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It has been said that the Hebrews had a religion, but not a theology. There is no debate on the existence of God anywhere in O.T. literature. No functional differences between God and His spirit were ever decided upon. The Hebrews simply believed that God existed and that no logic of man would make His existence any more real or vivid. Perhaps those minds were right in not trying to outline the characteristics of their belief and the One they believed in. Such an attempt might have served to desiccate an ever-flowing stream, - the stream of God's purpose for His people.

But there cannot possibly be a religion without theology; implicit, if not explicit. On this ground are we justified in our attempt to bring to light one aspect of O.T. theology - the aspect that Jahweh is the God of love.

I have taken the liberty of changing the title. As accepted by the Senatus, it ran thus :

"The Development of the Conception of Yahweh as the God of Love."

As originally planned, the outline began with Hosea, who invented the idea, then on to Jeremiah upon whom Hosea’s influence worked, then Deuteronomy, the "prophetic" law, ending up with some Psalms and Deutero-Isaiah. As I hope the following pages will reveal, my viewpoint has changed so that the word "development" would be misleading. In many of the ramifications
of the present viewpoint my mind is as yet unsettled. Perhaps
time and further study will clarify and unify—and verify.

Limiting this thesis has been especially trying. I
had constantly to remind myself that the subject at hand was "Jah-
weh, the God of Love" not "of Grace", Redemption", Salvation",
"Righteousness". Neither was it been my purpose simply to
collect all the material proving that the O.T. God was kindly and
benevolent. However, owing to a peculiarity of the O.T. religion
I have been unable to remain within the fences which I had erected.
The peculiarity is simply this: That the O.T. religion is not a
matter of logical certainty, however absolute that may be, but of
practical certainty. Jahweh was a God of love because He proved
it to Israel in two provinces, viz. history and nature. When
considering God, the Saviour from every need, in the past, present
and future, as well as the God who gives fertility and prosperity,
it is impossible to draw a sharp line of demarcation between the
benevolent helping God and the loving God. However, in self-
defence let me say that the fences have always been present
whether I stayed within them or not.

I have also limited my field to the canonical Old Testa-
ment, for the simple reason that time forbade including the
apocrypha. This has been singularly unfortunate, since such
books as the Wisdom of Solomon, Jubilees, and the Testaments of
the Twelve Patriarchs have much material to contribute to my topic.
But the Old Testament has offered a rich enough store of material;
I am not complaining.

From the very nature of the subject, it must needs be that where a divorce occurs between tradition, as the O.T. writer reported it, and history as the objective historian and archaeologist discover it, I shall work with the former. (Perhaps it is not irrelevant, however, to mention the recent efforts which have been made to reconcile these two quantities, not without success).

As for the chronology of the separate writings of the O.T. I have followed, for the most part, that of Sellin's Einleitung.

I should like to express here my very deep gratitude to the professors who have helped and encouraged and taught me during my work on this thesis, Professors A.R.S. Kennedy, P. Volz, A.C. Welch, and W. Fortescue, especially the last, who has been, more than any other single person, responsible for my (if I may use a time-tested expression) conversion. Finally am I thankful for the Old Testament in its present form, with its baffling inconsistencies of thought and narrative, and its insoluble mysteries of composition, in short, its shameless disregard for future students and theologians. There it stands. Let him who would systematize and theologize vainly batter his head against it. After all the theologies have been written and contradicted, God's Word will still be standing!

1) 1935.
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Nowhere in the O.T. do we find it expressed that God is Love. Such a manner of thinking was foreign to the realistic Hebrew mind. God is not anything else except God. God is, (Ex. 3:14) and God does.

There apparently was no doubt about the existence of God. Only a fool would deny such a premise. One saw Him working in the past and in the present, and one could picture how He would work in the future. Jahweh was the God of Israel's history.

The God of history directs history. And such a belief presupposes a plan; otherwise history is chaos. Israel believed that the plan of its national history, as different from every other nation, was to be the chosen nation of Jahweh and to expect salvation from no other hand but His. He had chosen Israel as a man chooses a bride. He had made a covenant with it as a man does with a wife, and when it had broken the covenant, He had forgiven. Among the nations of the world, all of whom were under the power and control of the one God, Israel was the favourite, just as Joseph was the favourite son among many brothers. Oddly enough, Israel did not think of its being chosen through any virtue of its own. It was nothing, nor had it done anything to merit, Jahweh's choosing it and giving it the best of lands along with prosperity and protection from powerful neighbours. There was only one reason to account for Jahweh's choosing and binding Himself in promises
to Israel, just as there is one reason for one son being a favourite in preference to other more worthy sons. Jahweh loved Israel.

Jahweh is not exclusively a God of love in the Old Testament. It might even be argued that He is not primarily or fundamentally a God of love. Volz has drawn from the O.T. clear evidence of the terrible side of God's nature: the capricious, Demonic, Ruthless, Ruinous Autocrat. And this picture of Jahweh is not to be cast out in order to portray a tender loving Father. The two are inconsistent, but both sides are necessary. God was a Presence to be feared, to be dreaded. He was inexorable, and He judged, with mercy and loving-kindness, to be sure, but He judged.

Either side of God's nature, if stressed without keeping its opposite in mind, would present a false picture of the O.T. religion. Jahweh loved Israel because such was His nature. But Israel's sin and rebellion forced Him to hate it. His love never completely supplanted His hate because Israel's nature never permanently became anything but sinful. But neither did His hate ever entirely supplant His love, for His loving nature could not change. The two elements have always existed side-by-side, creating a paradox.

But both sides of God's nature, the loving and the angry, are derived from the one great O.T. truth: the personality of God. No matter how supra-human His might, or how fantastic His works and revelations, Jahweh is always the Person. Only by constantly keeping in mind that He is not some ethical Absolute, or even some eternally creative Energy, but that He is the One upon whose

1) "He is such a person as we ourselves; His characteristics do not
pattern man is formed can His love be understood. As Quell puts it, "God's love is for the Old Testament authors always correlated to His personality, just as the imageless love to Him is thought of as to His person, and the love for His word, His law, His temple and the like is grounded in love to His person." And it is in a Person that Jahweh experiences the gamut of emotion. His jealousy is known from the time of Moses (Ex. 20:3) and Joshua (Ex. 34:14). The wealth of expression signifying God's anger gives a clear indication of the reality of this emotion in His character. The anger could become hate when the objects motivating this emotion were sufficiently opposed to His will. And Jahweh could even be moved by a desire for vengeance, e.g. against sinners (Is. 1:24) Nineveh (Nah. 1:2) Edom (Ezek. 25:14) and Babylon (Jer. 50:28.)

Especially noteworthy is the fact that God can repent for something He has done. In spite of such assertions as I. Sam. 15:29;

differ from ours, except that they exceed ours." (P.161) "From the first historical reference to God in scripture the idea of His being a person is firmly reached and little advance takes place along this line" Davidson Theology. p.107.

2) Th. W. s M.T.I.1 p.22
3) Sellin, Theologie p.30 ff.
4) See Sellin ibid, p.31.
5) Amos 5:21, 6:8, Is. 1:14, Hos. 9:15; Dt. 16:22, Ps. 11:5, Mal. 1:3, 2:16.
Hum. 23:19, that the very fact that He is God and not man prevents such an emotion, yet He even regrets that He made man (Gen.6:6) He repents of the evil He had planned for the people (Ex.32:14) and He promises to repent of His intended punishment if ever the evil people would turn (Jer.18:8).

It can be understood thus that Jahweh is thought of as actually undergoing an experience of the love emotion when His love is mentioned. It might be assumed that a God who is subject to violent emotions is become too anthropomorphic for man's devotion. But it must be remembered (1) that Jahweh is the God of a highly emotional oriental people and (2) that all His emotions are strictly in accordance with His holiness and are the outcome of it; moreover His holiness can only be seen in its true living sense when accompanied by these emotions, for they are always in harmony with His plan of making Israel a holy nation.

It also must be understood that Jahweh's love is never just a passive emotion, but something which motivates Him to activity. Just as His invisible anger is followed by a visible punishment, so is His invisible love followed by a visible well-being. Thus the knowledge of His love for Israel is not the result of abstract philosophical conjecture, but something obvious.

1) Also 1 Sam.15:11, 35; Amos 7:3, 6; Jer.18:10, 26, 3, 13, 19.
to each member of the nation in time of prosperity, in the form of their material gifts, such as the land and fertility in crops, herds, and in their own families, also in every victory over a foe, and deliverance from oppression.

We come now to discuss the limitations of God's love as revealed in the O.T. These are two, viz.: (1) God's love is reserved for Israel as opposed to all other nations, and (2) God's love exists only for Israel the group, not for the individual Israelite.

There is no gainsaying the fact that Jahweh's love is confined to the nation Israel. It is never stated that He loves another nation, or other nations, or the world.

However, it must be firmly established that Jahweh was the God of the entire world. Otherwise His love for Israel would be simply the glorification of a national God. There is abundant evidence for the belief in Jahweh the God of the universe. Naturally, firstly comes the conception of the Creator-God. A nation through which the world's traffic flowed, which had itself lived not only in its early history but always in the midst of foreign folk could not possibly be so blind as to think a Creator-God created only one nation, or sent rain only to one nation. Aside from the two creation narratives themselves, the creation of the world is one of God's glories which the Biblical writers exulted in. Amos sings out His praise in the doxologies.
4:13; 5:8, 7:15 f. "I have made the earth, the men and the beasts that are upon the face of the earth, by my great power and by my outstretched arm, and I give it to whom it seemeth right unto me". Jer.29:5

Especially is God the Creator-God for II.Isaiah; 40:12 ff, 42:5, 45:7, 12,18; 48:13, 51:13.

Nevertheless He says that He puts His word in Israel's mouth, and, though He stretches the heavens and founds the earth, yet to Zion He says: "Thou art my people (Is.51:16) Israel, though part of the creation and not distinct from it, naturally, is separated from the remainder of creation by the God of creation. What distinguishes Israel is only the spiritual possession of God's love.

Not only in the world's creation, but in the direction of its history is Jahweh the universal God. Jahweh was chiefly revealed to His nation through the direction of its national history, but that national history was intimately bound up with the history of the surrounding nations, and was made glorious partly at their expense. The very fact that Israel was "chosen" by God rests on the basis of a belief in a God who might have chosen other nations. Amos sees in historical events having nothing to

1) See Cramer p.92 ff for statement of genuineness of these passages "With Amos Israel's God is always the Creator-God." p.94.

2) Also Jer.10:10 ff - not Jeremianic. See Volz. ad loc. in K2 AT

3) The Psalms are rich in praise of the God of creation (Pss.8:19: 1-6; 29; 33: 104: 148.)
do with Israel the hand of God (9:7). According to Isaiah, he uses Assyria's king as a bowyer uses an axe (Is.10:15) (Cf. Is. 14: 24 ff). He has a purpose for Egypt (Is. 19:12). He has purposes against Tyre (23:8 f). But the nations have not received His word. They knew not the thoughts of Jahweh, neither do they understand His counsel: for He hath gathered them as sheaves to the threshing-floor". (Mic. 4:12)

On the other hand, Jeremiah even sees Jahweh ruling the nations under the same general ethical principle which Israel has; if a nation which God has decided to punish turns from its evil, then He will repent Him of the evil He intended for it. (Jer. 12:7 f) For Jahweh is interested in the salvation of the world. This fact is best seen in II. Isaiah (especially the servant songs) and Jonah. The purpose of Jahweh's servant is to be a light to the Gentiles, to be His salvation to the end of the earth (Is. 49:6) (Cf. 42:6) Likewise Jonah is sent to preach to Nineveh, the city which hearkens to his word and repents, thereby making possible God's salvation. When Jonah sulks over this success Jahweh asks him "Should I not have regard for Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than six score thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and also much cattle? (4:11) This verse is as near as the O.T. comes to expressing Jahweh's love for the other

1) "Jeremiah was feeling out after a religion which was not national in the narrow sense of the word, but which was historic and revealed. And because it was the revelation of the nature and will of One who was the God of the world, it must become universal". Welch, Jeremiah, p.193.
We can conclude therefore that Jahweh's love is practically confined to His people. And one must be indeed chary of speaking of a growing tendency to universalism in the O.T. religion. As we have seen, from the very choosing of Israel Jahweh was considered God (or perhaps chief God) of the other nations. He is regarded as God of the world's history, certainly from Amos' time onward. Jahwehism was always a potentially universal religion because of the very supra-nationalism of the character of its God. But Jahweh's love for the rest of the world is not an O.T. concept. The word 'rahab' is never found to express His relationship to the nations. Only once is raham used (Jer.12:15) but it does not have the same warmth as when applied to Israel. By the time of Psalms 33 (v.5) and 119 (v.64) the word 'hesed' had become weak enough so that the appreciative Israelites could see the whole creation full of it. But one cannot imply from this fact that the other nations enjoyed it (Psalm 136). The nations are only to know God's love through His beloved nation.

Thus we must content ourselves to restrict our study to Israel as the recipient of God's love. The God of the nations gave His love to one small undeserving nation, and not to another for a set purpose, - the seed of Abraham was to be the means of bringing salvation to the other nations.

---

1) Ziegler Die Liebe Gottes bei den Propheten, p.108. After punishing it Jahweh will return and have compassion upon the neighbour which touches His people Israel's inheritance. But only by accepting His people's religion can that nation save itself from utter destruction.
The other limitations of God's love in the O.T. is the fact that for the most part it exists only for the group, not for the individual. We do find mentioned God's love for certain individuals such as Benjamin (Dt.33:12), Solomon (II.Sam.12:24, Neh.13:26), and Cyrus (Is.48:14), but the only reference to an individual worshipper being beloved by God is found in Ps.127:2 (God's gifts come to His beloved in sleep).

However, this is not a formidable limitation and is only objectionable to a (fast-disappearing) individualistic age like our own. Israel was a community; its religion was a communal one. In that God loved the community, each individual shared in that love, but only in so far as he was a member of the community in good standing. It was with the people Israel that God had established His covenant in love.

But to conclude from this that it was only some vague communal quantity which felt God's love is to deny most of the Old Testament. The prophets from Moses on, the patriarchs, the Psalmists, all had the experience of a God whose nature was love. The prophets were called by Him individually. And the Psalmists trusted in Him individually to care for their needs. Jahwism was a religion of individuals, of great religious individuals.

1) For a clear description of this type of totalitarian society see Pedersen's Israel I-II passim.
But the individuals considered themselves members of the group in that only as members of the group did they receive their religious heritage. God had chosen Abraham that the earth might be blessed through his seed. God had chosen Moses that he might lead and instruct the people. Therefore it is to the revealed religion of the people Israel that we turn our attention.

---

1) For an example in the case of a prophet see Cramer, Amos pp. 50-55.
PART I. EXPRESSIONS DEMONSTRATING GOD'S LOVE
The most obvious proof of Jahweh as a God of Love is the words which are used to express His love. Although they furnish by no means the only proof, or even the most important proof theologically, yet the frequency and the varied sources of this word material give no inconsiderable evidence.

The most direct expression for God's love in the Old Testament is found in the word Ahab with its derivatives. This word corresponds apparently exactly to the English word love, and has just as many shades of meaning. Ziegler discusses the root meaning of the word, but finds it of little consequence in determining the conception of the O.T. term.

The various contributions which he sums up are as follows:

1. The syllable נכי represents an onomatop with the suggestion of breathing and blowing. Hence נכי as a passionate heaving. (But could not any word with the initial letter נ or כ mean as much?) 2. It might be related to the Arabic b b b meaning to blow. 3. Or to the

1.) op.cit.p.13f
Arabic ḥāb which means *protectingly shelter* or *hide*. There are two cases where this connotation can possibly be suggested; Job 31: 33 "By hiding my iniquity in my bosom." ḥāb and Habakkuk 3: 4, "And there was the hiding ḥāb of His power." Ziegler thinks that the former may mean either bosom or love. However it can very well be associated with As for Ziegler agrees with the LXX translation. Quell, on the other hand, takes this as a "theologizing or erroneous paraphrase"; the word really means a *covering*. With this meaning, however, the word can better derive from either or . The word occurs in Dt.33:3 "Jahweh loveth the people". If then derives from and thence Ziegler believes that it originally had nothing to do with sexual love, and concludes from Dt.4:15ff and Mal.1:2 that earlier, though not from the beginning, it had the meaning to prefer, or to favour. Ziegler remains unconvinced as to the certainty of the original meaning of the word, and satisfies himself with the uses of the word in the Old Testament itself.

In the LXX ḥāb is rendered by three verbs:

1. γάφαντω (γάφαντω) 
2. φιλέω and
3. ἐρούω.

2.) ἀγαπάωσις
By far the most examples are found as in the O.T. The three Greek words have different shades of meaning, all of which can be found in the one Hebrew word.

As to the exact meaning of the word love, the O.T. shows it as "fundamentally a spontaneous feeling, which forces one to Selbsthingabe, or, if it is a matter of things, drives to the appropriation of the object which awakens the feeling, or to the exercising of an action in which one takes pleasure."

Quell continues his description by pointing out what tremendous energies it commands. One loves with all one's heart, soul, and strength (Dt.6:5) According to the Preacher, there is a time for love and a time for hate - the two are opposites (Eco.3:8) And even though the word loses some of its original (i.e. sexual) meaning through becoming figurative, yet "it is so strong an expression of personal life that even the figurative use of the word in relation to things only loses its passionate note with the smallest of objects.

1. According to Deak, 197 times; is the characteristic expression for God's love to man. occurs ten times, but only in the profane use. is given five times for and are found once each, also only profanely.


3. Quell op.cit. p.22.
The simplest and perhaps most fundamental sense of love is the attraction between the sexes. This love ranges from the lower sensual aspect to the pure and moral. I think that Ziegler is making a false distinction in saying that 'Ahabah is not used in the sense of Liebeslust or Geschlechtsge noss.

To be sure, 'Ahabah does occur to signify this meaning.

Jer.4:30; Ez.23:5,7,9,11,12,16,20; but Hos.2:7; 9:1, 4:18, 9:10; Jer.2:25,33; 22:20,22,30:14; Es.16:37; 16:33,36,37; 23:5,9,22. However the deeper and purer love between the sexes is more frequent, and is seen not only between married couples but also represents the attraction between unmarried man and maiden. Isaac loved Rebecca after marriage (Gen.24:67,) but Jacob loved Rachel (Gen.29:18,20,30) so much that the seven years he had to serve for her seemed but a few days. The married love of Elkanah and Hannah was idyllic (1.Sam.1:5,8) but the more youthful "falling in love" is also designated by 'Ahabah, such as the love of Samson for Delilah, (Jud.16:4) or that of Amnon for Tamar (II.Sam.13:1.) But above all is the substantive 'Ahabah found to express the love between the bridegroom and the bride. (Sg.of Sol.2:4,5,7; 3:5,10; 5:8; 7:7)

2. The love of Solomon for his seven hundred wives, to say nothing of his three hundred concubines if it does not approach caricature shows what a shallow meaning the word 'Ahabah came to have - a mere legalization of sexual practices (Quell op.cit. p.23, note)
8:4, 6:7, Jer.2:2) The vigorous figure describing the love - "love is as strong as death" (8:6) - shows the power which was attributed to it.

However, 'ahab reached far beyond the attraction between the two sexes in its usage. Naturally, it designated the love of parent for child. Abraham loved his only son Isaac (Gen.22:2) Parental loves can be jouched with preference, as when Isaac loves Esau but Rebekah loved Jacob (Gen.25:28). Jacob loved both children of his old age (Gen.37:3; 44:20). But also a close friendship, such as that between David and Jonathan, is painted in the most glowing colours. (II.Sam.1:26) "Thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women." Love also designates a paler affection, but none the less real, as when Saul is greatly attracted to the young David and makes him his armour bearer (I.Sam.16:21). From the sense of friendship as a companionship (20:4,6; Est.5:10,14; 6:13) the intensity of the feeling gradually fades away as in the constant love of Hiram for David (1.K.5:15,16) (admiration) or in the love of a slave for his master, or of a people for a king who goes out and in among them. (I.Sam.18:16) Finally we even reach the state of cynicism revealed in Prov.14:20. "The poor

1.) Cf.Prov.18:24,27 5f) 
2.) Cf.Ps.38:12 RV11 and 88:19 RV18 - lack of friends bemoaned.
"is hated even of his own neighbour, but the rich hath many friends" (Parshah). The law of holiness demands that a man not take vengeance nor bear a grudge against the children of his people but love his neighbour as himself, also the stranger sojourning in the land is he to love as himself. (Lev.19:18,34) This love is more of a loyalty and an affair of honour. The covenant relationship and the law of hospitality must be held sacred. Ziegler (p.16) fails to see the spiritual basis of the covenant relationship when he interprets the love for the neighbour as merely support and helpfulness. Not only does the language of the verse itself and of the preceding one argue against this (Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart, nor bear a grudge) but also the classless nomadic life in which Israel was conducted, in which brotherly love could not be a case of the superior helping the inferior.

Quell (p.24 ff) brings out the paradoxical situation of the attempt to set into legal ordinance a province quite foreign to it, i.e. love. (Lev.19:18) "Love thy neighbour as thyself" can be no Rechtssatz because the conduct which is designated by 'abhāb, as one determined by feeling, is naturally withdrawn from legal regulation. "Thus (in the law to love) is nothing more than an oxymoron to be found, which will bring to the reader's consciousness when upon the whole giving of social law finally turns.

1. (Cf.Dt.10:19 - also concerning love for the ger.)
namely to guard the brother - sentiment (Brudergeschwinds). to
care for it, and perhaps now and then to awaken it." The as
thyself carries with it the consideration for the neighbour's
personality as of equal worth with one's own. The very fact
that Jesus made this law one of the two upon which the whole
law and the prophets hang, demonstrates clearly that this law
is not to be bound by any narrow legalistic interpretation.

Quell further points out, backing his argument with
Ex.23:4f and Dt.22:1-4, that the LXX scarcely errs in rendering
It is really concerned with the
man living in the nearest reach, who is to be thought of not as
one to whom the same law appertains, but simply as man. Thus
it can be deduced that even the enemy is to be treated in love.
"But whether friend or enemy, the res is to be the object, not
of legal thought, but of the feeling of love." The possibili-
ties of seeing in the law a prescript for the love of one's
enemies is thus not excluded, and David is actually accused of
having such a love, (II.Sam.19:3, 7). Quell concludes from
this, that though often theory and practice did not agree,
nevertheless one must not overlook the ethical demand and the
fact that it was thought of as given by God's authority, also
the fact that the concept love also had its place in the
religious field.

But before considering the religious usage of the
word, let us glance quickly at 'ăḇḇḇ as applied to things and actions. jásēḇ loved his savoury food (Gen.27:4,9,14) and Israel loves its cakes of raisins (Hos.3:1). Yet one who loves pleasure and wine and oil will never be rich. (Prov.21:17) Israel has also loved the (harlot's) hire upon every grain floor (Hos.9:1) the princes love bribes (Is.1:23). Though one is advised against loving sleep (Prov.20,13) the watchmen love to slumber (Is.56:10). Israel loves the bed of her adulteries (Is.57:8) and, summarily, the people love evil, (Mic.3:2) to wander (Jer.14:10) false oaths (Zech.8:17) vanity (Ps.4:7) RV2) violence (Ps.11:5) lying and devouring words (Ps.52:5-6) cursing (Ps.109:17). Consequently, the prophets try to counteract by telling the people to love the good, (Am.5:15) or truth and peace (Zech.8:19). One pleases his father if he loves wisdom (Pr.29:3) even as Jehovah, the Israelite loves Jerusalem (Is.66:10) and especially the law (Ps.119:47,48,97,111,119,127,159,163).

'ăḇḇḇ in the Religious Use.

'ăḇḇḇ is similarly used to signify the mutual relationship between Jehovah and Israel. With man as subject, love for God has both a personal and a national aspect. The individual is commanded to love Jehovah with all his heart, soul,
and might (Dt. 6:5). The poet sings of this love for Jahwah (Ps. 116:1) and exhorts others to love God (Ps. 31:26 RV 23) at the same time hating evil (Ps. 97:10) for Jahwah preserves them that love Him (Ps. 145:20). Abraaam is 

(As Quell brings out this is curiously rendered into the passion by the LXX. both in Is. 41:8, and II. Chron. 20:7, "As men of strongly marked inner life, the members of the Jahwah community are generally known as

The nation as a unit is continually demanded to love Jahwah. Love to Him furnished a condition upon which His kindness and gifts depended (Ex. 20:6, Dt. 5:10, 7:9, 11.13.22, 19:9; 30:11; Josh. 23:11; Dan. 9:4, Neh. 1:5). Even in the case of foreigners (Is. 56:6). Love to God and obedience to Him are essentially all that God asks of Israel (Dt. 10:12). The love to God is by no means merely a warm expression of the cold duty of fulfilling His orders. It is noteworthy that the command to love God is not placed within the code itself. It is intentionally kept outside, for it is more important then the law; it is the attitude through which man fulfills the law. As Winter proves in his essay, love to Jehovah is not a mere execution of moral duties to one's fellow men, but a cultic

1. There are those who love God's Salvation (Ps. 40:11 RV 16; 70:5 RV 4 or His Name (P35:12 RV 11, 69:37 (RV 36.119.132).
service to Jahwh as opposed to other Gods. Religion is not a synonym for ethics. Joshua, in his farewell address to the Transjordanites warns them to love God (Josh.22:5) The deep spirituality of Israel's love to Jahwh is shown by its opposite, i.e. Israel running after the lesser gods in sensual love. It makes no difference who or what the "lovers" are, be they the baalim (Hos.2:7,9,12,14,15) or the heathen nations. (Hos.16:33,36,37; 23:5,9,22) or those shepherds who led the people into apostacy (Jer.22:22), the result is the same. Israel's love is deflected from its true husband, Jahwh. Only in the happy bridal days did Jahwh know true love from His spouse (Jer.2:2).

But man's love to God is only His due, for Jahwh loves man. He loves Israel. 'Abb is here used in its purest sense. Nowhere in the Old Testament is Jahwh's love for man spoken of in what might be interpreted as the baser and more elemental interpretation of love. This point cannot be stressed overmuch, especially in view of the fact that the surrounding religions did see in this gods the sensual love. "The love of the Canaanite gods, especially that of Astarte was an erotic love".

Jahwh's love for Israel is inexplicable, if not looked upon as theological. Jahwh loved the fathers and

---

chose their descendants (Dt.4:37; 7:8; 10:15; 23:5) Two things must always be kept in mind in dealing with God's love. (1) Jahwah is not thought of as just a tribal God, but is God of heaven, the heaven of heavens, and the earth and all there is in it (Dt.10:14); and (2) Jahwah loved Israel though no virtue on their part. - Israel is the smallest of peoples (Dt.7:8). Jahwah's love is in no sense earned, for Jahwah loves a newborn babe (Solomon II Sam.12:84f) In fact, there is nothing that could make the Hebrew people feel that they were loved and chosen except the plain fact that they were. The bulk of their literature was written not when they were in a position of superiority over other nations, but when they were either a vassal state or in danger of becoming one. Yet they were the nation that Jahwah, the God of heaven and earth loved.

But Jahwah imposes obligations. Jahwah can cease loving. If He is to love Israel in the future, if He is to keep His covenant with them as He did with the fathers, then they must love Him and hearken to His ordinances and keep and do them. (Dt.5:10; 7:9; 7:12f.10:12;) Though Israel first received God's love through no virtue of their own, they cannot retain it without fulfilling certain obligations, demanded by the very nature of their God. And yet, they do
retain it. Not that they ever deserved it. The long train of prophets from Moses on constantly repeated such a message in their deaf ears. Nehemiah knows that God loved Solomon, yet also sees in Solomon a sinner (Neh.13:26) This is the paradox of the Old Testament religion. God is not only righteous by nature. He is also loving by nature.

The gift of a good king is attributed to God's love for Israel. It is interesting that two contemporary rulers recognise this fact. Both the Queen of Sheba (I.Kings 10:9) and Hiram (II Chron.2:10-11) see in Solomon a revelation of God's love for Israel. As fellow rulers, they recognise their own and their countries' limitations in comparison to their neighbour. And instead of attributing Solomon's wisdom and Israel's prosperity to some earthly cause, to a caprice of a supernatural power, they see therein evidence of God's love for Israel.

The prophets know of God's love for Israel as a deep spiritual bond. Hosea has no illusion about Israel as a nation superior to others. Jahwah tells him to love an adulteress - as He loves the children of Israel (Hos.3:1) - Jahwah loved Israel as a child, and drew them with bands of love. (Hos.11:1, 4) Yet, Jahwah must threaten; "because of the wickedness of their doings I will drive them out of my house; I will love them no more; all their princes are revolters" (Hos.9:15) But even this is not the end of Hosea's message. "I will heal their
backsliding. I will love them freely; for mine anger is turned away from him. (Hos.14:5 RV4) Zephaniah foresees God renewing (reading \( \omega \gamma \gamma \gamma \) instead of \( \omega \gamma \gamma \gamma \)) with Kittel and LXX) Israel in His love for it; the love endures past the Day of Wrath. Jeremiah, in spite of Israel’s whoredoms, and in spite of the threatening judgments, knows that Jahweh loved Israel with an everlasting (\( \varepsilon \lambda \alpha \mu \) love (Jer.51:3).

II—Isaiah’s chief consolation to Israel is His love for her. At a time when Israel could feel herself the most degraded of nations, this great spirit could write with assurance that Jehovah gives Egypt as her ransom, Ethiopia and Seba in her stead, since she has been precious in His sight, honourable, and He loved her (Is.43:3f) And Trito-Isaiah sees the ground of Israel’s past existence only in Jahweh’s love. “For He said, surely, they are My people, children that will not deal falsely, and He was a Saviour to them in all their need; not an angel, or a messenger, but His own presence saved them; in His love and sympathy, He Himself redeemed them, and He bare them and carried them all the days of old.” (Is.63:8f)

Finally, Malachi expresses conclusively that God’s love is simply based upon God’s choosing. There is no cause

1) With Vols. Torrey and LXX)
2) Ziegler (p.22) contrasts Jahweh’s love for Cyrus (Is.48:14) with that for Solomon (II.Sam.12:24 and Neh:13:26) by saying that Cyrus was merely called to Jahweh’s service, whereas Solomon was a “Liebling”. This seems to me a false distinction. If God loved a god, He could certainly love one who served His people.
for it which human reason can discern. Of the two brothers, one
He loved, the other He hated (Mal.1:2) Malachi also specifies
that Jahweh loves the sanctuary which Judah has profaned by
marrying the daughter of a foreign God. Thus it is the husband
Jahweh who is offended, for in the sanctuary, where He and Judah
were one, and which He loved, He has been forsaken.

After the return the thought of God's love gradually
weakened in its force. More and more came the individual into
prominence. God's choice is narrowed to Judah and Mount Zion
which He loved (Ps.78:68) Jahweh loveth the Gates of Zion more
than all the dwellings of Jacob (Ps.87:2) Jahweh's love be­
comes more a rhetorical device for praise.

Jahweh loves those who hate evil (Ps.97:10). Jahweh
loveth the righteous (Ps.146:8). Here the love is parallel with
help for the unfortunate. Also in Prov.15:9 the righteous take
the place of the nation in Jahweh's affection. Wisdom personi­
fied loves them that love her (Prov.8:17) This is no religious
thought; better is the idea which Prov.3:12 presents - that
Jahweh reproves those whom He loves. The preacher admits the
extent of the problem of God's love for the individual. He
concludes that man does not know whether God loves or hates him.
(Ecc.9:1)

1) Ziegler p.22, thinks that hate conveys too strong a meaning
here. What is really meant is simply the opposite of choosing,
i.e. rejecting).
2) Reading יִּכְנָ֣א instead of יְכַ֣נָּא and יִּכְנָ֣א instead
of יִּכְנָ֣א with Kittel).
In Dt 33:3 in the blessing of Moses, occurs ḫabab. It is not to be found elsewhere in the O.T. but the Arabic and Syriac and Aramaic have similar roots with the meaning to breath upon, to warm, to cherish, hence, to love.

Here it deals with God's love for the people seen in His gift of the law. In the text ḫāmin is found for the people. This term usually denotes heathen peoples, but such is entirely foreign to the context here. The marginal reading suggests tribes, LXX τοὺς λαοὺς αὐτοῦ.

The rich and beautiful word ἀγάπη has been until recently a generally accepted expression for God's love, kindness, mercy, or the Coverdale loving kindness. George Adam Smith (The Book of the Twelve Prophets, Vol.1, p.243) realized the inadequacy of such renderings and suggests leal love. For "Hesedh" means not merely an affection, "lovingkindness" as our version puts it, but a relation loyally observed.

---

1) Driver, in view of the many and other difficulties thinks that this verse as it stands is not in its original form. I.C.C. ad loc
2) See Driver, p393.
Harper translates as **real love**, representing dutiful or loyal affection and finds in the word the three ingredients, God's grace towards Israel, Israel's piety towards God, and one Israelite's love toward another. Duncan Cameron (Songs of Sorrow and Praise, Edin. 1934, pp.58-67) goes farther when he says, (p.59) "It (hesed) conveys the idea of fidelity to a covenant. Undoubtedly the word came to mean in later Hebrew "loving-kindness" but in the Scriptures of the Old Testament it speaks more of fidelity, righteousness, honesty, and truth, then of mercy and love." He gives but a few examples to prove his case, but Nelson Glueck investigates the question thoroughly and comes to the same conclusion. This point of view is challenged by H. Fuchs. Ziegler accepts Glueck's thesis in general.

agrees in the profane usage, but says that in the religious

1) I.C.C. on Amos and Hosea p.35f.
2) Nelson Glueck, Das Wort hesed im alttestamentlichen Sprachgebrauche als menschliche und göttliche gesamtschaftgemäße Verhaltungsweise. Giesen 1927 (Beih. z ZAW 47)
3) Das alttestamentliche Begriffswirkltnis von Gerechtigkeit (sedeq) und Gnade (chesed) in Prophetie und Dichtung, Christentum und Wissenschaft, 3. Jahrg. 1927. According to Ziegler, the challenge is unsuccessful. Unfortunately I have been unable to obtain a copy of Fuchs' work. Lofthouse criticizes his contribution thus: "H. Fuchs contrasted the word (hesed) with z'dakah, and held that it meant free mercy, like ben (which, however, he does not mention), but perhaps with a somewhat more marked theological significance. If the word were used of God alone in the O.T. we might perhaps understand it this way; our only difficulty being that we should have expected the two words to be more frequently used as parallels (they occur together only twice...), or that if they were partly synonymous, we should still have looked for some point of difference." W.F. Lofthaus. Benz and Hesed in the Old Testament, ZAW Neue Folge Band 10, Heft 1, 1933, p. 32f.
conception the word shifts in meaning, so that the idea of grace comes in and the legalistic one retreats. It is, therefore, of importance to consider this conception and to try to determine what light it throws on Jehovah as God of love. According to Robertson Smith the etymological relations of hesed are obscure. In Syriac there are two words hesed: the first, with a hard d means reproach, the latter, besdha, is the Hebrew hesed. As for the Hebrew word meaning reproach or shame (Lev. 20:17, Prov. 14:34) it "may safely be regarded as an Aramaism; and in all probability the two like sounding words are etymologically distinct; the one corresponds to the Arabic root H S D, the other to H S H D, in which the idea of friendly combination appears to lie, in correspondence with the fact that in Hebrew hesed is the virtue that knits together society."

Glueck finds in the associated Arabic word the idea of collecting to help one another. He also sees in the hesed meaning reproach or shame the exact opposite of the other sense, for it denotes an anti-social conduct.

The LXX usually renders the word with ἐλπίς, which is very inappropriate, especially when hesed refers to man's.

1) Prophets, p. 408, Note 9.
2) p. 67 f.
3) p. 68 Note
relationship towards God (Jer. 2:2). Often the word δικαιοσύνη is chosen, which Ziegler (p. 38) thinks is more apt, for the original meaning of rights and obligations is thus included.

'Ελεος ημεροσύνη usually is found in Proverbs, and once only οἱ κτεῖν η μω (Jer. 31:3), Χαράσ, which elsewhere serves to render the Hebrew יָאשׁ occurs in Esther and δόξα other in Isaiah. C.H. Dodd says: "It may be that the common idea is that of loyal affection, but the word came to be used more generally of "kindness", "mercy", clemency." Finally it could be used of the mercy of God, as in the Vulgate." ...."We may infer that the rendering χάρασ was growing in popularity"... And finally," In the best Hebrew thought the character of God and of the religious men is marked by יָאשׁ the most outstanding ingredient in which is "kindness or mercy".

Hesed in the profane Use.

According to Lothhouse hesed is not used indiscriminately, where any kind of favour is desired, but only where there is some recognised tie.

Glascock groups such relationships as follows:

(1) Between relatives and related tribes, e.g. Joseph to Jacob (Gen. 47:29f) Sarah to Abraham (Gen. 30:13) Boaz to Ruth (Ruth 3,10)

1) The Bible and the Greeks p. 60 f. 63.
(2) Between host and guest, e.g. Lot's two anonymous guests towards their host (Gen.19:19f). The spies promise ḫased to Rahab and her family in return for hers (Josh:2:12). (3) Between those bound by a covenant, e.g. David and Jonathan (I.Sam.20:8,14); (4) Between friends, e.g. David and Hushai (II.Sam.16:17); (5) Between rulers and ruled, e.g. Saul and Abner (II.Sam.3:8); And (6) between those who have performed a particular service and those obligated thereby, e.g. the spies and the man of Bethel, (Jud.1:24), David and the house of Barzillai (1.Kings 2:7).

Glueck then investigates these cases thoroughly and proves 1 that a ḫased relation consists of both rights and obligations; moreover, only those who stand in a Rechts-Pflicht relationship receive or show ḫased. ḫased is thus the answer to a demand of loyalty. It includes the idea of ḫ, ḫ, , in fact, the two can be taken as hendiadys, smith being understood as a determining adjective. It can be established through the oath, and is the substance of a covenant. The idea behind the conception of ḫased is above all mutuality, thence returning a favour, honesty, friendship, brotherliness, duty, loyalty, and love. "Ḥased in the profane usage according to the older sources is never arbitrarily given grace or kindness or favour or love."

Glueck, in stressing this sternest aspect, passes lightly over the fact that love might form the basis of the

1) op. cit. 20 f
2) op. cit. 21
covenant, and thus give an arbitrary coloring to the obligatory loyalty. Lofthouse (p. 33 f.) hints at this by saying that friendship and affection might be the motives of such a covenant, as well as baser motives.

**Hesed in the Religious Use.**

However, it is impossible to study this conception on the profane level alone, for the religious and the profane were inseparably intertwined. Arguing from this viewpoint, Glueck carries the conception of Hesed as a Rechts-Pflicht relationship over into the religious realm, assuming that a covenant between God and man, or God and nation is essentially the same in every detail as that on the purely human and profane level. And this is precisely where Glueck errs. His thesis is a good and just one and can be justified so long as Jahweh is conceived of as strictly and only a God bound by a covenant. And, to be sure, it cannot be denied that such a belief in such a God did exist in Old Testament Israel. But it was not the only belief. Jahweh suggested the very ultimate standard of loyalty, as, for example, when Jonathan wants David to show him Jahweh's hesed (I. Sam. 20:14) but His hesed was not limited by a covenant. God was also thought of as a power beyond a covenant. The very act of choosing Israel and making a covenant with it was a condescension on the part of the Creator God. But even more so, His maintaining a covenant relationship which had been broken by the other

---

1) Glueck p. 21.
party, i.e., Israel, was an act of sheer grace. This grace cannot be accounted for in any of man's thought-devices, and thus Glueck's theory breaks down. I do not mean to deny the service Glueck has rendered in confirming the belief in Hebrew religion as a covenant religion. But his conclusions, though logical, do not fit every case, and, moreover, tend to underline the phases, which the O.T. authors themselves did not underline.

The conception of hesed in its religious aspect can only be understood by conceiving of the Old Testament religion as one established by a covenant. For hesed as a word belonging to the legal terminology thus can be used for a whole people, both among themselves and towards their God, since all men were joined in the one covenant, with each other and with their national God. Winter denies the use of hesed as an attitude of man to God, since he sees in this concept always the note of condescension. It is thus only the kindly, generous attitude of God to men and men one to another. However, as we shall see, this is not always the case in the use of the word. It is used of man's attitude to God. Besides, as Ziegler points out (p.26) hesed expresses the loyalty which underlings pay to their superiors (II.Sam.3:8; 16:17; II Chr.24:22) (Also Glueck p.16 f). Duncan Cameron is also worried by the possible rendering of condescension from man to God, but argues that the idea must therefore be one of loyalty (p.63).

1) Quell Op.cit.p.27.
Robertson Smith, however, seems to have cleared up the problem long ago when he wrote (Prophets p.16 f) the following: "Jehovah and Israel are united by a bond of moral obligations, not a mere compact on legal terms, a covenant of works, as dogmatic theology would express it, but a bond of piety, of fatherly affection on the one hand and loyal obedience on the other. Jehovah and Israel form as it were one community and hesed is the bond by which the whole community is knit together. It is not necessary to distinguish Jehovah's hesed to Israel which we would term his grace, Israel's duty to hesed to Jehovah which we would call piety, and the relation of hesed between man and man which embraces the duties of love and mutual consideration. To the Hebrew mind these three are essentially one, and all are comprised in the same covenant."

Hesed is not used as an expression of man's relation towards God before the literary prophets. It is with Hosea that we first find it, and it is obviously here related to the covenant. In 4:1 where the lack of hesed is lamented the following verse (2) lists the sins of the time, which verse, according to Glueck (Op. cit. p.22) clearly is related to the Deutologue. And in 2:20-22 HVL8-20 the future covenant is to be made in hesed.

Hesed is, then, a quality which Jahweh demands from those in covenant with Him, but does not find.

Hear the word of Jahweh, ye children of Israel, for Jahweh hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land. Because there is no truth, nor hesed, nor knowledge of God in the land. (Hos.4:1) What is the meaning of hesed here? According to Sellin and Glueck (p.22) the three quantities 'emeth hesed.
and da'ath 'elohim ascend to a climax in the last. Hesed includes
'yneth, and they are both contained in da'ath 'elohim. Thus the
possibility of limiting hesed to a purely profane use is struck
out. (As opposed to Marti, Nowack and van Hoonacker - quoted in
Zeigler, p. 25 and Harper). According to Glueck (p. 22 f) hesed
here is the relationship of man towards God and towards man, since
God's commands are ethical, and are only affected through man's
ethical dealings with His fellowmen. "Hesed subsists not in
correct offering of sacrifice, nor in external μνοισσας, but
in moral religious action, in the utter fulfilment of divine
ethical commandments. In this sense hesed as the manner of re-
relationship of men among themselves is no different from hesed of
man towards God."

But hesed involves more than this, in that it is the
essential relationship of members of the covenant. Glueck
(c. p. 22) says that in Hosea hesed is a veredelter Begriff,
gelaßt mit Herzen des Propheten. "It is no longer the
communal manner of relationship of a narrow circle, but of every-
one with each other. Mankind is regarded on one hand as
members of a great family, on the other hand as children of a
heavenly Father. The word designates the mutual Hilfebereitschaft
of mankind out of pure Menschenliebe." He here broadens the
conception beyond Hosea's meaning. As Ziegler says (p. 27)
"Hosea is not thinking of men as children of a heavenly father.
He is addressing only the people Israel. Therefore hesed in
Hosea does not mean mutual helpfulness out of pure Menschenliebe but loyalty and love to Jahweh, which is grounded in the covenant relationship with Jahweh and operate in love to the Mitmenschen. Man's bessed towards Jahweh is thus an obligatory loyalty to the God of the Covenant and operates not out of love to fellowmen, but in adherence to the terms of the Covenant.

To understand man's feeling of bessed properly, however, one must understand what Hosea means by knowledge of God. For the two are closely linked together. In the future Jahweh will betroth Israel in qedeq mishpat bessed and rahamim, ...... and they shall know Jahweh (2:21-2 RV19-20) And in the present bessed is preferred to sacrifice and knowledge of Jahweh to burnt-offering (6:6).

George Adam Smith, in his chapter on da'ath 'elohim says that, "here, then, we have a word for knowing, the utterance of which almost invariably starts a moral echo, whose very sound, as it were, is haunted by sympathy and by duty. It is knowledge not as an effort of, so much as, an effect upon, the mind." (p.322)

Since in Hosea the people's ignorance of God is caused by their own vice and the negligence of the priests (p.323) knowing involves common sense, plain morality, and the recognition by a

pure heart of what God has done and is doing in history (p.324). Knowledge of God is feeling, character and conscience; it is not something man finds out for himself, but something which comes down on him from above (p.325). The means by which Jahweh impresses Himself on the heart of the people are the *torah*, but much more important and more direct, His revelation of Himself in the great events of the people's past (p.325). But also Jahweh revealed Himself in gifts of nature and even "in the success of the people's commerce" (328). Finally, then, the ignorance with which Hosea charges the people is that of the character which shines through the facts of history. Such ignorance is even forgetfulness (4:6), the *dat'ath Elohim* was once possessed, but their prosperity in Canaan has hardened their hearts and made them forgetful (13:13, p.330) (Kittel takes the words as probably an addition, from Dt.8:14; 32:18.)

It can be gathered from this exposition that knowledge of God is not only a knowledge of God's acts in the past, which the people certainly had, but a sympathetic understanding of the One performing these acts.

What Prof. Smith says implicitly is explicitly presented by J. Cranmerthus: (Amos p.56) "In the pregnant prophetic sense does not mean knowledge in our sense of the word, but a relationship between God and man, which is portrayed in
loyal care and love on God's side, and obedience and devotion on man's side and which for man does not remain without consequences. The thought complex which is connected with יִֽהְבָּה 'is best rendered through the figure of the marriage tie, which is expressed in Hosea and Jeremiah and presupposed in the other writings."

We can conclude from this that Israel's knowledge of Jahweh is an experience of His loving and giving nature, not only in the past but in the present. And this experience should awaken in the people appreciation, gratitude, and desire to do His will. Israel's knowledge of Jahweh, as it should be, is truly best pictured as the feeling, resulting in loyal deeds, of the loving wife.

And ḫesed is the loyalty which the wife, filled with the consciousness of being chosen, loved, cared for, shows to her Baal, her husband. Thus man's ḫesed to Jehovah is more than an obligation. It is an eager, willing obligation. Loyalty is a cold inadequate rendering and love ('ahabah) is, on the other hand too broad a designation. But it is loyalty with the love element strongly to the fore.

Even more prominent is the love element palpable in ḫesed in Jer.3:2) Thus saith Jahweh I remember concerning thee the ḫesed of thy youth, the love of thy bridal days; how thou wentest after me in the wilderness in a land that was not sown. The ḫesed and 'ahabah stand in parallel here, both denoting, not only the loyalty, but the loving and devoted loyalty of the
young bride. It was then a religion of the heart which Israel possessed. That Jeremiah is not simply carried away by his figure in this strong language is shown by the <sup>1</sup> a terminus technicus for religious and cultic service. It was a genuine affection which Israel felt for her God in the desert period. From Hosea and Jeremiah we can thus conclude that Israel's ḫased towards Jahweh was more than a mere formalistic and sheer obligatory loyalty, exercised in obedience to His commandments and in a sentimental belief in the brotherhood of mankind. Rather was it a loving loyalty to the person of God who had been like a husband to Israel right through her history until now, and it was exercised in a grateful obedience to His commandments, which happened to involve a respect for the person and property of other members of the covenant. However, the reason Jahweh could expect this feeling of ḫased from his people was because he continually was showing ḫased himself to His people. I believe that Cameron errs in thinking that it was in post-canonic literature that the concept of ḫased became one of "loving-kindness" also that Glueck, though not directly contradistensible, emphasizes the wrong aspect. What Glueck says is quite true, but one feels that his emphasis on God's loyalty to His people is not an impartial judgment, but rather contains a bit of the vigour and passion of reaction against a time-worn tradition. God did show loyalty to His

1) Vols. KS AT Jer. p.17;
2) Cameron, p.59, op. cit.
people, but this loyalty not only was founded upon God's grace, as Glueck himself admits but operated in grace and love from the very beginning on.

God showed hēṣed in both the patriarchal and the exodus tradition; this quality of God's dealing is closely knit into the two traditions of Israel's beginnings. As for the former, Gen.24 relates the story of Abraham's servant who went on an expedition to find a wife for Isaac. When he had reached the city of Nahor, he prayed (v.12) "O Jahweh, the God of my master, Abraham, send me, I pray thee, good speed this day, and show hēṣed unto my master Abraham." And if everything happens as he hopes, then will he know that Jahweh has showed hēṣed unto his Master (v.14). According to Glueck, there must have existed some relationship between Jahweh and Abraham which could lead the servant to expect hēṣed (p.36) "Jahweh was the God of Abraham; Abraham was His servant. It was a definite relationship which imposed both rights and obligations, a Gemeinschaftverhältnis to which hēṣed corresponds. This Gemeinschaft differed only in its composition from a purely profane one, not in its provisions and results." But its composition was precisely what could change it from a purely profane relationship. Ziegler also objects to Glueck's statement that Jahweh's hēṣed to Abraham is not to be understood as favour, grace, or kindness.

"The fact that it is God who shows the hēṣed brings into the word

1) p.66f
2) LXX ΔΑΙΩΣ certainly a mistranslation.
the idea of condescension or grace; for the servant could not demand ḥēsēd for his master from Jahweh with the same right that he could from Abraham's relatives; rather is the consciousness of dependence upon Jahweh the issue here, in whose hands it rested, either to give help or to refuse it, even though a special relationship to the man did exist. Therefore the servant asks for ḥēsēd. Similarly in other patriarchal stories, Glueck insists throughout that man, in asking ḥēsēd of Jahweh is merely claiming his due. But the very characters of the patriarchs, especially of Abraham, argue against this line of reasoning. For, whatever the faults of the patriarchs, they did stand as examples of pious humility in their relation to their God, not as co-partners of a Gemeinschaft. Therefore when Jacob says ( Genesis 32:11, RV10) "I am too small ( unworthy) for all the ḥēsādim and of all the truth which Thou hast shewn unto thy servant" I think he means it. Glueck (p.37) thinks Jacob is merely voicing his claim on Jahweh's rescuing him from his brother Esau. In his manner of addressing Jahweh (God of my father Abraham, and God of my father Isaac) and in thanking Him for past kindness, he grounds his claim and hope in Jahweh's ḥēsēd and 'emeth in the future." It is difficult to prove this interpretation is wrong, but it seems a suspicious attitude which the Jahwist's usual honesty does not warrant. I much prefer to think that Jacob honestly feels that he is unworthy of the ḥēsēd shown

1) P.28 - italics Ziegler's.
2) Probably to be read τὸν so Preussseh and LXX (Δικαίοσύνης )
him. He has no right to claim still more. But in his danger he asks the gracious Jahweh to show it to him. If Jacob's self-disparagement is genuine, then hesed was an expression of God's love. On the other hand, if Jacob honestly felt that he had a claim on Jahweh's hesed, then he had a claim on all that was shown him in the past, and he could not have thought himself unworthy.

Jahweh also exhibits hesed in the Exodus tradition in the song which Moses and the children of Israel sang unto Jahweh (considered by Sellin to come from the period of the Judges). 'Thou in thy hesed hast led the people that thou hast redeemed; Thou hast guided them in thy strength to thy holy habitation.' If hesed is the loyalty of one member of a covenant to another, this passage merely goes to show how well Jahweh keeps His part of the bargain. According to Ziegler (p.30) the people are yet thought of as a loyal people; therefore the idea of grace is not present here, but simply the exhibition of Jahweh's mighty, helpful intercession for His people, Israel. In the same light Ziegler thinks we should look at the passages in Ex.20:5f and Dt.5:9f.

'For I, Jahweh, thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, upon the third and upon the fourth generation of them that hate Me, and shewing hesed unt to thousands of them that love Me and keep My commandments.'
The first thing that strikes the eye in this passage is the equalizing - hesed for love. In the second place (as we have already seen) Israel's love cannot be thought of as simply a synonym for keeping Jahweh's commandments. It has the primary position; the keeping of commandments is secondary. Man's love for God entails love for His person and, as a result of that love, a loyal obedience to His commandments. And Jahweh balances the equation by shewing hesed. Now this is the normal and ideal state of the Jahweh-Israel. It was the original plan. But it does not follow that Israel thought of itself as loving Jahweh and thus earning Jahweh's hesed. Neither is it a case of individualization, i.e. Jahweh showing His hesed to the loyal ones, but avenging, even unto future generations, the evil, hating ones. The thought is only concerned with the people Israel, as the one half of the covenant. Hence it cannot be argued that hesed's meaning changed later than this passage; that from God's loyalty it became God's loving grace. The excerpt from the decalogue is to be taken purely as exhortation to the people, and is not to be thought of as the people's belief concerning its past or present at any one time.

Therefore the exodus tradition is also a witness of God's hesed as love. To return to the Song of Ex.15:1-18 we have here a

1) Likewise, when Amos speaks of the remnant, he is not thinking of a separatism or an individualism, but rather of the entity, the people Israel, cf. Cramer, p.154f.
In Deut. 7:9,12f we have the same exhorting formula, as in the decalogue. Jahweh keeps His covenant and beseed with them that love Him and keep His commandments. Because ye hearken to these ordinances and keep and do them, Jahweh thy God will keep with them the covenant and the besed which He swore unto the fathers and He will love thee, and bless thee, and multiply thee.

Jahweh's promise is absolutely reliable. Not only that, but He wishes to keep His promise. He wishes to be loyal to the covenant if only Israel would obey. Here Jahweh's beseed or loyalty to the covenant is closely associated with His love for Israel. Kraatzsehman devises here that the great feeling of guilt towards God which was extraordinarily intensified during the seventh century, brought about the belief that Jahweh's beseed was not enough to effect the continuation of His gifts. Hence the berith. Ziegler (p. 30) admits that Israel sought a steady

1) Bundesverstellung p.145 f
support in the thought of a covenant (apparently Ziegler sanctions Kraetzscher's, theory of the lateness of the covenant conception) but rightly objects to the belief that the covenant could give that steady support. "The consciousness of sin and the experiences of history awakened in the people the conviction that neither the fact of the covenant nor Jahweh's conduct resulting from it could give a sure guarantee for Jahweh's help, and therefore the intercession of Jahweh who keeps Bundestreu - that is the best rendering of  יִהְיֶה לְךָ יְהוָה בְּרֵעוֹן " - is, in the last analysis, the result of His grace."

The covenant and-hesed or Bundestreu is also found in I Kings 8:23; Neh.1:5; 9:32; Dan.9:4; 11 Chron.6:14. It is to be noted that in each of these uses except Solomon's prayer (I Kings 8:23 and 11 Chron.6:14) it is found in a prayer confessing sins. Israel had no illusions about its keeping the covenant, and yet it could ask Jahweh to keep His part. The only answer for this is that hesed denoted more than loyalty. It was God's graciousness.

Aside from the covenant, hesed is also associated with forgiveness of sin in Ex.34:6f and Numb.24:18f. 'Jahweh, Jahweh, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abundant in hesed and truth; keeping hesed for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin; and that will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children.

1) Vischer, Christusssegnia p.253 translates neatly - Before whom no one is sinless.
and upon the children's children, upon the third and upon the fourth generation.

The date of this passage is uncertain, as the text has certainly been worked over. As it stands in Ex. and Numb. it presents a contradiction which cannot be reconciled. However, the passage, as a description of Jahweh, is a popular one, and echoes of it are heard in II. Chron. 30:9, Neh. 9:17, 31; Ps. 86:15; Ps. 103:8, 111:7; 112:4; 145:8; Joel 2:13, Jon. 4:2, Neh. 1:3, and Deut. borrows from it in 20:5f. Yet only in the passage from Nahum is there a reference to the guilty not being acquitted. Hence, it can be concluded fairly safely that this phrase is an addition by one who feared lest the religion become ethically lax. However, the difficulty cannot be so easily eradicated, for certainly the belief was ever in God who punished the guilty. Especially in the prophetic literature is this true with the ever recurring threats of punishment, yet the forgiving God always in the background. And the conception of ḫesed is not thought inconsistent with punishment, for in the hymn which now stands in Jer. ch. 32, we hear of Jahweh, "Thou showest ḫesed unto thousands and recompensest the iniquity of the fathers into the bosom of their children after them" (Jer. 32:18). The forgiving and at the same time punishing God is simply the paradox of Old Testament religion, to which no solution was reached within its limits.

However, for our purposes the importance of this
passage is to show that ḫesed is related to the forgiveness of sins, and is, therefore, not a characteristic of a God who is not limited to loyalty to a covenant, but who surmounts all legal limitations in His forgiving love. Glueck theorizes that by forgiving the people, the covenant relationship was made healthy once more so that a ḫesed relationship was again possible. It is only to the people which has become loyal to Him again that He can exercise ḫesed. Referring to Num.14:19, he says that the very fact that the people have asked for forgiveness shows their return to God and are therefore worthy to be reinstated in a ḫesed relationship with Him (p.51). As for Ex.34:6, he considers the phrase, "Keeping ḫesed for thousands" merely an allusion to Ex.30:6 "showing ḫesed unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments", where the obligations necessary for obtaining God's ḫesed are clearly stated (p.52). These efforts of Glueck's seem forced and altogether unnecessary since he admits (p.52) that where the term ḫesed is mentioned along with God's grace, it becomes spiritualized so that God's ḫesed now. .... is regarded not as a right but a gift".

As a recipient of God's ḫesed in a special sense stood David and his house, the result of which was that David should never lack a descendant to sit upon the throne of Israel. (II.Sam. 7:15, 22:51; I.Kings 3:6). This gift, greater than which could not exist in the eyes of any Hebrew was established by promise.

1)p.45 ff
by oath which Jahweh took upon Himself (Ps.89:4f,36f,50; RV3f, 35f,49); and by a covenant which Jahweh made with David (II.Sam. 23:6; Ps.89:3f,H.4f) (Ziegler p.28) David, the ruler, was, however, the object of God's *hesed* in so far as he was King of God's people; God was showing them *hesed* in that He was granting them a good and just ruler. Long into the future did Jahweh's *hesed* appear symbolized in the form of a Davidic being. And a throne shall be established in *hesed*; And one shall sit thereon in truth, in the tent of David, judging, and seeking justice, and swift to do righteousness. Is.16:5(genuine Isaiahic — Sellin, Einleitung 7, p.83). It was ever a gift of Jahweh's gracious initiative, but it did set obligations upon the kings, "to take heed to their way", to walk before God as David did. (I.King 8:25) Not that David was sinless, but that he confessed his sin (II.Sam.12:13). It is noteworthy that God's *hesed* does not entail freedom from punishment, but, even though the punishment falls, the *hesed* will not be withdrawn (II.Sam.7:14f). However, it is not the promise, nor the oath, nor the covenant which maintains God's *hesed*, but His own grace, which made the promise, etc. in the first place. Therefore can Solomon call Jahweh's *hesed* great. Glueck (p.43) asserts that the fact that Solomon so describes it does not change the fact that Jahweh's *hesed* is obligatory, a result of His promise. But surely this is a distorted viewpoint.
Jahweh's hesed is great because His loyalty to His covenant exists in spite of David's breach of the covenant. Only Jahweh's love for David, and for the king of His chosen people, impels such gracious action. Jahweh's hesed to David is His loyalty to His own promise, even after disappointment in the person promised. And it must not be forgotten that there is no greater power which can force the God of heaven and earth to keep a promise - only His gracious nature.

The prophetic use of the word hesed as from God to man is chiefly reserved for the future. Hosea bears Jahweh predict a glorious future when He will betroth Israel in c d e q, hesed, and rahamim (Hos. 2:21 RV19). Hesed is here paralleled, not with the customary 'emeth, but with rahamim. To Ziegler this denotes that hesed signifies "the forgiving gracious love of Jahweh to Israel, who pardons His people's breach of loyalty and again takes it into Gemeinschaft" (p.32). The future would be a picture of loyalty from both sides, but, it must be remembered that it is the same Israel which now sins, just as it was the same Gomorreh whom Hosea took back. In the future hesed might mean mutual loyalty, but it would be established only through God's forgiving grace.

Of the five places in which Jeremiah mentions Jahweh's hesed, one throws conclusive evidence in hesed as an expression of God's love.

Jahweh appeared unto me from afar: "Yea, I have loved

1) "It (hesed in Hosea) means love but more than love, for it is not merely an attitude adopted by one person to another but that essential quality of the soul from which love, sympathy, pity, devotion, all spring... It implies a full appreciation of and a complete devotion to a personality" Oesterley and Robinson, Hebrew Religion, Its Origin and Development. London SPCK, 1930, 31 p.207
thine with an everlasting love, therefore have I continued benevolence unto thee." (31:3) It is not the loyalty which causes the love, but vice versa. Jehovah is not so much loyal to a legalistic covenant as to His love for Israel. In 33:11 the picture of Israel's future joy is crystalized in the refrain:

Give thanks to Jehovah Sabaoth,
For Jehovah is good,
For His benevolence is forever.

Their sins having been forgiven, and prosperity returned to them, the people are not to be chanting a hope but rather something experienced by them. i.e. that Jehovah's benevolence does last forever, in spite of the people's backsliding. This refrain was a favourite as seen by its frequency in the Psalms (Ps.106:1; 107:1; 118:1) and especially 136, where the last line is repeated in every verse. (Cf.also Ez.3:11, I Chron.16:3,4,41; II. Chron.5:13; 7:3,6; 20:21) In Jer.9:23 RV24 Jehovah's benevolence is mentioned with his punishing justice. It can thence be concluded that benevolence here is only for the good. In 16:5 Jehovah pictures the utter desolation of Israel deprived of His peace, benevolence and rahamim. Benevolence is here a positive gift, not just an abstract loyalty to a covenant. Along with peace and mercy, it helps to furnish Israel with what gives it life. In Jer.3:12, the adjective hasid is used to portray God longing for the people to confess their sin, and to turn from their backsliding ways unto Him. "I will not cause my countenance to fall upon you (in anger). For I am hasid, saith Jehovah. I will not keep (anger) forever." Hasid is hence to be
rendered "gracious", or "kindly", the idea of forgiveness lying in the background. But it is in the tender consoling lines of II-Isaiah that 
_ḥesed_ shows itself unmistakably an expression of God's love.¹

In a burst of wrath I veiled my face from thee for a moment;
But with everlasting _ḥesed_ will I have mercy on thee, said
Jahweh, the Redeemer (54:8)

For the mountains may depart and the hills be removed
But my _ḥesed_ shall not depart from thee, neither shall my
covenant of peace be removed, saith Jahweh that hath mercy on
thee (54:10)

Not only the close accompaniment of Rahamim² but the
picture as a whole, that of the forsaken wife newly restored give
_ḥesed_ a warm meaning here that justifies Torrey's translation af­
fection. The _ḥesed_ is to last forever, and in this sense is it
akin to loyalty, but it has much more depth of content. It is the
very opposite of anger, whereas in Jeremiah _ḥesed_ was consistent
with punishment, here there is not even to be a rebuke (54:9)

---

¹) Omitting the use in 40:6 which is to be read יָהֵם instead of יִהְמ according to Marti (via Glatz p.62) or either יָהֵם or יִהְמ according to the Kittel text, in spite of the fact that Torrey and Vels both retain the original, Torrey translating as Beauty, Vels as Ammut. In the sense of the passage, _ḥesed_ is not a word to
be found parallel to _bashe'm_, for _ḥesed_ is ever a more spiritual con­
cept. In addition, (54:8,10) speaks of _ḥesed_ in contrast to the
fleeting moment, it is something for the ages (alam).

²) Ziegler says they are Synonyms here. p.33.
Whereas Jeremiah could threaten the removal of shalem, hesed, and rahamim (Jer. 16:5), II. Is. promises their return and eternal duration. Moreover, as we have seen, David was a special object of Jehovah's hesed. Now this hesed is to be given to the entire people, for as David stands as a symbol of one chosen and beloved of God, the leader of his people, so is Israel to be the chosen and beloved nation, the spiritual leader of the nations of the world. And God, who out of His grace chose David to lead His beloved people, now chooses Israel to be His instrument in saving the world.

(Is. 63:7-9) shows through the intensity of feeling and richness of expression signifying God's love and forgiveness and mercy, that hesed is understood as a term of grace. To separate the forgiveness from the hesed, as Glueck does (p. 51), the hesed only being possible after the sins are forgiven, seems a distinction which was not a real one to the writer, for the hesed continued steadily through the nation's past.

In Lamentations 3:22f, hope springs eternal because of God's hesed which, along with His raham, prevents the people from being consumed. Similarly in verse 32 the theme of the chastening, disciplining God returns, but He is also one who will not cast off entirely, for He will have raham, according to His rab hesed. It is the amount of hesed which determines the mercy. Love is the best rendering of the word here.

Glueck finds in Micah 6:8, the necessary conditions for

---

1) Here also Glueck sees hesed set up as a result of the reformed and returned people. Accordingly raham as well can only be given by God to the people which has become loyal and obedient once more. (p. 630)
Jahweh's pardon and *hessed* in Micah 7:18. This would assume that both passages are by the same author, which Sellin and others do not accept. (Sellin KsAT 12 Propheten p.348 f). As it stands the passage gives clear proof of Jahweh's love, in that it shows His inclination, His desire to forgive, for His delight is in showing *hessed*.

"Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, And passeth over the transgression (of the remnant of His heritage)? He retaineth not His anger for ever, because He delighteth in *hessed*.

By the time of Ezra, *hessed* had reached a meaning, somewhat weakened in force, but much closer to the conception of grace and favour than to a relationship of rights and obligations. Jahweh extends *hessed* to Ezra before the King, (i.e. enables him to find favour) and his counsellors and all the king's mighty princes, so that Ezra can say, "I was strengthened according to the hand of Jahweh my God upon me". Ezra 7:28. *Hessed* is here almost a divine sanction, giving success to a man and his enterprise.

But we cannot say that *hessed* developed from a national concept to an individual one, because (1) the individual, according to Hebrew thinking, was never an entity apart from his nation and (2) throughout the history *hessed* is considered by individuals to be

---

1) Cf. the excellent treatment by Pedersen on the ideas of totality and solidarity, Israel I-II esp. p.55ff.
something which the individual receives from his God. It is the ever recurrent theme in the Psalms. Not only to David, as we have already seen (also Ps.18:51, RV50) but to the individual Israelite, hesed is that quality in his God which gives him hope for salvation. If one says, with Glueck (p.51 et passim) that one must fulfill certain obligations to receive Jahweh's hesed, and that the very confession of guilt is enough to warrant the relationship again being established, he robs the concept hesed of much of its inherent warmth. To be sure, hesed does frequently occur in parallel with 'Emeth, Mishpat and Gedakah and Amunah (Ps.33;36;40;52:61:88:100 inter alia) and it is promised to those who keep the covenant (25:10). But in addition there is the constant belief in the Person of Jahweh, who is not a blind justice, automatically giving out loyalty to those who pass the test, i.e., return and repent. The eye of Jahweh is upon them that fear Him (Ps.33:18); I will be glad and rejoice in Thy hesed; for Thou hast seen my affliction. Thou hast known my soul in adversities (31:8 RV7); Jahweh hears a prayer, for He is good and ready to forgive and grants abundant hesed unto all them that call upon Him. (Ps.86:5). In His hesed Jahweh has saved from death (86:13). And Ps.103, which presents a very tender picture of Jahweh as a pitying father, forgiving sins, and remembering the weakness of the mortal, speaks of His hesed four times within fourteen verses. Moreover, Jahweh, in His hesed, frees from captivity, and heals the sick,
(Ps.107:10-16;17-22). But from the very number of times in which the word occurs in the book of Psalms, it can be concluded that such a conception of God held a large place in the individual religion. Also, when Job is mentioning the elementary gifts with which Jahweh blessed him, hِesdِ is ranked with life and preservation of spirit (Job.10:12).

What, then, can we conclude from the use of hِesdِ in the O.T.? It is, to be sure, a characteristic of a relationship in which kindliness of treatment was guaranteed. On the profane level, the relationship might be one of love, but not necessarily so. Two people who are tied together in a bond might be total strangers and yet could show kindliness to each other, could as it were, consider with respect the personality of the other. On the other hand, hِesdِ also expressed the kindliness of, e.g. husband and wife, father and son, where certainly love was the motivating force in performing the kindliness. Thus hِesdِ could be, but was not necessarily, identical with love on the profane level.

In the religious realm the same reasoning applies. In a relationship between God and people where there was some sort of bond or covenant, kindliness might be expected, but not necessarily, love. However, if the love already existed, then the kindliness came as a natural fruit of that love. And hِesdِ would express that love.

---

1) Lofthouse, p.35. "It (hِesdِ) signifies ... a mutual relation of rights and duties; and if both or even only one of the parties is conscious of a strong and deep personal affection, the rights and duties are still no more forgotten than they are in the family itself." But the affection utterly transforms the rights and duties, so that the loving one, when not receiving his (His) rights, forgives, and joys in performing the duties.
Although based, as a term of contract, was peculiar to O.T. religion, a contract religion, סָּנַיִם is a common Semitic term. Ziegler (p.30f) sums up the various interpretations of its related stems and its original meanings as follows:

In Accadian, remu or ramu is found, which as a substantive means womb or compassion and as a verb to pity or love. Arabic gives both ﷺ to love tenderly, to be tender, and ﷺ to be merciful. The two verbs are closely connected. Robertson Smith and Wellhausen both point out that in Arabic ﷺ is commonly used to denote a feeling of kinship and a sphere of kinships, but properly means womb and thus birth from the same mother. In Syriac ﷺ means to love.

As for the Hebrew word סָּנַיִם which occurs only in the Piel, Gerber derives it from סָּנַה (womb) and believes that it originally meant birth from the same mother and then passed over into the common meaning, tenderness. Deak thinks that the original word meant to hide, as a mother hides a child in her bosom, and then came to mean, protect or love. Dhorme observes that remu in Accadian and reham in Hebrew means womb, which is the seat of the mother's sympathy for her children. Therefore ribam originally meant the love of a mother for a child, and thence the common meaning of pity, mercy, sympathy.

In addition to the fact that the mother's womb is the source of the formation of the family, and therefore of the family feeling,

1) See Ziegler, op.cit. p.37
Pedersen adds that "the use of the word is possibly also connected with the fact that the central feelings are localized in the abdominal region, of course, because they are felt there." (Israel I-II p.309,525)

Profane Use

If we accept then the feeling of kinship as the original meaning of the concept, what has the Old Testament text to offer by way of corroboration? Singularly, the O.T. presents no use of the word in this original sense. Robertson Smith, to be sure, sees in Am.1:11 such a meaning: "He (Eodom) did pursue his brother with the sword and corrupted his compassions (RV mg. נ‎) and his anger did tear perpetually, and he kept his wrath for ever", but the more general meaning of pity, mercy, applies quite as well, (Ziegler p.37), so that the only instance of such a use cannot be used to prove the case.

However, since, according to the O.T. viewpoint, the various organs of the body represented the seats of the emotions, and since rehem clearly represents womb (Gen.20:18;29:31;30:22;49:25) the word rahamim (plural of rehem) certainly represents a very strong word for compassion, mercy, a much richer word than our English equivalents can offer. As Lofthouse says (p.35) "this word (rahamim) signifies yearning love, like that of a mother for the babe within her womb."

The word is used to designate the heart of Joseph (LXX ἐν τῇ παύς) which burns for his brother (Gen.43:30). In this
touching story this expression is used for the great love of Joseph for Benjamin. Also the true mother feels the same burning of the heart (LXX \( \mu \gamma \tau \rho \alpha \)) for her son at Solomon's decree. Hence Ziegler says (p.58) "Here Rahamim clearly designates the feeling of love and attachment, which arises as a result of the blood relationship of single persons."

But rahamim was broadened to contain also the feeling of compassion which a captor might have for captives, as Solomon prays for in I.Kings 8:50 and as Hezekiah promises to the children and brothers of those who turn to Jahweh, II.Chron.30:9, (LXX \( \delta \kappa \tau \rho \mu \circ \)) Thence it was weakened even more until it became simply favour before a Monarch as with Neh.1:11, (\( \delta \kappa \tau \rho \mu \circ \)) and Daniel 1:9 (\( \chi \rho \circ \)) Thus, in profane use rahamim runs the gamut from the seat of the emotion of love and pity, to the emotion itself, and thence, once become figurative, it waters down to mean the favour which an underling finds before his superior.

Religious Use

Once more remembering that Jahweh suffered all the emotions which were also allotted His human children, and thus was capable of just as great, or even greater love than they, we can understand how the concept of raham came to have a particular meaning for the Hebrew as applied to His God. For the love relationship was even closer than the human blood-relationship. A woman might forget and not pity her child, but Jahweh would not
forget (to pity) His child Israel, (Is. 49:15). Just as Joseph felt his heart burn, so likewise does Jahweh. "How shall I give thee up, Ephraim . . . my heart is turned within me, my compassions. (LXX μεταμελείμαι ἔλεος) are kindled together" (Hos. 11:8). Thus the conception is one of love first, and then, when the human children suffered and were oppressed, the idea of pity naturally came to the fore. And since Jahweh was the ruler of the world, and could therefore lift the people from their distress when He chose, the merciful aspect of His love is stressed.

However, even in the concept of the religion of Israel can be seen as one based upon a covenant in which the two parties stand in a perfect harmony of a love relationship to each other. For although the present mercy of God can be prayed for, His (in its full sense) will be shown in the future when the two are one again. Thus can we interpret the naming of Hosea's daughter "Lo-ruhamah". In the present the perfect love relationship is disturbed. In the future lies the hope; then can the sister once more be called (Hos. 2:3 RV1). Then, once more the Husband can have mercy upon her who had not

1) Hos. 1:6; "Call her name Lo-ruhamah; for I will no more have mercy upon the house of Israel that I should in any wise pardon them". Even the forgiveness which existed before is denied. Forgiveness and mercy are thus the active fruits of the emotion).
obtained mercy (Sellin: I will love the unloved one) (Hos. 2:25 RV 23). For then Jahweh will betroth in gedeq, mishpat, hesed, and rahamim. Mercy here is very inadequate, even misleading. It is the perfect loving relationship of the two which Jahweh plans, not His forgiveness in betrothing the sinning people. The future betrothal is for a more far-reaching purpose than the turning of Israel. It is for the perfect love relationship between God and His people.

The love which Jahweh shows in is also evident in loving protection and help. Hence (also in the future) Israel will no longer be deluded into seeking help in Assyria, or in horses (from Egypt 7:11, 12:2 RV 1) or in idols, but the forsaken will find in Jahweh (Hos. 14:4 RV 3) This entire passage is now once more accepted. (Cf. Sellin p. 140, as opposed to former critics Willhausen, Merti, Duhrn, Berweck) as genuine Hoseanic, and as a whole presents an idyllic picture of the future love relationship. Sellin comments about this gem of prophecy: "The promise sounds like a love-song, reminiscent in part of the Song of Solomon. Indeed it seems that the style of a song of reconciliation between lovers has influenced the entire chapter." (Sellin, p. 137 18 Propetenbuch Vol. 1, 2, 3) Hence, we can see that denotes more than just mercy, but is part of the picture of the future perfect love between Jahweh and Israel.

1) Sellin's correction of to seems to me unnecessary. The silly dove, running here and there for protection in its state of frightened insecurity could very well seem like a fatherless waif, especially since Hosea has already compared Israel to a child which has broken away from its loving father to seek its own salvation (11:1-4).

2) Similarly Is. 54:7 shows the atoning love which the husband shows to the forsaken wife. "For a small moment have I forsaken thee; but with great rahamim will I gather thee."
But, Jahweh's love also exists in the present for the sinful people.

"Is Ephraim my dear son? Is he a darling child? For as often as I speak against him, I do earnestly remember him still: Therefore my heart yearneth for him; I will surely have mercy upon him". Jer.31:20. Thus Jahweh's pity is inseparably bound up with His love which seems even to Him utterly beyond comprehension, but nevertheless the most urgent necessity. The same figure is used in Ps.103:13, the father pitying His children, remembering they are but dust. But most poignant of all is Is.49:15 where Jahweh's love and pity even surpass that of a mother.

Likewise a positive note is struck in Is.54:8,10; 60:10. In wrath Jahweh hid His face for a moment, but in everlasting kindness He will have mercy. Mercy is not merely a passing feeling of pity and sympathy here but love which results in reinstating Israel.

Ziegler proposes pity in love, to be tender, to love as a rendering for such passages, but even this does not convey Jahweh's activity on behalf of His people.

Thus the deep emotional note is found retreating and only the active positive one presented. Thus, for instance, is the gloss now found in Hos.1:7 picturing the supernatural aid which Judah will receive at the hand of God, (Sellin: I will love the honor of Judah). When the judgment was imminent and during it (the Babylonian captivity) "represents the

1) The affective moment gives way to the effective - (Ziegler p.40)
reverse side of Jahweh's anger. As He took them away in anger He brings them back in compassion. Their proud spirits having been humbled, they are once more able to receive God's love.

(2) Jer.30:18, and such late passages as Jer.12:15 and 33:26) both falsely ascribed to Jeremiah—[Vol1] and also the exilic Is.14:1; Dt.30:3, and Ezek.39:25) (Jahweh restores and then has mercy—clearly the sense of pity or mercy is the wrong rendering here). Similarly Zeoh.1:12, 16 sees the return of Jahweh's mercy after seventy years of indignation with the rebuilding of His house at Jerusalem. And Zeoh.10:6, says: "I will strengthen the house of Judah, and I will save the house of Joseph, and I will bring them back for I have mercy (LXX η γ Ρ σαρ ) upon them; and they shall be as though I had not cast them off; for I am Jahweh their God, and I will hear them."

Jahweh's could also be found paralleled to his forgiveness as in Is.55:7 and the beautiful verse Mic.7:19 "He will again have compassion upon us; He will tread our iniquities under foot; and thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea."

Here also the existence of pictures the ideal time when

1) Habakkuk prays that God will remember mercy in His wrath.
2) 3) Ps.102:14, RV13 pictures Jahweh's pity upon Zion.
Israel's sins would be forgiven and a perfect relationship would once more exist between God and nation. God's forgiveness and patient enduring love are also pictured in Dt.43:1 and Ps.78:38. In both cases the adjective rahum is found. In Dt. the sins are pictured in the future, in the Psalm they have been recurring in the past, but God being rahum takes the people back, forgiving their iniquity and many a time turning His anger away. In Ps. 78:38 the pity motif enters, since Jahweh recognises the fact that men are but flesh (v.39). And in Dt. it is the constancy of God which is contrasted to the fickleness of man. With this constancy the term rahum takes on the meaning of long-suffering love. Nehemiah recognising that Jahweh is a God ḥesed and rahum in His nature and therefore can look back at the nation's history and see it as one long record of God's patient forgiving long-suffering love. When the people worshipped a molten calf, Jahweh in His great rahamim did not forsake them, nor did He whenever they cried to Him in their distress, because of His rahamim. Therefore can Nehemiah pray again with hope (Neh.9:17,19,27,28,31). And likewise Daniel sees Israel's past only as possible because of God's rahamim. (Dan.9:2,18). And Is.63:7-9 sees the goodness which has come to Israel as a result of God's rahamim and ḥesed, because they are His people, His children. The forgiveness is not mentioned here.

Jahweh's love is clearly seen behind the story of David's punishment for the census (II. Sam.24:14). David prefers God's punishment to man's because God's rahamim are great. It is here
not a case of forgiveness, for the punishments is to come. But God is loving as well as just and He can be moved by man's weakness. Hence in the popular expression of religion, in the Psalms raham is frequently found applied to God. Upon Jahweh's rahamim and hesed the Psalmist can rely for they have been ever of old; (25:6), in his sin it is only these two qualities of Jahweh that can preserve him (40:12f, RV 11f) Jahweh forgives sins in his hesed and rahamim (51:3 RV 1). Likewise Ps.69,17 RV 16; 77:8-10 RV 7-9; 79:8; 103:4; 119:76f. In the Psalms raham also stands frequently in parallel with hanum (86:15; 103,8). We can thus conclude that, although the concept of did represent mercy to the sinner, often with forgiveness, and pity for the suffering mortal with restitution for the broken and scattered Israel, yet, like hesed, the term is much richer and cannot be exhausted by these two meanings. Rather are mercy and pity the result of the fact that God is raham. And the only word which comes near representing the comprehensive quality is the English loving.
One of the most suggestive words to describe God's love is *hashaq*, meaning to join or fasten together. Hence it comes to mean to be attached in affection, or to cleave to someone. It is related to the Aramaic *f ḫ y t*, meaning to bind or saddle an ass.

In Gen. 34, in the story of Shechem and Dinah, a case where Shechem loved (Ahab) the damsel (v. 4) Hamor says that his son's soul *ḥ ḫ y t* for the girl, and therefore he asks that she be given for a wife (v. 8). Therefore, when we hear in Deut. that Ḥawah *hashaq* Israel (77), and that He set His love upon the fathers (10:15), we must appreciate the fact that the Israelite used his strongest terms to describe God's love for his nation.

This word also is applied to the individual. Hezekiah, in his song of thanksgiving, sings:

"But Thou hast in love to my soul delivered it from the pit of corruption; For Thou hast cast all my sins behind Thy back" (Is. 38:17).

The literal rendering of this pregnant construction is: "Thou hast loved my soul from the pit". Hence Ḥawah's love is an active, powerful, and redeeming love. It also has forgiven Hezekiah's sins.

1) Also the erotic sense in Dt. 21:11 - "When thou seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and thou hast a desire unto her" (*hashaq*).
is a term of love, especially in the erotic sense which, according to Holdeke, was originally a "liebkosender Lallwort". From it comes the substantive which is found in the plural in the Song of Solomon to mean loves or (concretely) caresses, and also to signify the one beloved. (1:13,14,16; 2:3,8,9,10,16,17) It is used of the harlot's enticement in Prov. 7:18. Figuratively, Ezekiel uses it not only in the bad sense of Abolabah's whoredoms with Babylonians, (23:17) but also of the love relationship between Jahweh and Jerusalem. "Thy time was the time of love; and I spread my skirt over thee, and I covered thy nakedness: yea, I swore unto thee, and entered into a covenant with thee, saith the Lord Jahweh, and thou becamest mine" (Ezek.16:8). This does not suggest that the love of God for Jerusalem was like that of the Canaanite gods; it is a spiritual love, - but the Greek influence is lamentably lacking.

From comes , also a strong term for a loved one. It is used in Deut.33:12 to denote the special affection of Jahweh for the tribe of Benjamin almost as that for the youngest child of a family. And Jeremiah pictures an outraged Jahweh whose beloved has wrought lewdness with many. (Jer.11:15). But He still called her His beloved; the sin did not destroy His love for her. In 12:7 it is His beloved which Jahweh

2) 1:2,4; 4:10.
sends He has forsaken, nay, that He has hated. Hence the paradoxical situation, God hating (because of their sin which He must hate) His beloved.

In Ps.60:7 RV 5, Israel, though cast off and broken by God, still thinks itself His beloved, and can therefore pray for assistance with hope and confidence.\(^1\) The conception of Jahweh's beloved narrows from the nation to gifted individuals in Ps.127:2.

It is vain for you to rise up early
To take rest late,
To eat the bread of toil;
For so He giveth unto His beloved in sleep.

Kittel (Komm. in loc) tries to hold that it is only the upright who could be called Jahweh's beloved - that Jahweh's favour is not arbitrary. He strikes out the \(\text{in sleep.}\) Weiser (Psalmen in loc) on the other hand passes over the beloved element stressing trust rather than worry as the message of the Psalm. He explains the \(\text{in "sleep" as follows: } \) God's blessing for man is often entirely different than that which man seeks. Man can not always judge what is best for him. "The word in sleep refers to this power of God, concealed from man." It is the opposite of man's striving and trouble. Such an explanation does not seem to have much to do with the Psalm. Both Kittel and Weiser cut the psalm in two between vss.2 and 3. Such a division seems to me

1) Ps.108:7 RV 6. repeats this verse.
entirely unnecessary. The thought is consecutive. God's love, when measured in external gifts, is arbitrary (Ecol.2:26). And certainly children were considered the gift of God, the withholding of which could only mean the inexplicable withdrawal of God's favour.

Both וָעָלָה and וַעֲלָה are found in Is.5:1, (apparently as synonyms) referring not to Israel but to Jahweh as One who planted a vineyard. God here is supposed to be taken is the paler sense of friend (uncle).

In relation to these two words are also to be taken into consideration the two kings whom Jahweh loved more than the others. The name כָּלִי is the abbreviated form of passive participle of כָּלִה and therefore suggests the beloved. Solomon's other name שָׁלֹם specifies that he was beloved of Jahweh.

Apple of the Eye.

As an expression of something very dear and highly treasured occurs the phrase translated as "the apple of the eye". The O.T. has four separate ways of expressing such a phrase. Prof. E. Robertson has contributed a discussion of these Hebrew words. Literally יָרֵדָה means the tiny image which a man sees of himself in the pupil of another's eye. In Arabic, Greek, Latin and Persian occurs the same figure. It thence comes to mean the pupil of the eye itself, and therefore something very dear. The young man is advised to keep the sage's law as the

---

apple of his eye. (Prof. 7:2) The tender love of God for His people is thus shown in the Song of Moses (Dt. 32:10):

He found him in a desert land,
And in the waste howling wilderness;
He compassed him, he cared for him
He kept him as the apple of His eye.

Here we see the pity of Jahweh for the helpless foundling which He takes and cares for in the same way that He cares for His most precious possession. In the same train of thought occurs the figure of the mother bird and her young, (v. 11). Zechariah shows how zealously Jahweh watches over even the scattered Israel by calling it the apple of His eye. (2:12, RV 8). He uses the expression ἠμαρκήσας which, according to Prof. Robertson, probably first meant baby or doll, like ishah, thence was related with ἐγκλήματα (door or gate).

The figure also occurs in personal religion. The writer of Ps. 17 calls out for God's bēse (v. 7) He is surrounded by wicked oppression and deadly enemies, (v. 9) therefore he cries out to His Saviour:

"Keep me as the apple of the eye. 1.
Hide me under the shadow of Thy wings. (v. 8)

That which is translated apple of the eye in Lam. 2:16, properly means tear.

1) The Hebrew here is a combination of the other two expressions ἠμαρκήσας.
PART II. GOD'S LOVE; HIS NATURE
But one cannot restrict oneself to the mere literal expressions of God's love for a witness of it. Part of the O.T. is, to be sure, sheer legalistic formulae, and we can expect there, as in Dt., direct statements of Jahweh's love. But a large part of the O.T. is poetry, and poetry is an art, the purpose of which is to suggest, not simply to state bald facts. Thus we can best learn of the O.T. conception of God's love through the figures of speech with which the poets express the dogmatic belief and through the characteristics ascribed to His being which are familiar to us in human guise. To consider such is the purpose of this chapter.

The most striking figure of speech found is that of marriage: Jahweh, the Husband, Israel, the wife. Such a figure is not peculiar to Israel's religion; in fact, it is common to nearly all Semitic religions. The God was the baal and the land itself was the mother of the inhabitants. But two aspects of Israel's application of the figure are remarkable, if not indeed unique, viz. (1) it is a spiritual relationship, not a sensual one; (2) its foundation is laid in love, not in a mere legal document.

One need not elaborate the first of these points beyond saying that the neighbouring religions all used the figure in a gross physical sense. Beyond a doubt, Jahwism is thus not just one of the Semitic religions. One reason for this peculiarity is the fact that Israel's religion was not primarily based upon a

1) W.Rob. Smith Prophets, p.171 f.
desire of fertility, but upon its own national history. He gave Israel the corn and wine and oil, to be sure, but He also chose Israel and led it out of Egypt. Jahwism is based not only on the gifts but on the acts of Jahweh.

But the second point is important, though often passed over. Both Jahwism and marriage were based upon covenants. Since the only established ground for monogamy was the economic one in the ancient Semitic world, it would by no means be necessary that marriage become more than a legal bond. But the Jahwism which the prophets preached was not based upon a cold legal document but upon an inner relationship of love. The covenant was merely the visible symbol. The marriage of Jahweh and Israel was thus not simply a legal contract, but a marriage in the deepest sense of the word.

JAHWEH as HUSBAND.

"It is generally accepted that Hosea is the first to see love as the Grundmotiv in Jahweh's dealings with His people; at least, he is the first to see with complete clearness that at the bottom of the thought of the choosing and the covenant lay the quellende Liebe of an acting God. (italics mine).

1) Not that the monogamous idea was absent from the O.T. See I.Sam. 1:8; Gen.29:28 ff; Prov.16:22; 19:17; 31:10 ff; also Gen.2:24; 3:16. And even in polygamy there was a favourite wife (Dt.21:15-17).
But this does not imply that he thought of himself as introducing a new element into Jahwism. It is the historical love of God which he sees, not a new development in religious thought. Therefore, we are not justified in regarding Hosea as the originator of the "doctrine" of Jahweh as a loving God. He contemplated the religion as an historical tradition just as others. But it was Hosea's personal experience that made the belief more intense and vivid than it had been to those before him. This personal experience deepened the conception for him and gave it authority.
Hosea was the victim of a domestic tragedy. His wife Gomer was unfaithful to him.

Whatever the interpretation of Hosea's marriage, the important aspect of it was that it was a love marriage in the spiritual and highest sense of the word. Whether the love preceded the marriage or not we cannot say. Although there are beautiful stories of monogamy and of mutual attraction preceding and causing marriage in the Old Testament, yet in general marriages were arranged by parents and not by the parties immediately concerned. That a great love should grow up between husband and wife is therefore of significance especially when one considers the customary position of the wife, who was literally the property of the husband, (Ex. 20:17; 1 cor. baal or 'adon (Ex. 21: 3; Gen. 18: 12).

I find not enough justification for the belief that Gomer was impure at the time of her marriage and therefore cannot agree with (Theodore) Robinson's theory that Chapters 1 and 3 are two accounts of the same event (attractive as the theory is). Instead I interpret the command to love a harlot in Chapter 1 as the result of later reflection on Hosea's part and the command in Chapter 3 as a command for the restoration of the marriage.

The two stories in Chapters 1 and 3 might be two accounts of the

---

2) Robinson, Die Zwolf Kleinen Propheten in Handbuch zum AT. Tubingen, 1953, pp.1, 7, 10.
3) With W. Rob. Smith Prophets p. 181
same incident if it were not for the fact that Hosea married Gomer. In the first place, unchastity before marriage was considered to be the very worst of crimes and could be punished by stoning, Deut.22:21. In the second place (and here we must enter into the necessarily hypothetical) it is impossible to imagine a person of the highest degree of moral sensitivity, as Hosea was above all else, marrying a harlot, especially receiving a command from Jahweh to do so. But in the third place, if Gomer was unchaste before her marriage, then the parallel of God and Israel breaks down.

For, as we shall see later, the original love of God in Hosea is for the pure Israel. The whole point of returning to the desert civilization is that there Israel was faithful and pure; perhaps there she will become faithful and pure again.

Hence Hosea married a virgin Gomer and he grew to love her, but she sinned against him and ran after lovers. I rather fancy the hypothesis of G.A. Smith's that the second two children were not Hosea's. If such were the case, then Hosea's love is a constantly suffering and forgiving one which is only defeated in the face of a spirit of whoresom. Our sin (the birth of the second child) can be forgiven because of the love but conclusive evidence of a sinful spirit necessitates a divorce.

Another reason for agreeing with G.A. Smith is in that

2) Book of the Twelve Prophets. 1. p.239 f.
the names of the second two children betray Hosea's knowledge that they were not his own. Whereas Jezreel means nothing particularly good or bad aside from interpretation, the other two have the stamp of despair and of unhappiness, something quite unharmonious with the event of child-birth. If the children are named with only the nation in mind, the references to parallel cases in Isaiah do not serve, simply because in both cases (Is. 5:3 and 8:1 & 3) the names are hopeful. Certainly Hosea was no more cynical than Isaiah about the dreadful moral condition of his people, yet Isaiah calls his sons by names attesting the remnant returning and the spoliation of Judah's erstwhile enemies, Ephraim and Syria. If Hosea's children were his own the essential optimism accompanying the birth of a child of a love marriage would forbid the giving of the names She-is-not-loved, and No-kin of mine.

Gomer, being of a "fallen" nature must therefore be judged; she must be put away. I am quite content to find the story of the divorce in the second verse of ch. 3: Sellin's ingenious displacement of 2:4a, 6, in order to make a smooth running gapless narrative of Hosea's biography does, to be sure, supply the missing detail of the declaration of the divorce. Yet displacing verses is too dangerous a pastime to indulge in except when absolutely demanded - which is not the case here.

1) zwolfprophetenbuch in loc.
2) See next page.
But Gomer's punishment does not change her character, does not redeem her. She sinks lower and lower, selling herself into slavery. She makes no effort to redeem herself. Yet even in this state in which all the tenderness and sensitivity, all that could awaken love or respond to it has vanished, she cannot escape the love of Hosea.

The incomprehensibility of the story enters in the redemption of the wife. In so far as it was against the law for a woman to return to her first husband, having been divorced and married to another man, it is strange that Hosea would take her back when she had not even married after her divorce. But the extraordinary fact is that he should buy her back in response to a command of Jahweh! Jahweh thus commands behaviour contrary to His law. So divine seems Hosea's love for his former wife that he attributes his urge to take her and love her once more to a direct inspiration from his God. He, therefore, buys her back

2) (From previous page) Divorce, to be sure, was a fairly simple matter (Dt. 24:1) Volz Die Biblischen Altertümer (p. 344) quotes from a letter in the Papyri (ed. Sayer-Cowley Papyr. 6) which discloses the proceedings as follows: One of the community simply stands up and says (publicly) "I hate my wife". The grounds for the divorce were not gone into. The wife took the belongings she had brought with her and went where she liked)
and proceeds to restore her to her previous status of wife. But there is a necessary prelude before this reinstatement takes place. It is the chastening. (3:3)

Hosea learns that complete restoration consists of much more than the mere external buying. For the spirit of the wife must be softened and moulded. In order to do this, there must first be a great humiliation. Therefore will he strip her naked before her lovers.

But Hosea also realises the weakness and the tendency towards the more ignoble life which is so dominant in his wife's character. He does not give her the opportunity to sin. "I will block up her path with a thorn hedge till she cannot find her way." (2:8 RV 6) He realises that even though she knows of his redeeming love of her, yet she is not strong enough in her own power to resist the temptation to sin. So he shuts her off from all contact with men—even himself, for a period of time.

But that would not be enough. The humiliation and the removal of temptation might reform Gomer's character and make it more worthy of Hosea's love, but only so much would not restore the proper mutual love between man and wife. The third step necessary in making a true marriage exist once more between them is that Hosea should speak to her heart (2:14 RV 16) This is the positive element which could not come in until the two preparatory stages had been gone through, but without which the two preparatory steps would mean nothing.

Here ends the biographical element in Hosea's prophecy.
But giving an account of his marriage was not Hosea's chief interest in writing his prophecy. The marriage was merely a point of departure. His real message is the love of God for Israel which endures in spite of Israel's infidelities to its God.

Jahweh had chosen Israel, a nation of poor estate but humble spirit upon which to pour His divine love. He had made a marriage covenant with it. He had lavished gifts upon it, bringing it safely through the wilderness to a goodly land. At first Israel had returned the love, but later it succumbed to a spirit of infidelity. When Hosea looked about him at the worship whether of Baal or of Jahweh (the two being practically identical), he saw the same rejection of a moral husband, as he saw in Gomer. Israel was desecrating something sacred even as Gomer had done. Her priests were puppets, her monarchy was a mockery, her international policy was a series of nervous alliances, first with one country, then with another. Where was Jahweh, the historic God, who had brought them from Egypt; who was their God? Either forgotten entirely or worshipped in a form which could only be revolting to Him. They had broken their compact with Him. In all that Hosea could see about him there was nothing that could please him about his country. No fidelity, no kindness, no knowledge of God in the land (4:1) Nothing worthy of a God caring for. Hosea's sense of justice was baffled. No nation should continue to
receive blessings when it reacted as Israel did. There must be a judgment upon her, a visitation for her punishment. Jahweh would then be like a lion, tearing and going his way, with none to rescue. (5:14)

Yet this could not be the whole story. For O.T. religion is a positive, not a negative thing. God must have something for Israel beside punishment or His interest in her would not be warranted. Thus came hope into Hosea's religion, and a solid rock for it to rest upon. His love for Gomer had made him redeem her. God in the same way has a love for sinful Israel. God would also redeem Israel. After punishing it He would betroth it to Him in gereg, mishpat, hesed and rahamim, in amunah and it should know Jahweh (2:21 f RV 19 f)

Thus in Hosea we see Jahweh who sets His love upon the nation Israel. He condescends to bind Himself in a covenant with it. But there are certain obligations which Israel must also fulfil in order to keep this covenant. These are not too difficult - at first it succeeds. But later it yields to its sinful nature and breaks the covenant. Consequently Jahweh is also free from His obligations. But He, a loving God, not only forgives Israel, but must try to bring it back. Israel does not come back of its own accord, Jahweh takes the initiative. Therefore He must punish it and chasten it in His love. The purpose of such is Israel's Redemption, which can only be accomplished by His act. Hosea believes that Israel's punishment and chastening will be enough to bring its heart back to its God so that He will be able to set up a mutual love relationship once more.
The "spiritual heir" of Hosea, Jeremiah, also makes frequent and trenchant applications of the marriage figure to poetry God's love for Israel. Here also we see the perfect union of God and people, in other words, the covenant relationship at the beginning.

The wilderness period was a time of newly-wedded bliss.

I remember your early devotion (месед)

The love of your bridal days (‛абабах)

How you followed me in the wilderness

Through lands unsown.

Then was Israel sacred to Jahweh. His first-fruit. (Jer. 2:2f)

The love of Jahweh is presupposed here, as that of a husband for a

1) The problem of Jeremiah's (and Hosea's) divergence from the Pentateuchal tradition as to the obedience of Israel in the wilderness is a very perplexing one. Volsz thinks that Jeremiah's view of the early period corresponds to the historical reality. "Just as the original Christian community in Jerusalem and the Christianity of the first centuries was especially powerful and vital, so was also the Israelite Volksgemeinde under Moses and immediately after Moses". (Komm. Jer. p.16) Welch, on the other hand (Jeremiah p.181) says "the idea (that the wilderness journey was a period of faithfulness) is no reflexion of historic tradition: it is the expression of Hosea's ideal of Israel's religion as a glad and grateful dependence on Jahweh." And Skinner says: "It is, for example, almost incredible that either prophet should have written as he does if the incident of the Golden Calf at Sinai had been known to him. (Exod. 32) . . . . "The simplest solution will be that Jeremiah accepts and amplifies Hosea's view of the religious development, and is at this early period of his life either ignorant of or indifferent to the literary activity which was consolidating the history of the Mosaic age . . . Ezekiel is the first prophet who teaches that Israel had been rebellious from the outset." Proph & Rel. p.65.
loving bride. Jahweh demonstrated His love by leading His bride through the wilderness, a land of deserts and pits, and giving her the plentiful land of Canaan, which she defiled. But the time when His love was requited is dear to Jahweh, and His memory of it is perhaps one of the factors motivating Him to renew the ideal relationship. And similar to Hosea's use the nation has broken the bond, she has committed adultery (3:20) She is the unfaithful wife who runs after lovers. She forsakes Jahweh 2:13,17,19. A virgin cannot forget her ornaments, but, something stranger has happened: Jahweh’s people have forgotten Him. (2:32) It is not a new thing, even the fathers began to look for vanities (2:5) But the wife’s whoredom is of the most degraded sort. No one need seek her, she can easily be found. (2:24) She is like a young she-camel uncontrollable in her passion. (2:23) She has sinned on every hill. (3:2) After His wife’s brazen wantonness, of which she arrogantly refuses to repent, can He take her back possibly? (3:1) Yet such as the patience and forgiveness of His love that He, thinking on the happy days of their early marriage (3:4) still waits for the shub, still

1) Volz. (p.13) omits the expansion of the description of the desert in the latter part of v.6; he also thinks v.7 is misplaced in its present location. But so long as v.7 is genuinely the thought of Jeremiah, its location does not matter.
waits for the dear wife to turn and affectionately call Him father. There is no plausible reason why He should take back His beloved after such shameless pollution and yet how pitifully and earnestly He pleads: "Return thou backsliding Israel: I will not look in anger upon you; for I am merciful, I will not keep anger for ever. Only acknowledge thine iniquity" (3:12 f) If they would only turn back to Him, He would gladly heal their backsliding (3:8); nay, He would even make their blessing the desire of the nations (4:2).

It is not a question of the wife purifying herself. Such a thing were impossible. "Though thou wash thee with lye, and take thee much soap, yet thine iniquity is marked before me, said the Lord Jahweh" (2:22). Precisely in this regard is the tremendous love of God visible. According to the law it would be impossible for Jahweh to take the adultress back (Dt.24:1 ff; Jer,3:1) The wife is impure to her first husband after a second marriage. But, as with Hosea, the love of Jahweh can transcend the law. It is superhuman, divine (Ziegler p.55) Jahweh is to take back His wife, but not in her present condition. A punishment must come first. The

1) "The figure of the bride is not superseded by that of a son; the wife-figure continues throughout the strophe. "X" often has a wider sense. The young wife in gratitude calls her husband "father", or "provider"; she gladly leans on the strong support." Volz.Com.p.38. Similarly 3:19 - the context insists upon father meaning husband.
wife must be purified. At times, this punishment comes from an outburst of Jahweh's anger, when, in face of Israel's disobedience, He loses His patience. His sword devoureth from one end of the land to the other (12:12) He will not pity nor spare, nor have compassion (13:14) He takes away His besed (16) and His tender mercies (16:5).

But in spite of His anger, His punishment does not imply the end of His love, for He says: "I have given the dearly beloved of my soul into the hand of her enemies" (12:7) thereby, proving that the punishment and love go together. And Jahweh's love sustains the people right through the punishment until the new marriage will be established in which the marriage covenant will be written on the heart.

Jeremiah varies Hosea's theme somewhat, although only in the external untheological detail of giving both the northern and southern kingdom positions as the two wives of Jahweh (3:8) Israel first broke the marriage covenant, and as a result was given a writ of divorcement. Jahweh then had to concentrate all His love on Judah and, in return, expect fidelity from her. But Judah is even worse, for she saw what her sister's lot had been and yet was untrue. Therefore, compared to Judah, Israel is relatively righteous (3:11) For she sinned out of ignorance, ignorance at least of the consequences. Therefore she is called to return:

1) We must remember that although, as we have seen, monogamous marriage presented the ideal picture, yet there was nothing offensive in bigamy to an Israelite of this period, even when the wives were sisters. (Of. Gen.29, Jacob, Leah and Rachel, and Ez.23; Jahweh, Abolah and Aboliah)
"Return, you truant Israel,
To Me", said Jahweh;
"I will not frown on you,
For gracious am I,
I grudge not alway." (Skinner trans).

Jahweh thus reminds Israel of His true loving nature which He wishes to show her in all its glory, but cannot because of the hard hearts which are unable to receive His message of salvation. The hard heart which is Jeremiah's almost unique conception of sin (elsewhere only in Dt. 29:16 RV19; Ps.81:13 RV12) is the heart which cannot, because of its constant sin, feel the warmth of God's love. His tenderness cannot pierce the hard shell. The one requirement which Israel must fulfil is the acknowledgment of her sin (3:13). In return for this Jahweh would heal the backslidings. (3:22) And suddenly the people do realize their sin and come to Jahweh! (3:22b-25). But, alas, this is but the ideal, not the real.

The distinction between the two wives, however, is an artificial one. They are both sinners and they (His dearly beloved !) have no right in His house (11:15). And when the new marriage is set up, and the covenant written upon the heart, there will be but the one wife, Jahweh's people.

We can conclude then that, theologically, the love of Jahweh in Jeremiah is essentially the same as in Hosea. Jahweh loves Israel which at first requites the love. But Israel is unfaithful to her Lord. Her sin knows no bounds in its desire. He calls to her but to no avail. In His anger He punishes, but
in His love He does not forsake. Finally, as Hosea speaks to Gomer's heart, so Jeremiah also sees Jahweh writing His law upon the heart. No "turning" of man but only God's redeeming love brings salvation.
Ezekiel also took over the marriage figure to depict the love of Jahweh for Israel. Here also the story is one of a perfect mutual relationship, which has been spoiled. In ch.16 the figure of father and husband are curiously interwoven. Israel is first the forsaken child which Jahweh pities. The love is thus at first entirely from Jahweh. In His love for the foundling He nourished it, giving it everything it needed to develop. He alone is the source of all Israel's desirable qualities, its large numbers and its beauty. However, God is not satisfied simply to give gifts. There must be a response. There must be a communion between God and nation in order that His love may fully express itself. Thus when God passes by a second time (v.8) He notices that the child has grown and is ready for love. This indicates the married love with its mutual rights and obligations. Jahweh then makes the marriage covenant, covering the maiden's nakedness and swearing an oath. Although the historical parallel cannot be traced in detail there must have been a time when Israel "followed her lord" for Jahweh makes His bride renowned for her beauty among the nations. But the bride begins to rely upon her beauty instead of upon its donor. And she lavishes all the fine gifts of her Husband upon worthless lovers. Her heart is utterly depraved. She is insatiable in her lust, running after Egyptians, Assyrians, and Chaldeans, even refusing hire. Jahweh looks sadly upon the degraded, ungrateful, foolish wife:

A wife that committeth adultery, that taketh strangers instead of her husband. They give gifts to all harlots; but thou
givest thy gifts to all lovers, and bribest them, that they may come unto thee on every side for thy whoredoms, (16:32 f).

But what seems to be the chief sin of harlot Israel is her ingratitude. In all her abominations she has not remembered the days of her youth when she was naked and bare and weltering in her blood. (v.32:43) Jahweh will punish therefore. He will strip her naked before the assembly of her lovers. He will judge her as one who breaks wedlock. And finally He will give her over into the hands of the greedy lovers, who will rob her of her ornaments and then stone her with stones and thrust her through with their swords.

Ezekiel makes it very clear that Israel (symbolized by Jerusalem here) has no inherent superiority over the other nations. Her mother was a Hittite and her father an Amorite, her two sisters Samaria and Sodom. And she is just like them, nay, she is worse. (vss.44-48). It was only Jahweh's pity and then love which made Israel the beautiful creature that she became. He did not choose her because she was desirable, but His choosing made her so.

As with Jeremiah, Ezekiel represents the historical division of the two kingdoms as two wives named Oholah and Oholibah, standing for Samaria and Jerusalem respectively, ch.23. But Jahweh's love is not mentioned. The two were sisters and apparently there was no time when they were pure. They were harlots in Egypt before Jahweh took them. Although they bore Him sons and daughters after
becoming His, no stress is laid upon a period in which they might have returned Jahweh's love. Almost immediately they began to commit whoredoms, and there was no limit to their excesses. This chapter is not meant to portray God's love, but to represent the extent of the two kingdoms' sin. However, it does raise one interesting point. The two daughters were harlots when Jahweh took them. Thus it is firmly established that Israel and Judah in no way earned God's love. Not only that; they were sinners before Jahweh took them as His own property. Both before and after their marriage were they possessed by a harlot spirit. If there was ever a time in which they returned the love of their Husband, it is of no importance to Ezekiel.

Why then did Jahweh choose these two wives? Ezekiel is not troubled by such a question. For he has the simple fact that Jahweh did choose them, sinners that they were. Nor is there any reason which we can find for God's choosing and God's love.

Ezekiel has penetrated deeply into the theological truth. He saw in one case a poor uncared for child, helpless and doomed to die like Romulus and Remus. Jahweh cared for it, and made it a nation worthy of respect among nations. Then it turned against its Benefactor and dissipated its love. In the other case, Jahweh took a sinful nation and tried to redeem it in marriage, but so strong was the sinful tendency that His attempt to make it respond to His love failed. From this we can deduce: (1) That God's love for Israel is like pity; (2) that nothing Israel does deserves this love, in fact it deserves quite the opposite; (3) that
God's love shows itself in giving prosperity and worldly gifts and adornments and making a covenant of marriage with Israel; (4) These two methods of attempting to arouse a responsive love in Israel failed. Ezekiel does not use the marriage figure to picture the new age.
The marriage figure, as employed by II Isaiah, takes on an entirely new coloring. Jahweh is still the Husband, and Israel the wife, but it is the Husband who has forsaken, not the wife. The neglected wife is to be pitied and consoled.

"Thou shalt forget the shame of thy youth, and the reproach of thy widowhood shalt not remember; For your Husband, Jahweh Sabaoth is His name, Thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel, is called God of the whole earth.

Jahweh calls thee a neglected wife, afflicted in spirit, "Surely the wife of youth is not to be disdained", saith thy God. For a fraction of a moment have I forsaken thee, but with great mercy I take thee back. In wrath for a moment I hid my face from thee, but now I will have mercy and be true for ever, saith Jahweh, thy Redeemer. (Is.54: 4b - 8.)

The figure here is that of polygamy, Dt.21:15 f. Israel is like a wife who has been scorned, probably because she is barren (54:1). Jahweh calls her neglected, i.e., He realises that He has wronged her and has sympathy for her. It would be different if she had called herself neglected.

But Jahweh has a certain predilection for Israel because

---

1) Volz omits as an explanation of the preceding word. On the other hand, the LXX has simply for (BMK) without the suffix.
2) Volz omits (with Duhm and others) and reads
she was the wife of His youth, and therefore tends to be the favourite wife. This refers to the choosing of Israel - the favourite wife in the Harem corresponds to the favourite nation among the nations. The wife Israel is not neglected unintentionally. It is for her sins that she has received double punishment (40:2). Likewise was she put away because of her (children’s) transgressions. (50:1) There is no essential difference between Mother and children in this respect. The distinction is made for purely literary reasons. And this condition of sinning has not been removed. "Both Yahwe and the prophet must say to the people . . . . 'Ye are still false and unworthy; unrighteous of life and destitute of faith. Why will ye not turn, so that the long delayed deliverance may come? And this is the attitude which the prophet consistently maintains, throughout the book" (Torrey p.390.) Israel fully deserves her punishment. She does not deserve the redemption which Jahweh promises. The love of Jahweh is thus so much more poignant. He must punish and yet His love for the punished nation makes Him pity her so much so that it seems she has received more punishment than she deserved. And His love also leads Him to buy back the ones He has sold into servitude. Yet there is no legal barrier to the wife’s reinstatement. Jahweh put her away because of her sins. If He pardons these He can take her back.

1) For the honourable position of the "wife of youth" see Prov.5:18; Mal.2:14.
2) Ziegler p.62.
The magnitude of the divine love is seen in His taking His people back. The anger which He felt was but a momentary thing. But His mercy is great. Compared to His mercy, which lasts for ever, Israel's period of sorrow and shame, which includes its entire history (v.4 b, youth and widowhood) lasts but an instant. "The prophet speaks here of the short duration of the present condition, whereas in 42:14 a, he calls it long, but both views supplement each other very well. To those waiting, Jahweh's silence appears centuries long, but seen from the point of view of fulfillment, it seems but a moment.

Mercy is almost a synonym for love here. For mercy in the sense of pity and forgiveness reflects a continued state of neglect among the people. Here, however, we have the beginning of a period of glory, of eschatological bliss. And forgiveness is but a momentary thing, whereas this condition of loyalty is to last for ever. It is the picture of an ideal close relationship.

Though the mountains depart, and the hills be removed,
My bezed shall not depart from thee, neither shall my covenant of peace be removed.

Saith Jahweh J.54:10.

It had been necessary for Jeremiah to threaten Jahweh's removal of his bezed, shalom, and rahamim, Jer.16:5. Now, however, II.Isaiah can promise their return and eternal duration. (Volz.p.134)

Trito-Isaiah similarly pictures the future idyll:

Thou shalt no more be termed Forsaken
Neither shall thy land any more be termed Desolate:
But thou shalt be called "My-Delight-in-Her"
And thy land "Married"

For Jehovah delighteth in thee
And thy land shall be married.
For as a young man marrieth a virgin,
So shall thy lord marry thee. (1.)
And as the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride,
So shall thy God rejoice over thee. (2.)

From Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah we can conclude that:

2) 62:4f.

(1) Jehovah punishes His beloved for her sins. (2) The punishment is because of His love. Jehovah does not forsake entirely as punishment, but punishes in order to discipline the spirit.
(3) The punishment though severe does in no wise work off the guilt. That comes only through Jehovah's miraculous pardon.
(4) The pardon having washed the past away, a new marriage relationship is established between God and Israel, a period of great joy for both.
JEALOUSY.

In connection with God's love for Israel depicted as that of a husband must be considered His jealousy. That this quality is deep in the nature of Jahweh is not to be questioned. In all three decalogues (Ex:20:5; Ex.34:14; and Dt.5:9;) Jahweh declares and warns of His jealousy.

"For Jahweh, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God." (Ex. 34:14) Jahweh qanā shemo El qanā.

This elementary jealousy is bound up with Jahweh's marriage covenant and is to be taken in its literal sense. Jahweh the husband will brook no other lovers. The same word is used in Numbers 5:14, where the spirit of jealousy comes upon the husband of an adulterous wife. Although later the word came to mean jealousy on behalf of His people, this is a derived and secondary meaning (as opposed to König, Theologie, p.190) Jahweh who has the other passions of a human husband also is jealous of whatever else the nation chooses to accept as the source of its salvation and therefore worthy of its love, whether it be other gods or other nations. In no stronger way could monotheism be expressed. But behind this jealous jealousy lies its indispensable theological principle, the positive, spiritual message of God's love.

1) The common acceptance of this word in all periods of O.T. literature shows how much this formula of the covenant formed part of the groundwork of Jahwism: Josh:24:19; Dt.4:24; 6:15; 32:16,21; Num.25:11; Is.9:16, 37:32; Nah.1:2; Zeph.1:18, 3:8; Ezek.5:15; 16:42; 23:25; 36:5f; 38:19; 39:25; Is.42:13f 59:17; 63:15; Zech.1:14; 8:2; Joel 2:18.
The conception of Jahweh as father is one in which His love is seen at closest range. It becomes in a measure comprehensible to the finite mind when incorporated into this image. Or perhaps it is the incomprehensibility, but nevertheless the certainty of human fatherly love which enables the figure to be transferred to God without one feeling that the love of God is become secularized and familiar to a degree in which it might jar the reverence of His worshippers.

It is interesting that the religion of the Old Testament chooses to symbolize the loving God as a father and not as a mother. But here is just one more indication of its spirituality. The conception of mother love, no matter to what spiritual heights it may rise, is nevertheless much more difficult to liberate from its sordid connotations. True, the figure of the mother is found, but only rarely. It is when describing God as a father that the O.T. writers made their greatest contribution to a warm religious relationship; it is God as a loving Father whom Jesus knew; and it is to such a God that nineteen Christian centuries have prayed.

The father-children religious relationship did not necessarily infer more than that of God-worshippers. Chemosh, God of the Moabites, was an unreliable deity who gave his sons as fugitives and his daughters into captivity (Num.21:29). And Judah
married the daughter of a foreign God (Mal.2:11) "There is abundance of independent evidence that not only the Arabs, but all the Semites, often spoke and thought of themselves as children of their gods".

But, on the other hand, as we shall see, it was possible for the heathen gods to have human progeny by means of physical relationship. This train of thought is absolutely foreign to the O.T. Jahweh remains the Creator-God whose Word is sufficient to create. In this respect Jahwism is absolutely unique and opposed to the religions surrounding it. Therefore can Hempel with reason believe that the figure of Jahweh the Father is foreign to the characteristic expressions of Hebrew religion; it is a figure of speech which, for the most part, has been assimilated to the Hebrew religion from its external influences.

Only in the late Song of Moses do we hear that God gave birth to the people Israel.

"Of the Rock that begat thee, thou art unmindful
And hast forgotten God that gave thee birth." (Dt.32:18)

However such language is merely figurative for the establishing of the nation as can be seen from the same poem:

He found him in a desert land,
And in the waste howling wilderness;
He compassed him about, He cared for him,
He kept him as the apple of His eye. (32:10)

1) See also Acts 17:28.
2) W. Robertson Smith, Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia, p.240.
3) Gott und Mensch, p.132.
Thus the love of Jahweh for His child Israel is that of a father for a foundling child which he adopts and sustains (thereby giving him life.) In rescuing Israel from Egypt God made its national life possible.

The singularity of the Father-child relationship in Israel's religion is attested by personal names. That Jahweh was characterized as Father is apparent from such names as Abijah or Abihu. But such names were not predicated to other personal names which might thereby ascribe parenthood of a particular individual to Jahweh. Such a restraint is significant. The opposite practice was carried on in Accadian, Canaanite, and (West) Aramaic nomenclature. Noth sees two possible explanations for this difference. In Israel the Father-God was held an ethical-personal relationship instead of a physical one with man, and He was designated as Father to the entire people rather than to an individual name-bearer. Even such as Abijah "falls into disuse just when the deeper ideas of the fatherhood of God were developing."

The uniqueness of Israel's conception of the Father-Son relationship between God and man is best illustrated by Jahweh's relationship to the king. It is difficult to ascertain how much Jahweh's fatherhood of the kind involved a love relationship.

1) Properly, only such a belief could be consistent with Israel's belief in itself as the chosen nation, set apart from all the nations of the earth to be sacred to Jahweh. (Dt.14:1 f)
2) Also v.6
Jahweh promises David concerning his seed, "I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his father, and he shall be my son; if he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men; but my besed shall not depart from him." (II.Sam.7:13 ff) In Ps.89:25 (24 f) the same relationship is to exist between Jahweh and David himself. Jahweh's besed and amunah are to be with him and he is to cry unto Jahweh. "Thou art my Father, my God, and the rock of my salvation. Jahweh is to make him His firstborn, and the highest of the kings of the earth. Jahweh's fatherhood thus at least signifies preference; and in Ps. 2:7 f is it declared that Jahweh said unto the king:

"Thou art my son
This day have I begotten thee,
Ask of me, and I will give thee the nations for thine inheritance."

It is a common thing in the orient for the ruler to be called the son of the God. In Babylonia Hamurarabi was the son of Marduk and in Egypt is the Pharao the son of Aither Re or Amon. But in the main it is a natural relationship. In Egypt, for instance, the highest god comes to the new queen in the form of her husband and thus is a new ruler born. And the Hebrew belief in the king as son of God might very well have originated in the heathen mythology as Quell thinks it does (o.p. cit. p.29) Yet this natural relationship is impossible in the Old Testament for Jahweh has no single wife or child. Never is the expression "son of

1) Cf. also I.Chron.22:10 -reverse order and threat of chastening omitted.
Jahweh found. Therefore is the relationship of God and king only compared with that between father and son, or at most is thought of as one of adoption. The fact that "Thou art my son" is the standard formula for adoption bears out this theory. Also in that the king is only this day begotten shows that the adoption by Jahweh is the thought. Jahweh adopted the king on the day that he mounted the throne. As Weiser points out, the king was only the son of God in that it was his function as king to be the tool of the divine will. (P<sup>3</sup>"almen p.27)

But Jahweh as father of the king is rarely expressed in the O.T., probably, for one reason, because it is so common in rival oriental religions. On the other hand, Jahweh did stand in a special love relationship to Solomon (II.Sam.12:27; Neh.13:26) and also to Cyrus. (Is.48:14) Yet the more fundamental reason was that those gadfly prophets would not allow the all-too-human kings to assume any close relationship with the God whom they knew. So great and absolute are His ethical demands that, even were Coniah (Jehoiachin) the signet upon His right hand, yet would

---

1) So Gunkel, Handkommentar d.AT p.7)
2) Gunkel p.7)
3) Kittel, Gunkel).
4) All three references use the root ahab.
He pluck Him thence. Never again is a man of his seed to prosper, sitting upon the throne of David. (Jer.22:24,30).

We can conclude therefore that Jahweh had a love for the king, and for special kings, and that this love was strong enough to be pictured as that of a father for an adopted son, but that the connotations of heathen mythology and His ethical demands prevented a more extensive use of the figure.

The sonship of Israel is already stated in Isaiah (Is.1:2,4; 30:1,9) Quell (p.30) says that the weight here is more on the authority of a father than on His inner feeling of affection, as the sharp words over the ingratitude of the sons demonstrate. Nevertheless one can certainly detect more than disregard of authority in:

The ox knoweth its owner, and the ass its master's crib but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider. (1:3)

God's own children are contrasted to the dumb animals which know to whom they belong. The children of Israel have rebelled against Him who not only has fed them, but has brought them up. And when the children take counsel but not of Him, when they make a league, but not of His spirit, going down to Egypt without even considering Him, He is angry, (30:1-3).

Small wonder that the Father's patience is exhausted at such incorrigible children who are "a rebellious people, lying children, children that will not hear the law of Jahweh" (30:9) Therefore, Jahweh becomes the angry punishing father, but punishment seems

---

1) Hosea2:8
2) "I have nourished and brought up children and they have rebelled against me (1:2).
the only remedy for such self-willed children. The self-sufficient pride must be broken. God's paternal love then in Isaiah is shown in bringing up children, in giving them a law, and, instead of allowing them to go their own wicked rebellious way, in punishing them.

In the early passage, Ex.4:22, Jahweh declares: "Israel is my son, my first-born. Here Jahweh is proving to the Pharaoh that Israel belongs to him, as a son belongs to a father. The son has no right to serve another except his own father. Therefore Jahweh intercedes for His son when He cannot be served properly by him. Ziegler asserts that the use of "first-born" has no special significance here. Its purpose is not to show a preference of Jahweh for Israel over other peoples, but merely to place His first-born son, Israel, over against Pharaoh. (4:23) But the first-born does have the favourite position, and if we can assume that other nations are therefore considered as children of the Creator-God (since Israel is the first-born) then Jahweh's preference for Israel is manifest in His protective care of Israel from the other nations. If the other nations are not considered as children of Jahweh the Creator-God, then the only possible reason for Jahweh's referring to Israel as His first-born would be that such a term had connotations of preference.

2) Ziegler p.86.
And in Dt.14:1, "Ye are the children of Jahweh your God", we see the claim of Jahweh, who has chosen Israel as His own possession from all the nations of the earth (v.2), and therefore has a special relationship with them. The relationship is such that it forbids any practices which might smack of heathenism; in other words, it is exclusive. And the children "owe to Him on the other hand filial love and obedience, they should conform their character to His, and do nothing that is unworthy of the close and intimate relationship in which they stand towards Him".  

Jahweh's commands are distinctive in that they are the commands of a Father to His children.

Although the words father and son are not used extensively, perhaps intentionally, nevertheless the picture of God's love as that of a loving father reaches its most beautiful expression in Hosea. Nowhere else in the Old Testament is the tenderness and the pain of father's love so vividly expressed. The paternal side of the relationship receives the emphasis, rather than the filial, but that was the side which was most real to Hosea.

The relationship here is definitely not a natural one, but one based upon choosing. When Israel was a mere lad, in Egypt, Jahweh loved him, and called him His son. This picture of a young boy is not quite consistent with the striking picture of 11:3 "I taught Ephraim to walk". But consistency of the figure is not

1) Driver, I.C.C. on Dt. p.156
2) So Quell, p.31.
3) Of. Weiser Glaubt und Geschichte p. - 29f)
4) "Jehovah does not love Israel because he is His son, but took him as His son because He loved him." W.R. Smith Prophets p.169.
important; what is important is the loving, yet neglected father. The son might be adopted, but if so, all the more weight is to be attached to the bond of love.

The most touching part of the story is when the father feels it his duty to punish the children. Punishment is here intended to be the final one, the forsaking of the people to other lands and gods, (11:5), yet there is a power which restrains him, stronger than loyalty to a covenant. (For Israel has long since forgotten the covenant; they are deserving of punishment).

Jahweh cannot give them up. Even He cannot understand why. He plans to destroy them, but His heart turns within Him, forbidding the fulfilment of His plan. Instead is to come a period of ideal harmony between God and people, brought about by Jahweh. Where it was once said: "Ye are not my people? it shall be said unto them, "Ye are the sons of the living God, (2:1, RV.1:10).

The restraining power is His inexplicable love for Israel. The love is divine, not human, in that it is not changed by feelings of anger or by considerations of justice. Love is the Urkraft of God's Being, which works on unceasingly. God proves Himself God and the Holy One in that He is motivated by love.

1) "Jehovah is God and not man, but the meaning of this is that His love is sovereign, pure, unselfish, free from all impatience and all variableness as the love of an earthly father can never be." W.Rob. Smith, Prophets, p.162.

2) Quell, op.cit.p.31.
Jeremiah, like his predecessor Hosea, did not learn religion out of a book. Of a deeply sensitive nature he came to know God as the only companion of His loneliness. Although He never speaks of God as a Father to him personally, yet "we feel that no other word than Father will fittingly describe the God of grace with whom he lives in such intimate communion, and before whom he lays bare his inmost soul". We can expect then that in picturing God as father of the nation he will follow along much the same line as Hosea. He too passes beyond the aspect of Jahweh, the father, ordering his children to obey his commands to the deeper aspect of the loving father who suffers when his children disobey, who tries to banish them from His thoughts because of their rebelliousness, but finds that His love forces him to take them back.

Already at the beginning of his career he hears the Father calling His backsliding sons of the northern kingdom to return (3:14) But the sons refuse to hear the voice calling to them. Not only do they disregard His pleading; they themselves turn against Him. His heritage becomes like a lion in the forest. It raises its voice against Him. His passion changes. How must He hate it. (12:8) Therefore He forsakes His house, casts off His heritage, and gives the dearly beloved of His soul into the hand of the enemies (12:7)

But the story cannot end here. The people in their

1) Pace, Idees of God in Israel, p.165.
2) Skinner thinks verses 14-18 post-exilic and probably containing no word of genuine Jeremianic material. However, I think Volz is justified in accepting as genuine through verse 15).
suffering came weeping. So He leads them, consoling them, causing them to walk by rivers of waters in a straight way wherein they shall not stumble. The reason for taking them back is simply that He is a father to them. Ephraim (as opposed to Judah) is His first born son (31:9). The people have been punished and are now to be consoled. As was the case in Hosea, Jahweh Himself cannot fathom the ground for this love of His. Why should He take the rebellious and backsliding child back after breaking the bond with it and freeing Himself from its demands and limitations? Is Ephraim His dear son? Is he a darling child? For just as often as He mentions his name He finds that his memory haunts Him. His heart yearns for him. He must have compassion upon him (31:20) Volz says:

"He has mercy, not because Ephraim makes expiation, but because He loves him ineffably; He has never ceased to love the lost one. Jeremiah gives here an unsurpassable expression for the secret of the divine love: it is so wonderful, so inconceivable a love that even Jahweh Himself cannot comprehend it!" Ziegler finds in 31:20 the peak of the O.T. conception of Jahweh's love. "Jahweh's very Being is kindness and love; Jahweh loves His people because to love His child is in His Being, just as it is in the nature of a father." Nevertheless Ziegler finds ethical grounds for this love in that Ephraim has become converted and is penitent. To him verse 20 by itself betrays weakness on the part of God; it

1) With Volz and LXX.
discloses a love more human than divine. It is only because Ephraim has turned (vs.18 f) that Jahweh can again bestow His love upon it. How surely to conclude thuswise is to miss the mark completely. It is because of God's love, as that of a father for a child that He is to provide the means of salvation. His love goes out to the sinner for whom His heart inextricably yearns. Were man (or Ephraim) obedient and humble there would be no mystery - he would deserve God's love. Ziegler finds in this story a prologue to the parable of the prodigal son in that both instances relate of a conversion, which makes possible the Father's love. But the Father's love continues to exist right through the period of apostacy. Relying upon this everlasting constant, the son can return, knowing his own sinful nature, knowing that no matter how humble and penitent he may be he can never deserve such love. It is the steady dependable love which is the foundation of the son's faith.

This is, I insist, not to read back into the O.T. what one would like to find there. Ephraim can call out begging to be restored (verse 18) because Jahweh is his God. The conversion Ephraim only promises, because it can only take place properly in its own land. Its only turning has been to turn away from its God for which it is sorry (v.19) But knowing of the everlasting love it can ask to be returned.

As has been already pointed out, Ezekial intertwines the figures of God as father and as husband so that no clear picture of God as a loving Father emerges. But we can gather that Jahweh

1) 'habath 'olam 31:3)
was in no way responsible for the birth of the nation. Thus it could boast of no divine nature within it. In fact, it was the most despised of infants. Not even the most elementary practices of midwifery were carried out upon it.

"No eye pitied thee to do any of these things unto thee, to have compassion upon thee; but thou wast cast out in the open field, for that thy person was abhorred in the day that thou wast born". (16:5) It was thus out of sheer pity that Jahweh adopted this child. In no way did it deserve His care. Out of grace He took it in its blood and caused it to grow. (16:6f) But the Father's love changes into that of the Husband when the child grows, so that we catch only a momentary glimpse of the divine pity for the helpless nation in Egypt.

When Israel grows up she bears children to Jahweh, but these she sacrifices to the other gods. The love of Jahweh for these children is not expressed. He is only outraged at the ungrateful wife who can take possessions which He has given her, even His children, and sacrifice them to the gods of the nation with whom she has entered into political entanglements. (16:20f). The two evil sisters receive the same accusation (23:4,37 ff).

We have already considered Is.50:1, in which it is said that Jahweh put aside the mother and sold the children. The children deserved to be sold; their iniquities brought it upon them. But they are not irretrievably sold. Jahweh is not the Father who must sell His children because of His own poverty. It is for their sakes that they are chastised. But they remain
Jahweh's children, and He who can dry up the sea and make the rivers a wilderness at a word has power to deliver and redeem (50:2). Jahweh proves not only His power but His loving Fatherhood when He prepares to ransom the children (43:3 f). This passage shows how very dear (two senses) Israel was to Jahweh.

"I will give Egypt as thy ransom, Ethiopia and Sabaea in thy stead; because thou art precious in my sight, esteemed, and I love thee; Therefore will I give lands in thy stead and peoples instead of thy life."

The ransom money includes the entire territory of the then known Africa. Such boundless liberality certainly suggests a father's love, for as a nation or land Israel is in no way worth so much. Only love could justify such a grotesque barter, (Dt.7:7f).

The most striking figure of Jahweh's love for Israel occurs in Isai: 49:14-16: "But Zion said, Jahweh has forsaken me, my Lord has forgotten me. Does a woman forget her child, a loving mother loving the son of her womb? Even if these do forget, yet will I not forget thee. See, on the palms of my hands have I

1) The reference in v.6 to the gathering of the scattered sons and daughters does not bear on the sonship of Israel.
2) Volz objects to the reading lands, for he says the plural of 𐤇𐤉𐤋𐤈𐤄𐤉𐤃 means fields rather than nations or districts. However, his conjecture is too far from the text, and there is no reason why great strips of land can not be thought of here.
3) With Volz, a double subject is necessary because of the following 𐤇𐤉𐤋𐤈𐤄𐤉𐤃. B H K simply changes the pointing to 𐤇𐤉𐤋𐤈𐤄𐤉𐤃 leaving the shorter masculine form as a common gender where the feminine is understood. This use follows the Arabic.
4) This idiom, graem on my hands is also found in the Song of Solomon 8:6, thereby showing its association with the love theme.
graven thee: Thy walls are ever before me.

Vols has commented excellently on this great theme when he says: "This love is greater than mother-love, stronger than the strongest human feeling, more deeply rooted than the most deeply rooted bond of nature." Together with Jeremiah 31:20 the passage reaches the peak of the conception of Jahweh as a God of love. The prophet has gone the limit, and no one has ever expressed God's love more poignantly. Here is not a love for righteous acts, or even for loyal religious adherence. It is a tie which Jahweh cannot break. It is not just a passive feeling, for Israel benefits by it; the land is to be too small to hold them when restored (v.20), yet it is above and beyond history. Even in Israel's darkest hour, Jahweh's love does not forsake it.

As one whom his mother comforts, so will I comfort you; and ye shall be comforted in Jerusalem. Here, however, the picture is more the conventional eschatology, although this singular addition about the mother's comfort adds warmth to the whole. But here, as in ch.49, the underlined aspect of the maternal relationship is the spiritual love of the mother for her child. There is nothing which even suggests a natural religion. The tenderness of Jahweh's parent-love is compared effectively to that of the parent bird caring


2) Perhaps to the trust of a child in its mother is to be ascribed the figure of Dt.33:27: "And underneath are the everlasting arms".
for its young. Thus Israel's childhood is a period of helplessness, a time in which they have depended entirely upon Jahweh's care. The flight from Egypt is the result of His care, of His activity. "He bare them on eagles' wings" unto Himself (at Sinai) Ex.19:4. But the picture of the bird is more fully drawn in the Song of Moses (Dt.32:11):

As an eagle that stirreth up her nest,
That fluttereth over her young,
He spread abroad His wings, He took them,
He bare them on His pinions.

Here is the mother bird teaching her brood to fly, yet always near to rescue and to support when the younglings become exhausted.

More familiar is the thought of protection and shelter under the wings of God.

For He will deliver thee from the snare of the fowler, And from the deadly pestilence.
He will cover thee with his pinions. 2. And under His wings shalt thou take refuge.

Thus can be seen how such a figure easily penetrates the personal religion. Ruth also seeks shelter under the wings of Jahweh (2:12).

In the poem now found in Is:63:7–64:11 (which Volz establishes chronologically shortly after 586 - before Dt.Isaiah) there occurs the deep trust in the fatherliness of Jahweh. But also

1) For a similar picture of the wilderness period, Cf. Dt 1:31, where Jahweh bare the people as a man bears his son, in all the way they went.

2) Ps.91:4 Cf. Ps.61:5, RV.4.
there is a unique touch, - the trust of Jahweh in His children.

"For He said, 'Surely they are my people, sons who will not deal falsely.' (63:8) Such a trust is merely mentioned along with His great gifts of blessed and redemption, but it is surely one of the greatest gifts of the Father's love, a trust in the children's capacity for receiving His love and ability to understand His purposes for them. It is a felicitous corollary to God's love.

But the children also have a great trust in Him and His fatherly love, even at this hour. The perceived reality of God's fatherhood appears in 7.16: "Though Abraham knoweth us not, and Israel doth not acknowledge us: Thou, O Jahweh, art our Father; our Redeemer from everlasting is thy name." In spite of the deep belief in the patriarchs as founders and fathers of the people, the belief in God's efficacy for the present as well as in times past wins for Him the filial devotion. The "our Father" of this verse is carried over into the prayer of 64:7 f (RV 8 f):

"But now, O Jahweh, Thou art our Father; we are the clay and Thou our potter; and we all are the work of Thy hand. Be not wrath very sore, O Jahweh, neither remember iniquity for ever: Behold, look, we beseech Thee, we are all thy people".

In the context of this prayer two ideas stand out: the sublimity and "almightiness" of God, and His anger at His people's sin.

But there was apparently another characteristic of God familiar to these punished ones. They knew that, like a father, He can also pity when He sees His children, the ones He himself moulded, in

1) and even as living in each descendant - redersen Israel I-II p.278.
distress.

In Malachi, it is not so much the Father's love as His demand for a father's honour and reverence which one sees (1:6). If He is a beneficent Father to Israel, they must fulfil the filial obligations, the strongest claim which the ancient Hebrew felt was his duty to his father. In the patriarchal system of society the father had absolute authority. Yet God's love was also one of Malachi's messages (1:2) so that it is quite possible that the author considered Jahweh as a loving Father. It is the Creator-Father aspect which the amazing question of 2:10 brings out: "Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us?" But the paternal love of God to all mankind is not yet to be revealed.

Yet the tender note of God's Fatherhood is not altogether lacking in the book. Those that fear Jahweh are noted, and they are to become His own possession. The meaning of this is that on the great day Jahweh is to spare His own, even, as a father spares the son who serves him (3:17). Jahweh's fatherly love is reserved

1) Pedersen, p.275.
2) However, such a system by no means excludes the more tender side of the human father's relationship. A father is one who cares for a child (Job.31:18; 29:12,16; Cf. Numb.11:12 ff where Moses chafes as bearing the burden of the people as if he were their father. Ziegler's belief that Moses implies the fatherhood of Jahweh here seems to me unconvincing (Ziegler, op.cit.9.87)
3) Cf. the exalted image of the Potter Is.45:9 ff)
for those who fear Him.

God's love comes irritatingly close to a universal love in Ps.103. One feels that the Psalmist knows of God's love for sinful mankind, yet has just missed the opportunity of expressing it. Man's days are as grass; he flourisheth as a flower of the field. (verse 15) God takes this weak ephemeral nature into account in His judgment and therefore forgives all iniquities (v.3). He does not deal with man according to his sins (v.10) but removes transgressions as far as the east is from the west (v.12) because of His hesed, which is as great as the heavens are high above the earth (v.11). He is like a father who pitieth his children. (v.13) Yet, in spite of the psalmist's realization that man is of a sinful nature, still the love is not for sinners. His great hesed and His fatherly pity are confined to those who revere Him. The time is not yet come. The Father's love is made up mostly of pity also in Ps.68:6, (RV 5) where He is pictured as a Father to the fatherless and a (favourable) judge for the widows. The echo of Is:49; 14 ff. sounds in Ps.27:10 showing how God's care for the individual is like that of the father and mother. "When my father and my mother forsake me, then Jahweh will take me up." It is not a far cry from here to the Father-God of the New Testament.

The depths to which the Father conception goes can be seen in the fact that misfortune is looked upon not only as God's punishment for sins committed, but as a father's disciplinary
measure. And those whom God loves receive the more stringent discipline, in order that they may receive the greatest good.

The most clear expression of this doctrine is found in the parabolic section of Deuteronomy (8:2-5): Jahweh leads the helpless people through the wilderness in order to humble it and prove it. He allowed it to hunger and fed it with manna to teach it to live by what proceedeth from the mouth of Jahweh. "And thou shalt consider in thy heart, that, as a man chasteneth his son, so Jahweh thy God chasteneth thee". (8:5) The individual received the same treatment, whether he be a specially beloved one such as Solomon (II. Sam. 7:14) or the ordinary mortal to whom the Proverb applies:

For whom Jahweh loveth He reproveth. Even as a father the son in whom he delighteth. (3:12) Thus "Jahweh's love punishes not only to expiate but to educate".

If, then, the conception of Jahweh as a father had been revealed in Old Testament days, and since it has proven itself the most acceptable figure in Christian days, why is it so rarely found in the Old Testament?

Although it cannot be positively concluded, yet it is a reasonable assumption that, both in its prophetic and priestly

1) Ziegler p.88.
2) The Babylonian religion, which is contrasted with the Hebrew in its feeling of distance from its Gods, yet addresses Shamash as Father of the Blackheads, and Ishtar as merciful mother of mankind, (Begrich, p.256)
factions, the father-conception was frowned upon for one definite reason - its perilous similarity to the Canaanite natural religions. Jeremiah, for instance, scoffs at the enticing religion in which the people say to a stock: Thou art my father, and to a stone: Thou hast begotten me. (Jer.2:27) Volz thinks that the reason for the prophet's refraining from a more constant use of the familiar figures of family love to portray Jahweh's relationship to Israel is because the prophets, for whom above all Jahweh was the Holy One of Israel, felt the distance between God and man more keenly. II-Is. (as contrasted to Hosea and Jeremiah) does not actually name Israel or Jerusalem the son or daughter of Jahweh (Although to be sure he follows I-Isaiah in speaking of the Israelites as sons and daughters of Jahweh), (43:6; 50:1). The argument that the prophets felt the distance between God and man more keenly than the rest of the people I hold as true only in a certain sense: that they were more conscious than the average of their own and their peoples' sin. But the prophets surely felt the nearness of God more than the average as well. However, since most of the argument must be from silence, it is impossible to assert finally that prophetic influence obviated the attitude of sonship from the individual Israelite.

1) Komm. II.Is. p.133 f.
SUMMARY.

1. Jahweh is thought of as Father to the nation Israel.

2. His Fatherliness takes form in His creation and His paternal authority, but especially in His love for the child Israel.

3. In spite of a few expressions signifying a natural fatherhood, the general conception of God, the Father-Creator, might be compared to that of a potter.

4. God's Fatherhood is also conceived as based upon adoption. His pity and love for a helpless child lead to His taking the child as His own.

5. God's Fatherhood to the king is based upon adoption.

6. God's fatherly love chastises and disciplines His child.

7. Although He lays moral requirements upon His child, His love is not destroyed when the child disobeys.

8. God's love is also like a mother's love.
Closely akin to the picture of Jahweh as Father comes that of the Shepherd. This figure of speech is a very familiar one among the ancient Semites. Throughout the Hither Orient one finds both kings and gods referred to as shepherds of their people—

The O.T. is true to its oriental background in this respect. Kings and princes and leaders are almost unconsciously called shepherds. (Is.58:11; Jer:2:8; 5:15; 10:21; 12:10; 22:22; 23:1 ff; 50:6. Ez.34:2,8,9,10; Nahum 3:18; Zech.10:3, 11:3,5,8. Moses was regarded as the traditional shepherd of the people, Is.63:11. And Jahweh is to carry out His plan by means of His shepherd Cyrus (Is.44:28). The ideal future is the time when Jahweh will set up one shepherd to feed His people, even His servant David, who is to feed them and shepherd them. Ezek.34:23; (OJ.37:24) Micah also sees the future Saviour pasturing Israel in the strength of Jahweh (5:3; RV4) Also the gloss of 5:4b RV5b speaks of seven shepherds and eight principal men.

It is only natural that the figure should be applied to Jahweh Himself, as One who not only leads His people, but provides them with sufficient pasture and watches over them to protect

1) Ziegler p.91.
2) Reading singular according to many mss. Volz ascribes the pluralizing to the dogmatic influence seeking to include Aaron.
them from harm in the form of attacks by hostile powers. But first and most significant is Jahweh who owns His flock; they are His property. This not only means that they belong to Him, exclusive of other shepherds, but that they can have absolute trust in His caring for them. "And they shall know that I, Jahweh their God, am with them, and that they, the house of Israel, are my people, saith the Lord Jahweh. And ye my sheep, the sheep of my pasture, are men and I am your God, saith the Lord Jahweh. And they shall no more be a prey to the nations, neither shall the beasts of the earth devour them. (Ez.34:30 f; 28) Such a feeling of confidence gave the people their greatest cause for thanksgiving. They had trust that Jahweh would care for His own property, His sheep and they loved to sing: "We are His people, the sheep of His pasture". (Psa.79:13; 95:7; 100:3)

As opposed to His permanent ownership the other lesser shepherds were merely appointees. He takes the skilful shepherd David from his father's sheep and makes him shepherd over Israel, but Jacob remains His people, His inheritance (Psa.78:71; cf. II Sam.5:2) He is the constant reliable good Shepherd as opposed to the human leaders. For instance, when the governmental authorities whom He allowed to lead His sheep have scattered them and driven them away, Jahweh must punish them but He promises to gather the remnant of His flock and bring them again to their folds. And He will set over them good shepherds who will feed them and in whom they will be able to trust, (Jer.23:1 ff. Cf.50:6).
The history of Israel lends itself naturally to the shepherd figure. Apart from the nomad background in which the tribe wandered about, not only with sheep, but like sheep, the beginning of Israel's national history is when Jahweh leads His flock out of Egypt into better pasture land. At this period the Shepherd is the gentle pitying figure, for the sheep are entirely helpless and realize their dependence. Even in the very early poem of Ex.15: Jahweh is regarded as the one who led and guided the people in His hesed. The Psalmist dwells upon the days of old, when, as a sign of His hesed rahamim Jahweh led His people as sheep by the hand of Moses and Aaron (77:21, RV 20): "He led forth His own people like sheep and guided them in the wilderness, like a flock. And He led them safely so that they feared not; but the sea overwhelmed their enemies" (Ps.78:52f).

However His flock lost their docility; they rebelled against the shepherd who cared for them. Therefore must He feed them with wormwood and give them water of gall to drink. Moreover, He scatters them among the nations, even sending the sword after them (Jer.9:17 f RV 15 f). The leaders are partly to blame: "My people have been lost sheep: their shepherds have caused them to go astray; they have turned them away on the mountains; they have gone from mountain to hill; they have forgotten their resting place. All that found them have devoured them," (Jer.50 6f).

---

1) The stock of the nomad Hebrews probably consisted of sheep, goats, and small cattle. Leda, Israel, p.203 f.
But Jahweh's love outlasts His anger. After scattering the sheep He takes pity on them. "Israel is a hunted sheep; the lions have driven him away: first, the king of Assyria devoured him: and now at last Nebuchadnessar, king of Babylon, hath broken his bones". (Jer.50:17) Moved by His pity He will punish the king of Babylon as He has punished the king of Assyria. Then will He "bring Israel again to his pasture, and he shall feed on Carmel and Bashan, and his soul shall be satisfied upon the hills of Ephraim and in Gilead." (Jer.50:18 f)

The assembling of the scattered sheep and bringing them home forms one of the favourite figures of the hopes for the new future. Ezekiel foresees Jahweh gathering the sheep together, bringing them into their own land, and feeding them upon the mountains of Israel. "I will feed them with good pasture; and upon the mountains of the height of Israel shall their fold be: there shall they lie down in a good fold; and on fat pasture shall they feed upon the mountains of Israel" (Ez.34:13 f). But the important aspect is that it is Jahweh who collects them. "Behold, I myself, even I, will search for my sheep, and will seek them out . . . . . and I will deliver them out of all places whether they have been scattered in the day of evil and thick darkness (Ex.34:11 f).

It is Dt. Isaiah who paints the picture of the future in the warmest colours:

"Like a shepherd He will feed His flock, gathering them with His arm; the lambs He will carry in His bosom, those with young He will lead (40:11). Along the ways they find pasture, on all the
bare heights shall be grazing for them; They shall not hunger nor thirst, neither sun nor scorching air shall smite them; for He who has pity will lead them, and to fountains of water will guide them," (49:9ff).

Hempel rebels at the sentimental picture which is often drawn of the "Good Shepherd", insisting that a shepherd of ancient oriental days protected his flock in battles with lion, bear, and wolf, often giving his life in these struggles. The rod and staff were his only weapons which often had to be used in the dark valley against two- and four-legged enemies (Hempel, Gott und Mensch p.137 ff.). However, protecting a flock against enemies does not in any way exclude the tender love of the shepherd, but rather demands it. Otherwise the shepherd would not risk his life. It is never suggested that Jahweh is an idle shepherd. In this figure especially is the activity of Jahweh demonstrated.

What Jahweh demands of a shepherd (and therefore what He as shepherd does) is reported by Ezekiel. The shepherd must first of all feed His sheep, even before feeding and clothing himself. He must strengthen the diseased, heal the sick, bind up what is broken, bring back that which is driven away, and seek that which is lost, (Ez.34: 2 ff). But the shepherd must feel some affection for his sheep in order to perform these duties with zeal. In Jeremiah's time the shepherds became brutish; not being religious, they lack the tenderness which they should show, (Jer.10:21).

1) Terreytrans.
The sheep are helpless, yet at the same time worth saving and caring for. Such a conclusion must be drawn also from Jahweh's treatment of His human flock. They are incapable of saving themselves, yet God, in His love for them finds them worthy of being saved.

It is noteworthy that the individual experienced the love of God particularly by means of the Shepherd-figure. As the Shepherd must care for each individual sheep as well as the flock, so does Jahweh care for the single member of Israel's flock. Trusting in such care, the individual finds peace. (Ps. 23). Even when conscious of going astray like a lost sheep the individual can call to His Shepherd to seek him out, (Ps. 119:176). Such trust presupposes a loving Shepherd.
JAHWEH as the HEALING ONE.

Jahweh also shows His love in His care for the sick. He is the Healing One. And since physical suffering was generally regarded as punishment for sin, all healing must be regarded as a gift of God's grace.

In the literal sense Jahweh's healing comes to Abimelek because of Abraham's prayer (Gen. 20:17); Miriam is healed when Moses prays (Numb. 12:13); and to Hezekiah as a result of his own prayer (II. Kings 20:5, 8). Thus can be seen Jahweh's direct dealings with individuals in response to prayer. He also heals the leprosy of a foreigner, Naaman (II. Kings, 5:15) and when Elisha utters the word from Jahweh, the waters are healed, preventing future miscarriages, (II. Kings 2:21).

But Jahweh's healing was also carried over into the figurative sense whence it came to designate a relief from any condition causing suffering. Hence it can be applied to the entire people. In the prophetic message of doom and destruction the figure of Jahweh, the healer, always can be found in the background. The two sides of God's nature always complement each other; the wounding and the healing, the judging and the saving. And just as the purpose of the judging is to bring about salvation, so is the purpose of the wounding to bring about the healing.

It is Jahweh alone who can heal lastingly for the very reason that it is He who smites. Therefore in the hymn found in

1) Sending to Tiglath - Pilezer is of no avail (Hos. 5:13)
Hos. 6:1-3; the people sing:

"Come, and let us return unto Jahweh;
For He hath torn, and He will heal us,
After two days, will He revive us,
And on the third day He will raise us up
And we shall live before Him. (Hos.6:1 f) 1.

But there are two maladies which Jahweh must deal with, and the two traditions are interwoven inseparably in the text. The first is the wounds which Jahweh sends as punishment. These are external and can be dealt externally - by restoration of the people's fortunes. But the wounds come as a result of an inner weakness - a state of moral unhealthiness. It is like an ulcer or some inward growth which must be cut away. The false prophets and priests have attempted to effect a cure, but their treatment has been superficial and psychological. They failed to see sin as the root trouble, and thus have failed to work the cure (Jer.6:14: 8:11,14,18.). They failed to see what a very grievous wound it was from which the virgin daughter of Israel suffered, (Jer.14:17). The sensitive Jeremiah suffers vicariously for his people: "For the hurt of the daughter of my people am I hurt: I mourn; dismay hath taken hold on me. Is there no balm in Gilead? Is there no physician there? Why then is not the health of the daughter of my people recovered? " (Jer:8:21 f). There seems no ground even for hope of relief: "For thus saith Jahweh, thy hurt was despained of, Israel, thy wounds incurable. There was no medicine for thy sore, no remedy for thee. All thy friends had forgotten thee: they have not sought after thee.

1) A later addition to the book of Isaiah speaks of Jahweh smiting Egypt so that they will return to Jahweh and He will be entreated of them and heal them. Is.19:22.
For I have wounded thee with the wound of an enemy, with the chastisement of a cruel one; Why criest thou for thy hurt? thy pain is incurable; For the greatness of thine iniquity, because thy sins were increased. I have done these things unto thee." Jer.30:12-15.

Jahweh it is, and Jahweh alone who can perform the miraculous cure. He does this because He takes pity upon the people.

"I will restore health unto thee, and I will heal thee of thy wounds." Jer.30:17 Cf. 33:6; 3:22.1.

Jahweh's healing consists in changing the heart; His new law is to be engraved on the heart and will be different from the old one which could be broken, 31:31 f. The hurt of Israel is brought about by its sinful nature and the only cure for such a hurt is to change the nature. Such is the drastic measure which Jeremiah with his keen perception into the essence of humanity sees required. Only in this means could a loving God effect salvation for sinful man. Thus Jeremiah understands the magnitude and depth of the problem. Actually, the solution which he saw was not the one chosen by God. But it was revealed to Jeremiah that God, as a loving God, must bring healing in some form.

Isaiah also sees Jahweh's healing as a gift to take

1) Probably neither 30:17 nor 33:6 are to be taken as genuinely Jeremianic. See Velz Keim in loc. also Welch, Jeremiah, p.227,231.
place in the new order. Man at present is fat of heart so that
he cannot understand and turn and be healed. (6:16). But in the
day of Jahweh's healing and binding up, the man's light shall be
like the sun's, and the sun's light shall be sevenfold (30:26).
And Trito-Isaiah sees an eschatological vision of the time when
Jahweh will heal the sinful nature of the people. Jahweh saw
their sin and smote them in His wrath. Yet even after the punish-
ment Israel continued to backslide and go the way of his heart.
Hence Jahweh, instead of condemning him in judgment, takes pity
upon him and restores comforts to him as a recompense. He will
create prayers in his lips, will establish peace for all, and will
heal, (Is.57:17 ff). Jahweh in His love and pity for sinful man
will heal his nature. He will make him religious, of a contrite
and humble heart. He will provide man with the means of salva-
tion.

In the Psalms the cry for healing is often heard. The
healing may take different forms, either in the literal saving from
death (6:3; RV.2) or in forgiveness of sins (41:5 RV.4). But the
important thing is that the Psalmist knew that Jahweh's loving
responding nature would heal and forgive and care for when He was
called upon, (Ps.103:3; 147:3).
JAHWEH as the FORGIVING ONE.

If Jahweh was always considered an ethical God making ethical demands upon man and condemning him when he failed in their execution, He was also always a God who gave pardon. His gracious relenting goes hand in hand with His rigid condemning. God, in His love for Israel, always provided them with a means of grace.

Like love itself, forgiveness is a divine mystery. How sin can be atoned for is comprehensible, but how it can be blotted out is beyond all human understanding. Yet one of the foundation stones of Jahwism was laid upon this very quality in its God.

For the most part, Jahweh's forgiveness seems to come only as a result of certain conditions being fulfilled by His worshippers. The most obvious condition was the proper performance of sacrificial rites.

How far back into Israel's history the sin and guilt offering reach is not our concern here. What does concern us is that regulations were provided, set down by the Priestly writers, whereby atonement might be made and, not contemporaneously, but consequently, sin forgiven. There were some offences which were too grave to be thus pardoned. The wilful murderer, for instance, must be put to death (Numb. 35:16-17). And the sin of Eli's house is so great that

1) Lev. 4:1; 5:13; 6:24-30; Ex. 29:11-14; Num. 15:22-29 for the sin offering; Lev. 5:14; 6:7; 7:1-7; Numb. 5:5-6; for the guilt or trespass offering.
no sacrifice or offering can ever expiate it. (I.Sam.3:14). But
the important thing which must be remembered about atonement by
sacrifice is that, "the final ground of the sinner's pardon and
restoration is thus not the precedent sacrifice but the free grace
of a merciful and loving God." But for the most part, at least in
the prophetic literature, forgiveness rests upon repentance. From
its earliest days Israel's history is one of rebellion against God,
His punishment, the people's crying unto Him again, and His forgiv­
ing them. Such a formula formed the leitmotiv of the Deuteronom­
istic history. And the entire purpose of the prophetic life was
to persuade the backsliding people to turn. Unless the people do
so, Jahweh cannot see how He is to forgive them. He asks how He
can pardon such a sinful people (Jer.5:7). Sooner could the
Ethiopian change his skin and the leopard his spots than this
people change its sinful way (Jer.13:23). Yet He never gives up
hope that the people may turn, thereby enabling Him to forgive
their iniquity and their sin. (Jer.36:3) The cry rings out :

"Seek ye Jahweh while He may be found;
Call ye upon Him while He is near:
Let the wicked forsake His way,
And the unrighteous man his thoughts;
And let him return unto Jahweh, and He will have mercy upon
And to our God, for He will abundantly pardon." him;
(Is.55:6f)

But forgiveness could also be brought about by vicarious goodness
and by intercession. If there had been but ten righteous people

1) H. O. G. (2nd vol.) Art. Sacrifice
2) Similarly II. Chron. 7:14, Josh.24:19; II. Kings 24:4; Dt.30:2f
for the necessity of an ethical "turning" to receive pardon.
in Sodom, Jahweh would not have destroyed it, (Gen. 18:32).
Similarly in Jerusalem, if He could find but one just man He would
pardon the city (Jer. 5:1) Intercessory prayer also effected God's
forgiveness, such as that of Moses (Num. 14:19) and of Solomon.
(I Kings 8:36, 50) But, as if after the fulfilling of conditions,
the wonder of forgiveness itself were not great enough, it also goes
out to the people as God's free gift of love. It is seen in His
sustaining activity, which has never ceased in spite of the people's
constant backsliding.

But He, being merciful, forgave their iniquity and destroyed
them not:
Yea, many a time turned He His anger away,
And did not stir up all His wrath. (Ps. 78:38)

Amos infers this constant forgiveness when he hears Jahweh
say: "The end is come upon my people Israel: I will not pass by
them any more (Amos 8:2, Of 7:8) and II. Isaiah, though ever calling
the people to repentance, yet knows that Jahweh must forgive them
before the turning, hoping that it will come afterward.

I have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions
And as a cloud thy sin
Return unto me; for I have redeemed thee (Is. 44:22).

Jahweh must accomplish the redemption; the people cannot in their
own power. Having redeemed them He can only hope for their return.
(Torrey is opposed to this interpretation. He changes the tenses of
the passage into the future, for he claims that "the prophet would
have been the very last to imagine that the sin of the people could
be "wiped away" until they had repented.

1) Of. Dan. 9:16.
Such a view would exclude the vicarious redemption altogether. God does demand that the people repent, but in His love forgives them beforehand.

Thus it was Jahweh's very nature to forgive, so that He preferred to forgive rather than punish. It was forgiveness as a dominant trait of God's character, which was part of the belief in a loving God. Only such a belief could warrant the hope and assurance voiced in such a passage as Micah 7:18 f.

Who is a God like unto Thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth over transgressions
He retaineth not His anger for ever, because He delighteth in haved.
Thou shalt again have compassion upon us; tread our iniquities underfoot.
And thou wilt cast all our sins into the depths of the sea.

It is the very fact that He is God and not man which prevents Jahweh from executing the fierceness of His anger upon Ephraim. (Hos.11:9) Jahweh's love is such that He forsakes not His people, in spite of the manner in which they dealt proudly, hardening their neck and hearkening to His commandments, refusing to obey, because He is a God ready to pardon, gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and abundant in haved, Neh.9:16 f). God not only will but wants to pardon.

Naturally, God's forgiveness finds a position of importance in the Psalms, especially where there is a feeling of personal guilt. Jahweh is asked not to remember the sins of youth.

1) Cf. also the un-Jeremianic passage of Jer.33:8.
but to remember the Psalmist according to His ḭesed. (25:7) He is to pardon iniquity for His name's sake, for the iniquity is great. (25:11) The forgiveness comes as a result of a confession (32:5). And again, Jahweh is to have mercy according to His ḭesed, and according to the multitude of His tender mercies to blot out transgressions (51:3 RV.1) The man cries out of the depths:

If Thou, Jah, shouldst mark iniquities
O Lord, who could stand?
But there is forgiveness with Thee,
That Thou mayest be feared. (130:3 f)

It is to be noted that forgiveness is always regarded as the gift of grace and love. The Psalmist by no means thinks of himself as earning pardon any more than the nation Israel does. Yet he has confidence that Jahweh will forgive Him, for to him Jahweh represents a gracious loving, forgiving God.

The finest expression of God's pardon is found in Ps.103:

2 Bless Jahweh, O my soul,
And forget not all His benefits.
3 Who forgiveth all thine iniquities
Who healeth all thy diseases.
10 He hath not dealt with us after our sins,
Nor rewarded us after our iniquities.
11 For as the heavens are high above the earth
So great is His ḭesed toward them that fear Him.
12 As far as the east is from the west
So far hath He removed our transgressions from us.

Here we see the forgiveness inextricably bound with God's ḭesed.

Just how closely love and forgiveness are linked together for the Hebrew mind is shown in the secular story of David, who, when he heard of His son Amnon's sin was very wroth. But he would not punish (harm the spirit) Amnon his son because he

1) For, another, somewhat different, example of individual forgiveness, See Is.6:7 where the prophet's lips are touched with the coal.
loved him, since he was his first-born." II.Sam.13:21 LXX. The Hebrew knew that where there was love, forgiveness followed.

According to Prof. Mackintosh, the Old Testament belief in forgiveness is established upon the sands of personal prosperity and well-being. He does concede that we cannot as Christians divide the spiritual and the natural altogether, since the Christian "heaven" conceives of a "changeless prime of body and soul", a perfect society in a perfect environment, with God over all. But O.T. religion is made of deeper spiritual reality than this position suggests. There is nothing apart from God's grace which can lead man to ascribe his misfortune to sin, and likewise only grace can cause man to feel God's forgiveness in his restoration to well-being. Such grace was given to the Hebrew people. Moreover, when II.Isaiah sang his song of forgiveness, his audience was not the prosperous but the oppressed. For proof of Jahweh's forgiveness the prophet had nothing save the faith in a loving God whose purpose it was to make man conscious of his sin and thus enable him to receive His forgiveness. I am not trying to blunt the unique Christian doctrine of forgiveness but merely to point out that, in that He is a loving forgiving God, He is the same in both Testaments.

PART III. GOD'S LOVE; HIS ACTIVITY.
Israel did not learn that God was like a loving Husband, Father, Shepherd, Healer, and Forgive through abstract speculation. They had positive proof - in their national history. In finding their God in history, i.e. in basing their religion upon their history, they stand in contrast to all other religions of the Hither Orient. And thus it was precisely in this history that Jahweh was perceived as a loving God. He delivered them from Egypt, He led them and fed them in the desert, He gave them the land of Canaan, a land flowing with Milk and honey. He was with them in their wars, conquering through His strength their enemies. In their hours of anxiety He was not forsaking them but punishing them; His presence was with them. And in the future He is to make them the glory of all nations.

The acts were Jahweh's, not Israel's. His goodness is not a reflection of human desires, especially in the punishment. Throughout, the religion is something not invented, but discovered.

The hope for a glorious future could only excite faith in itself because of God's glorious deeds of the past. Thus Israel's religion finds one of its chief elements in gratitude for something already done. Man's religion is a response to God's love and goodness. God's love comes as a result of goodness, but it also

1) Galling, Erwählungstraditionen, p.92.
2) Welch, Jeremiah p.187.
exists before that goodness is performed. The stages are therefore as follows:

1. God loved.

2. Out of His love He gave Israel good things. (deliverance, prosperity).

3. As a result of these gifts, Israel must be grateful and return service to God (by making only Jahweh the object of its worship and by keeping covenant with Him).

4. Israel, of a sinful nature, fails to respond to God's love.

5. God, of a loving nature, sustains it and forgives it.

But in a religion founded upon deeds of the past and therefore expressing itself in humble gratitude, would the appreciation not tend to grow more and more cold as the centuries went by and the distance between the actual deeds and the present grew greater? One would expect such to be the case but there were two elements, two deeds of Jahweh which brought the past to a living actuality in Jahwism. One of these was the choosing of Israel by God, the other was the covenant which He made with it. They both were events in a point of time yet by their very nature did they entail a "continuance". And both of these elements were established out of Jahweh's love for Israel and were maintained by Him for no other reason than that He loved Israel.

We shall discuss the choosing and the covenant-making separately, although the two are to some considerable extent bound up with each other. As Galling points out, to such an one as Jeremiah the covenant and the choosing were one. "The prophet places the act of law-giving at Sinai which according to the

1) Op.cit.p.34.
Exodus tradition comes between the exodus and the entry into Canaan, right at the beginning simultaneous with the exodus. It cannot be concluded that the Sinai tradition was unknown to him, but for his religious thinking the Heilstat, i.e. the Exodus, and the Covenant belong immediately together. The choosing is the covenant." (Italics Galling's)

Galling traces the two strands to the tradition of the choosing - the exodus, and the patriarchal, and comes to the conclusion that only in the prose-narrators of the Pentateuch and in the late writers is the patriarchal tradition assimilated. In the patriarchal tradition (aside from Deuteronomy) there is no statement in the Pentateuch that God loved the fathers. We can only notice His regard for them, which is this entire background of Genesis, also that He goes so far as to bless Laban for Jacob's sake (Gen. 30:27). In Ex. 3:6,13,15,16 Jahweh is identified as the God of the fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and such an identification was apparently supposed to give hope to the depressed Israelites. But the two important facts to be gleaned from the patriarchal tradition as reported in JE and P is that it is Jahweh who called (chose) Abraham, not vice versa, and that there is no mention of Jahweh choosing because the fathers were pleasing in His sight. The fathers did not in any way earn their choosing.

1) Op. cit.63
2) Galling, p.56.
4) E.König - Kakt Das Deuterononum - p.88.
The patriarchs were, to be sure, held up as patterns of devotion and faith in the pentateuchal accounts. But what was especially admirable in the patriarchs was their humility and their spirit of thankfulness in the consciousness that they were chosen. Never is it even hinted at that Abraham was chosen because he was devout. Abraham was chosen—and obeyed. On the other hand, there is evidence that both Hosea and Jeremiah thought their ancestors anything but perfect. (Hos.12:3-4 RV.2-3)

Jahweh hath also a controversy with Israel
And will punish Jacob according to his ways
According to his doings will he recompense him.
In the womb he took his brother by the heel
And in his manhood he had strength with God.

Similarly Jer. 9:3 RV 4.:
For every brother will utterly supplant
And every neighbor will go about with slanders.

But the exodus tradition is the one commonly associated with the choosing. When God calls Moses, He says that He has seen His people's affliction in Egypt. He has heard their cry, and He knows their sorrows. He is now going to deliver them from the Egyptian and lead them into a land flowing with milk and honey. (Ex.3:7ff) God is motivated by His pity here. Although He identifies Himself as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, (3:16 f) it is not His covenant with them which provides the incentive for the deliverance. It is because the people are suffering and are

1) The RV. rather misses the word play here on ḫōl and jôʾḵōl which the rabbis tried to cover in the pointing.
helpless that He comes to their rescue, at least according to the J. narrative.

After the mission of Moses, Jahweh continually demonstrates that He has chosen the people Israel. When the first-born of Egypt were struck, not even a dog moved his tongue against any of the children of Israel, against man or beast, in order to prove one thing — that Jahweh makes a distinction between the Egyptians and Israel. (Ex.11:7 J.) But the distinction proves to Moses and Israel that they have found favour with Jahweh.

"For wherein now shall it be known that I have found favour in Thy sight, I and Thy people? Is it not in that Thou goest with us, so that we are separated, I and Thy people, from all the people that are upon the face of the earth?" Ex.33:16 J. Thus it is recognized, that the God who has led them and separated them does so because He favours them. He can and does withdraw His favour when displeased, but in answer to Moses' question, He replies, "I will do this thing also that thou hast spoken; for thou hast found favour in my sight and I know thee by name, (Ex.33:17 J.) The favour would seem all to be spent upon Moses personally except that it must be remembered that Moses, and subsequent leaders of

1) In P. God hears the groaning and then remembers His compact with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Ex.2:23,5-25). The suffering serves more to remind than instigate immediate succour.

2) LXX ταρατανατανα, Knowing well implies an intimate relationship. Cf. Hos.4:1, 6:9,8:6,8. (also the sexual use of the word Gen.7:1 Gallin thinks that 'jada' is a word borrowed from the marriage terminology and denotes the indissoluble union of God and people. (Op.cit. p.29).
Israel are conceived as representing the people in dealings with the divinity. The earlier prophets, believing in a God who chose because of love, nevertheless saw the extreme danger of such a belief. To their contemporaries Jahweh's choosing gave a sense of security. But to them Jahweh's ethical nature implied that His choosing involved responsibility. The choosing not having been brought about because of any virtue of Israel's was not necessarily an enduring factor. Jahweh could withdraw His present choice at any time and choose another. They, who were especially sensitive to their own and their people's sin, would certainly tend to doubt God's love. How could a perfect One love such an immoral and degenerate race? Hence, although they refer to the choosing, they do not emphasise it except as an exhortation for the people to try to become worthy of being chosen.

You only have I known of all the families of the earth
Therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities.

Am. 3:2.

Amos also believes that Jahweh's grace has delivered the people from Egypt, has led them in the wilderness, and has falled the Amorite before them, (Am. 2:9f) but he does not believe with his people that "the evil shall not overtake nor meet us". (9:10.)

Hosea looks back upon the time of the choosing as the golden age of Israel's history, for it was when Israel was a child

1) Sellin translated auserwählen". "The word naturally does not refer to the intellectual province, but rather to the personal "caring for", "acquaintance". Also Dt. 9:24, Cf. Gen. 4:17,18,19. Job 19:13@ Jer. 1:5; also see Cramer, Amos, p.55.

2) Cramer would go as far as to say that the idea of Israel's being chosen was the point of departure for his thinking, willing and acting. (Op. cit. p.55)
that God loved him, calling His son out of Egypt (Hos. 11:1; 12:1).

Micah represents God pleading with His people, reminding them of their deliverance through Him. He was the one who sent Moses and Aaron and Miriam with Him. He also reminds them of Balak and Balaam (Deut. 23:5) ("Nevertheless Jahweh thy God would not hearken unto Balaam; but Jahweh thy God turned the curse into a blessing unto thee, because Jahweh thy God loved thee").

Isaiah was also aware of God's grace in choosing Israel. He casually refers to Jahweh's destroying the Egyptians 10:26, and probably also thinks of Jahweh adopting Israel in the time of Moses; hence, "I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me" (1:2).

Jeremiah thinks upon Israel as the young bride, chosen by Jahweh and returning the love He gives it. If Israel wished to continue as God's chosen people, it must continue to be true to Him. It is when we come to Deuteronomy that the love implied in preceding reports of Jahweh's choosing becomes explicit. The dependence of the book, at least the framework, upon Hosea is not to be denied. But the extraordinary fact which confronts us here is that what appeared as a true revelation of God's nature to a

1) Reading יָוִי for יָא (6:4f)
2) "Because a moral and spiritual God, Jahweh, had chosen Israel, therefore it became a moral and spiritual people and should remain such an one; this was the meaning which the prophets attached to the choosing." Volz. Komm. p.17.
single man who was of an unusually passionate and affectionate nature seemed also true to a school of legalists. It is so true that it can be said that "upon love Deuteronomy builds its entire system. As proof of His love Jahweh chooses Israel. "And because He loved thy fathers therefore He chose their seed after them, and brought them out with His presence, with His great power, out of Egypt." (4:37) The choosing and the love are almost synonyms in 7:7f "Jahweh did not set His love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people, . . . but because He loveth you." Although the two traditions are hopelessly tangled here, yet Jahweh loves both the fathers and the people. Thus it can be seen that the patriarchal tradition did not differ from that of the exodus in deserving God's choosing. It was a matter of free grace and love in both cases.

Another outstanding feature of the Deuteronomic treatment of the matter is the fact that, although it is a law book, yet in the majority of cases, Jahweh's choosing is not made to be dependent upon obedience, but rather upon His love.

Ezekiel 20 5 f. also thinks of Jahweh choosing Israel in

2) Further expressions of God's love and choosing are found in 10:15, 23:5, 14:1f. For the synonymous meanings of 'ahab and bahar see Ziegler, op. cit. p.20, also Vischer, Christusgemeins p.68.
3) See von Rad, Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium p.25 f.
Egypt in order to deliver it and give it a land of milk and honey, the glory of all lands.

At the crisis in Israel's history, however, the choosing took on new significance. Just when it seemed that Israel was the one nation that Jahweh did not choose, came forth one who consoled and assured. Just as Jahweh chose the nation Israel and delivered it from Egypt, so will He deliver it once more, Is. 43:16-19.

But above all is God's love shown in His choosing of the servant, Israel.

But thou, Israel, my servant. Jacob, whom I have chosen The seed of Abraham, my friend. Thou whom I have taken hold of from the ends of the earth And called from the corners thereof And said unto thee, Thou art My servant. I have chosen thee and not cast thee away. Fear thou not, for I am with thee. (Is. 41:8-10)

And again Is. 42:1:

Behold, My servant, whom I uphold; My chosen, in whom My soul delighteth.

Amos had prophesied that God's love entailed obligations along with its privileges. The servant experienced it himself, but he knew that Jahweh forsakes not him whom He chooses.

Zechariah also is not looking at the past but at the present and future when he cries:

Jahweh shall yet comfort Zion, And shall yet choose Jerusalem. (Zech. 1:17)

The conception of choosing was also prevalent in the private religion. The Psalmists were ever looking back to Jahweh's choice of Israel, as proof of His care for his, the Psalmist's people, and apparently His thought was that the affection which was

1) See Köhler, Theologie, p.66.
demonstrated in the choosing in Egypt, and also of the patriarchs did not die.

8. Thou broughtest a vine out of Egypt.
   Thou didst drive out the nations and plantedst it.

14. Turn again, we beseech thee, O Elohim Beseoth
   Look down from heaven, and behold, and visit this vine.

15. And maintain the stock which Thy right hand planted.

Also Ps. 77:

3. Is His beseed gone for ever?
   Doth His promise fail for evermore?

9. Hath God forgotten to be gracious
   Hath He in anger shut up His tender mercies?

11. I will make mention of the deeds of Jah.
   I will remember Thy wonders of old.

15. Thou hast with Thy strong arm redeemed Thy people,
   The sons of Jacob and Joseph.

20. Thou leadest Thy people like a flock
   By the hand of Moses and Aaron.

The two traditions are bound up in Ps. 105:

5. Remember His marvellous works that He hath done,
   His wonders, and the judgments of His mouth.

6. O ye seed of Abraham His servant,
   Ye children of Jacob, His chosen ones.

And after the people's arrival in Egypt:

26. He sent Moses His servant
   And Aaron whom He had chosen.

43. And He brought forth His people with joy.
   And His chosen with singing.

Even narrower is the choice in Ps. 78:

67. Moreover He refused the tent of Joseph,
   And chose not the tribe of Ephraim.

1) With Revised ms. - Text corrupt.
68. But chose the tribe of Judah 1
The mount Zion which He loved.

God's choosing of Abraham is also recorded in Nehemiah 9:7. And here also is the choice a matter of grace, of God's irrational and groundless inclination towards Israel, for "Thou art Jahweh, even Thou alone; Thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth and all things that are thereon, the seas and all that is in them, and Thou preservedst them all; and the host of heaven worshippeth thee," Neh.9:6. In spite of all this Jahweh chose Abraham and his seed - so ran the thought down through the centuries of Old Testament religion. There was no reason why the God of the universe should have chosen them, for they were the smallest of people, except that He loved the fathers, and He loved Israel.

1) Not entirely is it a case of God's love for an individual when His choice of David is referred to, for David represents more than a person. For God's choice of David, as King of His chosen people, see Ps.18:43, 50; 78:70 f., 89:3 f. Also I Chron. 28:4-6. 'Howbeit Jahweh, the God of Israel, chose me out of all the house of my father to be king over Israel for ever . . . . He took pleasure in me to make me king over all Israel . . . . And He said unto me, Solomon, my son, he shall build my house and my courts; for I have chosen him to be my son, and I will be his father.'
Closely bound up with the belief in Israel, the chosen nation, is the belief in a covenant which Jahweh made with the nation.

There are two quite distinct views upon the place of the covenant in Old Testament religion. The one is upheld by Kraetschmar in *Die Bindesvorstellung des Alten Testaments*. This view contends that the covenant idea as the religious bond between Jahweh and Israel was a late conception. The other view maintained outstandingly by Eichrodt in his Old Testament theology, maintains that Old Testament religion was a Bund religion from the start. Let us consider these two views briefly.

Wellhausen and Stade noticed that, according to the Wellhausen chronology of O.T. literature, the covenant first appeared among the prophets, shortly before the exile. Kraetschmar, also accepting the Wellhausen chronology, asserts that the 8th century pre-prophetic period of Israel's religion consisted of a natural relationship between God and people. This relationship consisted of nothing more than thanking the Giver for the fruits of the soil. It had no moral content (p. 97 f) As for the 8th century prophets, they were in no wise dependent upon a moral covenant relationship for their message (p. 122) After them the E Decalogue was united with the story of the covenant. Then came the Deuteronomist who took over the vital warm belief in a loving and holy God from Hosea and Isaiah and added to it a God who kept covenant; God's hesed was not enough to assure 7th century Israel that Jahweh would hold off His punishment.

1) p. 145 He overlooks the fact that hesed is a covenant term.
This view, however, of late has been challenged, for it rests on what is now widely believed to be a false foundation, i.e. the position of the prophets as the unique personalities who introduced ethical monotheism. The view which has superceded it, which, in the main, believes that the prophets were recalling the people to something which they already knew, is supported by the work of Max Weber and E. Troeltsch, who approach the question from the Sociological and Philosophical viewpoint.

Accordingly, Eichrodt makes the covenant the point of departure for his entire theology of the Old Testament. He denies the thesis of Stade and Kraetzschmar that the covenant conception as the basis of the ethical relationship between Jahweh and Israel was introduced after the 8th century prophets (by Jeremiah according to Stade) and asserts in its place that the covenant was the foundation of Israel's religion from Moses on. He finds witness for it not only in such passages as Ex.24:9-11; J 1 (the story of the (covenant) meal on Mount); Ex.24:3-8 E (where Moses sprinkles the blood on the people; and Ex.34:10,27 J 2 (Jahweh promises marvels to the people with whom He makes a covenant and prescribes certain words for Moses to write - Sellin ascribes this section to the Judges period), but also in the entire course of early Israelite history with its Verankerung of religious solidarity in the Sinai tradition. "And

2) See especially p.6 ff.
"when in the period following Moses, the relationship with God, even where the covenant is not spoken of is thought of as a relationship of grace, grounded upon a deed in history, kept according to specific stipulations, guarded by a powerful divine Helper, there are found evident the spiritual foundations for a covenant relationship." Kraetschmar is objected to also on the ground that a covenant in which the partners are on unequal levels does not exclude the mutuality of the relationship. The fact that Jahweh had obligated Himself does not mean that man's behaviour is outside the question (p.6 f). Jahweh and Israel were in a covenant relationship, and such a relationship entails both rights and obligations on the part of both members. Yet, granted that Jahwism was a covenant religion from its earliest period, we must realize that a covenant was not necessarily, nor usually, a detached, objective means of carrying on business and obtaining one's desires.

Lofthouse adds to our understanding of the covenant relationship by pointing out that we of to-day live in a world of contract, and not of status. "With us the cash nexus is supreme. . . . But the Hebrews like most of the ancients, lived in a world of covenant, not of contract . . . they did not understand the idea of contract at all. Every bargain was to them a matter of covenant, of personal relations; and though its fulfilment did not necessarily involve kindness or mercy . . it did involve a sense of personal attachment (based, if no nothing else, on self-respect)

1) For similar belief in the fact that the covenant came from the Normadic period of Israel's life, perhaps from Moses himself, see Quell, Th. W.z M.I.II. 2 p.121, 126; Sellin, Geschichte 1:2 p.82 ff; Kohlen, p.43.
which might, and often did, pass into warm affection. Again, to
the formation of such a covenant, there might go all sorts of
motives . . . from the give and take which was looked to for the
seduring of some personal advantage, to pure friendship and affection." It is difficult, almost impossible in fact, for us to-day
to project ourselves into such a world where, according to Pedersen
(Israel p.298) "to live is to live in covenants." "All life is
common life, and so peace, and covenant are really denominators of
life itself. One is born of a covenant and into a covenant, and
wherever one moves in life, one makes a covenant or acts on the
basis of the already existing covenant. If everything that comes
under the term covenant were dissolved, existence, would fall to
pieces because no soul can live an isolated life.

"The covenant is not a thing to be dealt with as one
pleases. It goes deeper than everything else, because it is the
presupposition of all life!"

"The covenant is the creator of all rights and duties.
Therefore it is identical with right and duty; even of the least
privilege or the least duty the Israelite can say that it is the
covenant, for the covenant is present in it. The basis of all
Israelitic ethos is the common feeling, love, and according to the
nature of the compact it must, in its innermost essence, be a family
feeling.

"The old law of love finds its direct expression in a

2) Ibid p.308.
3) Ibid p.308.
single place when it is said: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself (Lev. 19:18) In this claim the Israelite expresses his idea of the mutual relation of mankind. The life which the individual holds is not private property, but something common, which he shares with others, first and foremost the family, and then the others with whom he has a covenant . . . "To "speak peace" with one another and to "speak love" are two manners of expressing the maintenance of the common covenant; it is practised by those who "know" each other because knowing indicates a thorough, mutual feeling." (p. 309).

To recognize the deep love content that was possible in a covenant, one must only remember that marriage was always thought of as a covenant. "Jahweh hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth . . . the wife of thy covenant (Mal. 2:14) The dangerous strange woman forsakes her husband, "and forgetteth the covenant of her God." (Prov. 2:17) And David and Jonathan find it almost instinctive to express their love in a covenant (I. Sam. 18:3) Love is the cause of the covenant. Thus can we understand when it is said that the substance of the covenant is to benefit one another.

An interesting feature of the covenant relationship (which in itself shows how far it is from the equality presupposed in a business transaction) is the frequency with which a covenant is established between unequals. For instance, political covenants such as those Israel would make with Assyria or Egypt would

1) Pedersen p. 304 Cf. 286
We admittedly between a strong power and a weak power. But since covenants presuppose a singleness of will and aim, the stronger power gave its character to the union. But the weaker power enjoyed the strength of the stronger.

It has been necessary to study the nature of the covenant in order to make clear just what the covenant with God meant to the Israelite. Only by considering this material is it at all understandable to us how the Israelite could reconcile a Creator-God, or at least a God of all nature and a God who would enter into an agreement just as mortals do. Their mind thought in terms of covenant, so that, where any relationship occurred, that relationship, if not a hostile one, was a covenant relationship.

Israel's covenant with God was never thought of as with an equal. God, in His grace, gave the covenant, just as a strong power might to a lesser one. Israel thus could enjoy Jahweh's strength and protection. But Israel, the weaker power, must take on the character of Jahweh in order that the relationship might be one of peace. And Jahweh happened to be an ethical God.

But we can also understand how a love relationship would come to be expressed in the form of a covenant, since human love relationships were so expressed. The covenant was a guarantee for its endurance. But even when based upon such a vital force as love, certain stipulations were not necessarily excluded. A wife must remain faithful to her husband. Even though Jonathan had just promised David anything which his soul might desire, yet David

1) Pedersen 286, 293.
could ask Jonathan for a certain favour on the ground that they had
made a covenant (I.Sam.20:4,8)

So is it with Israel's covenant. Even though Jahweh made
certain demands on Israel, that is not to say that Israel's religion
was only a legalism of many rules of conduct. Nor can it be said
that the legal side of Israel's religion was to be distinguished
from its vital "religious" side. All the departments were bound up
in one comprehensive whole. Jahweh had chosen Israel in love, had
given a covenant as a token of this love, and had given Israel cer-
tain rules to follow. Jahweh, on the ground of the covenant re-
lationship could expect the rules to be obeyed. Only by fulfilling
its obligations could Israel properly be called a covenant partner.
Likewise only by doing such could a living relationship be sustained
between God and people. And only by protecting His people could
Jahweh keep the covenant relationship; that was His duty as a
partner.

As with the choosing, there are more than one covenant
tradition. We shall divide these into two sections: the first,
dealing with the covenant tradition before Moses, and second, the
covenant which Moses received.

Of the first section, the first covenant spoken of is
that with Noah, Gen.6:18 f, in which God promises to protect him and
his family. "But I will establish my covenant with thee; and thou
shalt come into the ark, thou, and thy sons, and thy wife, and thy
sons' wives with thee." This covenant is thus not with the family

1) Passing by Vischen's broad interpretation of the bereth whereby he
sees the first covenant with Cain. Christusseugnis, p.93
of Noah only, but is actually with the entire race of mankind, for Noah's family is to repeople the entire earth. The covenant after the flood is specifically not only with man but with every living creature. (Gen.9:17 P) "And God said unto Noah, this (the rainbow) is the token of the covenant which I have established between me and all flesh that is upon the earth". Both of these covenants are presented as gifts to mankind; there is no earning them. True, Noah was an obedient and trustful man, "He was a righteous man and perfect in his generation" (Gen.6:9 P) But the covenant was really with mankind to follow, not with Noah. Besides this, Noah was not perfect according to the J account (Gen.9:21).

The next covenant is not between God and mankind, but only with Abraham for his own people. After Abraham completes the necessary ritual, Jahweh gives him this promise, "In that day Jahweh made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land." (Gn.15:18 JE) The covenant included also the great multiplication of his descendants (Gn.17:2 P) The priestly account of the covenant with Abraham is given fully in Gn.17. Circumcision is to be the token of this covenant and the chief feature, aside from the gifts of progeny and land, is the statement that "I will be their God" (Gn.17:8) Once more the covenant is given by God, in order that He can give land and a host of descendants. Both of these provinces are only within the power of God to give. As

1) 18 19-21 are a later insertion.
Creator of the world Jahweh only can parcel out lands, and Jahweh is throughout looked upon as instrumental in the mystery of birth.

The covenant had for both sides privileges and duties. God was to keep His promises as well as receive the honour and worship of Abraham and his followers. Abraham and his descendants were to be circumcised in order to receive God's gifts. Abraham was obedient and trusting; he had no doubt that Jahweh would keep His part of the covenant. Hence he can send his servant away in absolute confidence that Jahweh, the God of heaven, who took him from his father's house and from the land of his nativity and who told him that he would give the land to his seed, will send an angel and somehow find a wife for Isaac (Gn. 24:7 JB) Why Jahweh should have chosen him for a covenant relationship Abraham does not ask. He merely accepts. But his obligations in the covenant were so small compared to the great benefits which he received that he must have thought on Jahweh only as a giving and kindly God.

But apparently, though not formally breaking the covenant, Jahweh could momentarily forget it. So we can infer from the sufferings of His people in Egypt. If He had been mindful of it constantly, their cries of distress would never have taken place. But once reminded of His covenant with Abraham, He immediately comes to the rescue. (Ex.2:24-5 P, 3:7-9 J) Jahweh is thought of as one who merely need by reminded in order to bring about goodness. But, though Jahweh forget the compact, He is never so far away that He cannot be reached. The groanings of the children of Israel remind
Him of the covenant; He must be near (Ex. 6:5) But it was not the covenants with Noah and Abraham which struck the most familiar chord in the hearts of Israel, but rather that covenant which Jahweh gave to the people through Moses at Sinai. The former might be more or less legendary in character but the latter was the kernel of their religion. It was to unite the people politically and religiously through the years to come. It not only gave them a superior ethical religion; it gave them certainty of that religion. God Himself had appeared to their leaders. It was a happening in their own national history. It was something tangible, something which gave them superiority over their foes before they even joined battle.

The exact account of God's making the covenant in which Moses represents the people is impossible to extract. The various layers and glosses in both Exodus and Deuteronomy make a continuous narrative at best a mere speculation. But we do know this: That God made a bond with His people at the time of the exodus and that from that time on they considered themselves a people in a special relationship to their God.

No matter what the content of the exodus covenant, there was a new emphasis on Israel fulfilling its part afterwards. Jahweh orders Moses to tell the people. "Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bore you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now, therefore, if ye will obey My voice indeed, and keep My covenant, then ye shall be mine own possession from among all peoples: for all the earth is mine." (Ex. 19:4-5) Here is
also a more spiritual effect of the covenant. Instead of a fruiteful land and an innumerable progeny, the people are to be distinguished from other people by their relations to God. They are to be His very own possession. Immediately this concept paves the way for the belief in God's love for them. And whereas the Abrahamic covenant merely provided them with a fine land, (and a Creator-God gives each nation its land) here we learn that it is part of the covenant that Jahweh is to drive out the other peoples - the Amorites, the Canaanites, the Hittite, the Perizzite, the Hivite, and the Jebusite. (Ex.34:10 fJ) God is in a relationship with Israel now to the exclusion of other peoples. They are not merely one of the nations to whom He is gracious; they are His own, for whom He sacrifices other nations.

In Deuteronomy God's love and His covenant with Israel are expressly bound up. The patriarchal tradition and the exodus one are confused. There is no attempt to keep the two stories separate; for the Deuteronomist it is all part of the same great truth - Jahweh's covenant relation to Israel. Having loved the fathers, Jahweh made a compact with them to give their descendants a fine land. The people are now to march in and take it. (Dt.1:2 f) Jahweh is always acting upon the compact with the fathers whom He loved. (Dt.4:31; 6:18, 7:8; 8:18; 9:5) But it must be remembered that this compact is not some part of the dead past. It is not a promise which Jahweh keeps for His own honour's sake, and then can thrust the people aside. Jahweh made not this covenant with our
fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day. (Ex. 5:3) The covenant is a lasting condition. Nor is the love something which God felt only to the fathers. Jehovah loveth you. (Dt.7:8) Both the love and the compact are going on in the present. And they will again in the future if the people will only keep His ordinances. Jehovah will love thee and bless thee and multiply thee, i.e. He will keep with thee the covenant. (Dt.7:12 f) But the ordinances given to Israel to follow are but part of their covenant duties. Jehovah, thy God, He is God, the faithful God, who keepeth covenant and hewed with them that love Him and keep His commandments (Dt.7:9) Thus, according to Deuteronomy, the covenant is not a cold, legalistic formal law laid by Jehovah upon the people. It is a bond drawn up and kept in love. Both parties of the covenant are to keep it - in love.

From this point on, the story of the covenant is concerned with the fidelity of one of the parties and the utter abandon and forgetfulness of the other. Yet it is really in this part - which runs the length of Israel's recorded history - that God's love is most evident. Jehovah promised to love the people so long as they obeyed Him and kept the covenant. But Israel disobeyed while they were still in the wilderness. Therefore Jehovah would be justified in breaking the bond also, since it was no longer a "bond". Yet Jehovah continued keeping the covenant, utterly irrationally. He fed the people in the desert when they were hungry. He led them safely out of the desert, into the promised land. "Jahweh gave unto Israel all the land which He sware to give unto their fathers;
and they possessed it and dwelt therein. And Jahweh gave them rest round about, according to all that He swore unto their fathers: and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them; . . . There failed not ought of any good thing which Jahweh had spoken unto the house of Israel; all came to pass. (Josh.21:43-45) It is precisely in Jahweh's maintaining the covenant relationship that His love is shown. The covenant rests upon the solid rock of His love; not vice versa. For if the covenant only were the basis of the Jahweh-Israel relationship, then that relationship would have been severed before Israel left the wilderness.

1 Quell sees the conception of Jahweh's love impaired in Deuteronomy. The experience of the prophets becomes a dogma and therefore loses much of its vital force. Quell thinks that the apocalyptic purpose of Deuteronomy is responsible for this change. God's love is stated for a purpose; to exhort men to love Him and follow His commandments. The covenant is thus the principal message of Deuteronomy. God's love for the fathers is weakened by the thought of Jahweh's oath to the fathers.

However, Deuteronomy is not different from the prophets in this respect, but continuing in the direct line of their tradition. The prophets did not dogmatize, to be sure, but they did preach. Preaching was the purpose of their lives. Their own experience of God's love would prove nothing. They must convince

1) Quell Th.W.z N.T I.1 p.33)
the people. Their message was also that the people should love Jahweh, should know Him, should obey His commandments.

The thought of God's love is just as irrational in Deuteronomy as it is in any of the prophets. Quell admits that there are places in Dt. where the message of God's love is free from the shackles of the law and therefore more appropriate, such as 10:14 ff.

"Behold, unto Jahweh thy God belongeth heaven and the heaven of heavens, the earth, with all that is therein. Only Jahweh had a delight in thy fathers to love them, and He chose their seed after them, even you above all peoples, as it is this day. Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart, and be no more stiff-necked. (Dt.10:14-16).

But Quell thinks this is the extraordinary case in Deutero­nomy. Elsewhere he sees God's love coming as a reward for Israel's keeping of the commandments (Dt.7:12 f) And so it seems on the surface. However, if we consider this passage of the framework as written any time after Moses, or at least after Samuel and Elijah, when the consciousness of sin and apostacy had awakened, then it definitely shows one thing and that is, that God's love is always there for those who will turn and accept it. And is this not the prophetic message in substance? The shackles of legalism virtually contain the message of grace.

Thus we see in the covenant the condescension of God to bind Himself to the people whom He loves. But also He lays upon
these people certain regulations and ordinances which they are to
observe as their part of the covenant. In this duty they fail.
Yet God, in His loving nature, does not forsake them. "Thus one
is conscious from the beginning that Jehovah is not the stern credi
tor who collected His covenant's due with a strong hand, but that
He swore the title of "Slow-to-Anger" with the same right as that
of "Jealous God". (Ex.34:6,14)" "It was given to Israel to
experience in the same Unmittelbarkeit both God's grace and His
requisitions."

1) Bichrodt p.25.
CONCLUSION.

In summing up this thesis we reach the following conclusions:

1. Jahweh was regarded as a God of love. It was His nature to love.

2. His love had the people Israel as its object to the exclusion of other nations.

3. God's love was most like that of a human husband or father. Yet Israel never considered itself related naturally to Jahweh. Jahweh had chosen Israel.

4. The people in no way deserved or earned His love. It was a gift of grace.

5. The love found its expression in the covenant. The covenant from its beginnings had ethical stipulations which Israel failed to observe. Therefore God must be the judging one. Yet, although Israel had broken the covenant, God in His love forgave and "kept the covenant".

6. God's love forms the meaning behind Israel's history. Its national history symbolises in space and time the theological truth that God first loves man and seeks to awaken in him a corresponding love. The tragedy of the Old Testament history is that Israel's love was never awakened. But through that tragedy comes the glory. God, having failed to awaken a love in Israel by gifts, covenant and discipline, knows that He must give His Son.
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