifest shortcomings?

In one respect Deutero-Isaiah's reply resembles that given by Ezekiel. Because of the calamities which befell Israel Yahweh's name has been blasphemed (52:4-5; cf. Ezek. 32:21), and therefore he must contend with Babylon "for His name's sake" (48:9), in order that all flesh shall know that "I, the Lord, am He who saved thee, thy Redeemer, the Mighty One of Jacob" (49:24). But Deutero-Isaiah developed even this idea to its logical conclusion. For if Yahweh had "created this people for My purpose" (43:21), then they need not be merely the passive tool in the hands of Yahweh, but they might also become His active agent, His conscious messengers, (44:26), witnesses (43:10) summoned "to tell of My glory."

This, then, is the finishing touch requisite for a perfect universalistic structure. Now there is considered not merely Yahweh's relation to Israel and mankind, but for the first time we have an accurate and clearly expressed relationship between Israel and humanity. Israel is to become the teacher of humanity, both by example and by precept. Not vicariously, but rather as the living exemplars of Yahweh's ways, testifying by its history to the purificatory effects of suffering, through which the nations also will be purged and purified.

Aside from this passive role as exemplar through suffering, even greater is the servant's task as teacher by precept. Like the priests of old, Yahweh's spirit is poured out upon them (42:1; 44:3), thus consecrating them to His service, endowing them with divine power and insight, permeating them with a complete and perfect knowledge of Yahweh and His ways.

Up to this time, except for a few similar passages in some of the prophetic writings, only individuals were conceived of as being thus endowed, but now it descends upon the collective individual, the personified servant, Israel. He is to bring "*mishpat*" (42:1) to the nations; he will not fail or falter, relax nor grow weary until he has faithfully (v. 2) discharged his function; a verse translated by Prof. Battenwieser: "until He has set forth religious truth on earth and until even the far distant isles await His revelation." (v. 4). The use of "*mishpat*" together with "*torah*" gives us the clue to its meaning in Deutero-Isaiah. Here it does not convey the idea of justice, in the legal sense, but rather "religion" or "religious truth". As "*torah*", in its original usage, means not merely law, or a specific codification of law, but rather "teaching" and especially religious teaching, the purpose and function of the servant is clearly defined. Israel is not merely destined to become an example to the nations which might learn from the despised servant the error of their ways, and the redemption which likewise might be theirs (53:1-12), but the servant, though at first the rejected of men, is yet to become the teacher of Yahweh's religious truths to the nations. Through this instruction in Yahweh's ways, will he fulfil the task of bringing all mankind into the same covenant relationship with Yahweh as Israel itself enjoys. Thus the

term "*berith am*" is employed by Deutero-Isaiah with this connotation; not that Israel is to be merely a covenant people (which would be "*am berith*", but (as the expression "*'or la-goyim*" used synonymously implies) a conscious agent of Yahweh in effecting this universal covenant with all mankind, to bring light to the nations; to worship and to proclaim Him as their universal God.

To leave Deutero-Isaiah at this highest plane of true universalism, without saying a word or two of his particularism, were to gloss over and to ignore an important element in his teaching. Universalism, as we understand it, does not imply an entire renunciation of particularism, nor a complete merging of all groups into one uniform whole; but, to recall the definition which we posited at the outset, it is rather the harmonization of that separatism as a part of a universal whole. It is the development and retention of group identity for the benefit of mankind at large. And so Deutero-Isaiah, in his fervid universalism, did not lose sight of Israel as a separate entity or nation. Yahweh, the creator of heaven and earth, was for him, none the less, as much the God of Israel as He was for Amos and Isaiah. His particularism, in certain passages (49:22ff; 45:14ff. etc.) is as marked as in those of some of the other prophets, but it must be borne in mind that his true universalism lies, not in the negation of this doctrine so inherently a part of the very soul of Israel, but in the harmonization of it with a broad humanitarian ideal. Rather is this that perfect universalism, that only satisfactory solution to the dilemma of a people imbued with a universal message, toward which centuries of religious thought had been groping.

MAURICE N. EISENDRATH.