
A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

possible combinations of these ideas stands another view, that the leaven may mean the members of the Kingdom themselves who, by contact with outsiders gradually permeate and change the social structure.

The variety of these suggestions raises at once a general question. Is it ever the purpose of a parable to be vaguely yet fruitfully suggestive? Is the way in which these readings can be made to shade into one another an argument against insisting on too rigorous a canon of interpretation? Or is there here just a challenge to decide sharply and clearly which reading is correct? It is to be noticed, however, that one point is common ground on every view. The operation of leaven is familiar, gradual, inevitable; mysterious indeed, but entirely reliable, to use the very word Bultmann repudiates, 'at man's disposal, at every woman's disposal every day.' Is not this therefore the real intention of the parable? The one point driven home in every exposition is that the Kingdom has an aspect which is illustrated by the quiet, ordinary, irresistible phenomenon of growth. Any preacher or teacher or hearer or witness may be patient and unafraid. For 'the kingdom of heaven is like leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal till the whole was leavened.'

In the parable of 'the blade, the ear, and the full corn in the ear' also, it seems strangely perverse to ignore the careful emphasis upon the slowness and naturalness of what happens. The man who has cast the seed sleeps, and what occurs while he sleeps is not a miracle, however mysterious, but something confidently to be expected: nor is it in any way a sign of God's special intervention; it is part of a stable order of Nature, 'the earth beareth fruit of herself.' If the Kingdom of God is like this, it is because it, too, takes quiet root and finds in men a soil suited to its growth.

The conclusion to be drawn in these parables and in many other places—in the parable of the barren fig-tree spared and nourished—in the study of the experience of the prodigal son—in the allegory of the vine and the branches—in the story of the pound that made ten—in the saying that 'the Kingdom of God is within you'—in the pleading note that sounds in the words, 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden . . . learn of me,' is that Jesus observed curiously the fact of growth, and used the idea in His teaching. This conclusion seems to-day to require a defence that relies not on a still more forceful or ingenious exegesis, but on the operation of that human faculty of reason or common sense to which Jesus Himself hopefully appealed when He turned from the dialecticians of His day, and exclaimed to the crowd that had begun to lose interest, 'Hear me, all of you, and understand.'

Some Outstanding Old Testament Problems.

VII. The Early Post-Exilic Community.

By the Reverend Prebendary W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D., Litt.D., University of London.

II.

We have dealt, so far, with the evidence offered in our sources regarding the history of the early post-exilic community; and we have seen that the *data* are in part both ambiguous and contradictory. The reconstruction of the history of the period is, therefore, difficult; and this difficulty is enhanced by the variety of attempts which have been made at reconstruction. For the present we shall leave this part of our subject in order to examine the religious problem which confronts us. The nature of this second problem will be grasped in the light of the following observations.

It is necessary that we should examine in some detail certain aspects of the teaching of Deutero-Isaiah (Is 40–55), given towards the close of the exilic period. That in the teaching of this prophet the religion of Israel reached its zenith is universally recognized.

We begin by drawing attention to three subjects prominent in the teaching of this prophet, and it is indispensable that they should be illustrated by a certain number of quotations.

The first is *the doctrine of God*; the monotheistic teaching of Deutero-Isaiah is so well known that just one or two of the many passages in which this teaching is contained will suffice; but the need of laying emphasis on this part of his teaching in the present connexion will be seen in a moment. In Is 43^{10} it is said: 'Before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. I, even I, am Yahweh; and beside me there is no saviour'; again, in $45^{5-7.\ 18}$ it is taught: 'I am Yahweh, and there is none else; beside me there is no God. . . . that they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none beside me; I am Yahweh, and there is none else. I form the light, and create darkness; I give prosperity, and bring calamity;[1] I am Yahweh, that doeth all these things. . . . For thus saith Yahweh that created the heavens—he is God—that formed the earth and made it; he established it, he created it not (for) a waste, he formed it to be inhabited; I am Yahweh; and there is none else.' From this last verse it follows that all the inhabitants of the earth are to acknowledge the One God, and worship Him; so that the prophet contemplates the salvation of all mankind. It is, thus, secondly, his monotheistic doctrine that necessitates his teaching of *universalism*: 'Look unto me, and be saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else. By myself have I sworn, righteousness is gone forth from my mouth, my word shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Only in Yahweh, shall one say, have I righteousness and strength; even to him shall men come . . .' (45^{22-24}). But, and this is the third point, the salvation of the Gentiles is to be brought about, under God, by Israel: 'Behold, thou shalt call a nation that thou knowest not, and a nation that knew thee not shall run unto thee, because of Yahweh thy God, and for the Holy One of Israel; for he hath glorified thee' (55^{5}). Most pointedly, however, is this brought out in the 'Servant Songs' (whether these belong to Deutero-Isaiah or not is immaterial from the present point of view, they echo his teaching); thus, in the first song it is said: 'I, Yahweh, have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles' (42^{6});[2] similarly, in the second song: 'It is too light a thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel; I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth' (49^{6}); and, once more, in the fourth song: 'And the nations shall be agitated[3] because of him; kings shall shut their mouths; for that which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they consider' (52^{15}). Whether by the 'Servant' we understand an individual or the nation symbolized, is again immaterial in the present connexion; the probability is that he was conceived of at one time as the former, at another as the latter; in either case he, or it, is the means of the salvation of the Gentiles, and that is our present concern.

Here we have, then, uttered by the greatest of Israel's teachers, the sublime doctrine of the unity of God, the assurance of His love for all mankind, and the glorious message that Israel was to be the instrument for bringing all nations to the knowledge of Him who was their heavenly Father and Saviour. What was here proclaimed was nothing less than the ideal of Judaism as a world-religion. On the eve of their setting forth on their journey to the land of their fathers the exiles hear the message of the grand destiny reserved for them.

Let us now turn to the religious teachers of the post-exilic period, and see how they were affected by the thoughts and words of this prince of prophets. It is necessary to determine first in which books this teaching is to be found; unfortunately, there is not unanimity on this matter among scholars; so far as the books of Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, Ezra, and Nehemiah are concerned there is agreement; but there are some others in regard to which there are differences of opinion. Many authorities will, however, agree that some passages in Trito-Isaiah (Is 56–66),[4] and the books of Malachi and Ruth, belong to the period under consideration. Space forbids our giving reasons for assigning these to the period between 516–444 B.C., but it may be claimed that there is a good deal of justification for this view.[5] In one particular, and that the most important, all these writings reflect the teaching of Deutero-Isaiah: the doctrine of the unity of God is taken for granted; from his time onwards an absolute monotheism never ceased to be the

[1] The R.V. rendering: 'I make peace, and create evil,' is not the meaning of the Hebrew.

[2] Some scholars do not regard this verse as part of the song, which, they hold, is comprised in vv.$^{1-4}$.

[3] Following Duhm's emendation.

[4] The passages in question are: 56^{1-8} (56^{9}–57^{13} uncertain), 58. 59^{15-21} 63^{7}–64^{8} 65. 66.

[5] See Oesterley and Robinson, *A History of Israel*, ii. 104–108, and *An Introduction to the Books of the O.T.*, 84.

cardinal doctrine of Judaism. The teaching of earlier prophets had tended towards this, and the prophetical (in its original form) Book of Deuteronomy came near to it (Dt 6^4, but, on the other hand, see, *e.g.*, 10^{17}); a pure monotheism was taught for the first time by Deutero-Isaiah. On this point, therefore, all the post-exilic teachers are at one with him. When we turn, however, to their attitude towards the Gentiles it is very rarely that Deutero-Isaiah's teaching finds expression; Zechariah, it is true, says: 'And many nations shall join themselves to Yahweh in that day, and shall be my people' (2^{11}, and see also 8^{20-23}); in one or two passages in Malachi one may perhaps discern a similar spirit ($1^{6.\ 11.\ 14}$); further, in the sections of Trito-Isaiah belonging to this period there are a few passages of a universalistic character (56^7 65^1 66^{23}). These are the only utterances in the post-exilic literature of the fifth century B.C. which re-echo Deutero-Isaiah's universalistic ideals;[1] elsewhere it is always an exclusive, nationalistic spirit that finds expression (*e.g.* Hag $2^{6.\ 21.\ 22}$, Zec $1^{15.\ 20.\ 21}$ $5^{10.\ 11}$, and throughout Ezr., Neh.). As to the thought of Israel being the instrument of God for the salvation of the Gentiles, there is but one passage, and that is a little uncertain (Is 66^{19}),[2] which contemplates such a thing.

It is not to be denied, therefore, that Deutero-Isaiah's ideal of Judaism becoming a world-religion through the instrumentality of the Jewish nation found but little favour among the teachers of the post-exilic community. To their specific teaching, and to their attitude towards the Gentiles, we shall come presently; it will be profitable to show, first, that in spite of official discountenance, the ideals of Deutero-Isaiah lived on among the more enlightened, few though they may have been, of the Jewish people.

It is in writings belonging to the fourth century and later that passages occur which testify to the continued existence of the universalistic outlook of Deutero-Isaiah. Foremost among these is the Book of Jonah. It need hardly be pointed out that the writer of this book represents a small party among the Jewish community of the late Persian period—perhaps even the early part of the Greek period—which dared to withstand the narrow particularism of the dominant leaders; in opposition to the belief that the Jews, as the elect people of God, were alone the recipients of the marks of divine favour, and that therefore all other nations were outside the pale of God's mercy and love, this writer teaches both that the Gentiles were objects of divine solicitude, and that the Jewish nation was to be the means of bringing them to the knowledge of God. Forced, against his will, the prophet in this beautiful symbolical narrative becomes the nation's missionary to the most hated of the Gentiles; and the book concludes with the words, put into the mouth of the Almighty: 'Should not I have pity on Nineveh, that great city; wherein are more than sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and also much cattle?' This universalistic note is also struck in a number of the later psalms. Perhaps most notable among these is Ps 87, where the city of God is pictorially represented as the birthplace of the Gentiles; the text is somewhat out of order; emended, vv.$^{3-7}$ may be thus rendered:

Glorious things are told of thee, O city of God,
Yahweh writeth in the record of the peoples,
'This one was born there';

I reckon Rahab and Babylon among those that know me,
Behold, (also) the Philistines, and Tyre, and Cush:
'This one was born there.'

To Zion it shall be said, each one was born in her,
The singers and dancers all respond,
'This one was born there.'

In Ps $102^{15(16)}$, again, it is said:

So the nations shall fear the name of Yahweh,
And all the kings of the earth thy glory.

In more than a dozen other passages in the Psalms similar universalistic thoughts are expressed; but further quotations are unnecessary. It is abundantly clear that, though repudiated by those in authority, the ideal of Judaism as a world-religion was held by some of the most God-fearing and spiritual among the Jews during the period indicated.[3]

It is also of great significance that in many passages in the apocalyptic literature a universalistic spirit is in evidence; this literature, belonging to *circa* 200 B.C. onwards, was looked upon with disfavour by the orthodox Jewish authorities. It would, however, take us too far afield to deal with the Apocalyptic books.

[1] See, *e.g.*, Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia* (1914), 456.

[2] The Book of *Ruth* opposes, in all probability, the nationalistic action of Nehemiah and Ezra in the matter of mixed marriages, and should also be mentioned here.

[3] To this period belongs also the remarkably universalistic passage—Zec 9^{1-10}.

We must now turn to the other side of this question, and take note of the attitude towards non-Jews of the religious leaders during the post-exilic period.

Of Joshua and Zerubbabel there is but little to say; we have the indirect indication that, inasmuch as they are mentioned in conjunction with Haggai in the matter of the rebuilding of the Temple, they welcomed the co-operation of the people of the land; this would point to a friendly feeling towards those who were not of the captivity;[1] these were Jews, it is true; but Joshua and Zerubbabel showed a more tolerant attitude in this than Nehemiah and Ezra, and in so far they were nearer to the spirit of Deutero-Isaiah. What their attitude would have been towards the Gentiles cannot be said; for them the question had not arisen.

There are two passages in the Book of Haggai, prompted by the disorders within the Persian empire, in which the prophet proclaims the near advent of the Messianic era; in these his attitude towards the Gentiles is made clear; the first is 2^{6-9}: 'Thus saith Yahweh Zebaoth, It is but a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; and I will shake all nations, and the desirable things of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory . . .'; in this passage the prophet proclaims the destruction of heaven and earth preparatory to the creation of a new heaven and earth in the Messianic time; the nations, too, are to be destroyed, and their wealth is to be used for the beautifying of the Temple. In the other passage, $2^{21.22}$, the destruction of the nations is more pointedly expressed: 'I will shake the heavens and the earth; and I will overthrow the throne of kingdoms, and I will destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the nations; and I will overthrow the chariots, and those that ride in them; and the horses and their riders shall come down, every one by the sword of his brother.' The vindictive feeling here expressed towards the Gentiles is in striking contrast to such words as: 'Look unto me, and be saved, all the ends of the earth.' That Haggai should show such bitterness towards the Gentiles so soon after the time of Deutero-Isaiah proves that the party of narrow nationalism was already in existence among the exiles in Babylonia; indeed, such a passage as Hag 2^{10-14} shows that Haggai belonged to the strict legalistic party among the exiles; that he had lived among them prior to his coming to Palestine may be regarded as certain.

In the case of Zechariah the spirit of Deutero-Isaiah seems to have been not wholly without effect; it is seen at work in two passages in his book; 2^{11} has been quoted above, the other, 8^{20-23}, is sufficiently striking to merit quotation: 'Thus saith Yahweh Zebaoth, there shall yet come peoples, and the inhabitants of great cities, and the inhabitants of one (city) shall go to another, saying, Let us go speedily to intreat the favour of Yahweh, and to seek Yahweh of hosts; I will go also. Yea, many peoples and strong nations shall come to seek Yahweh Zebaoth in Jerusalem, and to intreat the favour of Yahweh. Thus saith Yahweh Zebaoth: In those days ten men shall take hold, out of all the languages of the nations, shall even take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you.' This is an important passage as showing that even one who belonged to the orthodox legalistic party was at times impelled by his better nature to look beyond the confines of nationalistic exclusiveness and to recognize that the God of Israel was also the God of all His created beings, and that it was the zenith of Israel's glory to be the means of bringing them to Him. In this as in other directions Zechariah showed himself a greater teacher than Haggai. Nevertheless, upon the whole, and in spite of gleams of better things, Zechariah's attitude towards the Gentiles must be recognized as disappointing. In essence, what Haggai had proclaimed about the destruction of the Gentiles as a necessary preliminary to the advent of the Messianic time, is repeated by Zechariah in the first two of his night-visions (1^{7-17}, see especially v.[15]; and $^{18-21}$ [He 2^{1-4}]); in the latter it is said: '. . . these are come to fray them, to cast down the horns of the nations.' The spirit of bitterness is particularly manifested towards the land of the Exile, in spite of the fact that release had been proclaimed to all the exiles; this is seen in the night-vision wherein Wickedness personified is described as taking up her permanent abode in Shinar (*i.e.* Babylonia; cf. Is 11^{11}, Dn 1^{2}), the implication being that the land in which Wickedness resides is doomed to destruction (5^{5-11}). In the night-vision that follows (6^{1-8}) there is a similar implication in v.[8].

To deal with Nehemiah and Ezra is unnecessary; their attitude towards the Samaritans is well known (see, *e.g.*, Neh 2^{20} and the whole of 13, Ezr 6^{21}

[1] A very different account is given in Ezr 4^{1-5}; but of the unhistorical character of this passage there can be no doubt, see Oesterley and Robinson, *op. cit.*, ii. 88 f.

$9^{1.\ 2.\ 11.\ 14}$ 10^{10}); and if they felt this antipathy for those who were, after all, largely of the seed of Israel, the more would this be the case for the Gentiles in general. Their spirit of exclusiveness naturally made impossible any thought of their nation becoming the instrument of salvation to the Gentiles.

From what has been said it will be realized how profoundly critical that post-exilic period was, a period during which the tremendous alternative was being determined as to whether or not Judaism was to become a world-religion. Within that post-exilic community forces were at work which were to decide the destiny of the religion which alone at that time partook in any degree of a spiritual character. Alas, that the champions of Deutero-Isaiah's ideals lost the day—or seemed to; they continued, as we have seen, to bear witness through the ages; but the forces of a rigid exclusiveness were too strong. We do not forget that the world owed to Judaism a monotheistic belief and an ethical code far in advance of anything that mankind had known; that may never be forgotten. Yet it cannot be denied that in practice the religion centred in a narrow nationalistic outlook, a glorying in an arid legalistic system, and in a calculated contempt for all who did not bow to the Law.

Nevertheless, the essence of Deutero-Isaiah's ideals was too great, too sublime, to be permanently submerged. We cannot conclude without recalling how his teaching was accepted and developed by One even greater than he. When in the synagogue at Nazareth our Lord quoted the words from Is $61^{1.\ 2}$, and applied them to Himself. That He accepted their universalistic teaching is seen in what followed; He reminds His hearers of the Gentile widow woman of Zarephath to whom Elijah was sent; He reminds them of the cleansing of Naaman, a Gentile, by Elisha; and how engrained was the bitterness felt towards those who showed any sympathy for the Gentiles is painfully illustrated by the attempt to kill our Lord then and there, 'they led him unto the brow of the hill whereon their city was built, that they might throw him down headlong' (Lk 4^{16-30}). Very significant, too, were our Lord's words to those who sought from Him a sign from heaven: 'There shall no sign be given unto it, but the sign of Jonah' (Mt 16^{1-4}), the prophet who preached repentance to the Gentiles. We recall also our Lord's sympathy for the Gentile centurion (Mt 8^{5-13}, Lk 7^{2-10}), and His words: 'I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel'; His healing of the Syro-Phœnician woman's daughter (Mk 7^{26-30}); the parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk 10^{30-37}); His rebuke to the disciples for desiring vengeance on the Samaritan village which would not receive Him (Lk 9^{51-56}); His healing of the Samaritan leper (Lk 17^{15-19}); His striking words: 'Many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdon of heaven . . .' (Mt 8^{11}). These and many other things show our Lord's recognition of the teaching of Deutero-Isaiah. If not Judaism, then its transfigurated form was to be the world-religion; and, even so, it was true: 'Salvation is from the Jews' (Jn 4^{22}).

There are some other subjects in connexion with the post-exilic community which have not been touched upon, especially the Messianic expectation, on the one hand, and the Law, on the other; but space forbids our dealing with them here.

Literature.

BARTH'S MAGNUM OPUS.

Karl Barth has projected a great work. Its title is to be 'Church Dogmatics,' not 'Christian Dogmatics,' as at first announced. For he would emphasize his conviction that Dogmatics is not a 'free' science, but is bound to the sphere of the Church. The first volume appeared in 1927, but the second edition was soon called for; and in 1932 the first part of it appeared. And now it appears in an English translation under the title of the original, *The Doctrine of the Word of God* (T. & T. Clark; 18s. net). It consists of 'Prolegomena to Church Dogmatics,' and contains five hundred and seventy-five pages. The translator is the Rev. G. T. Thomson, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology at the University of Aberdeen.

The publishers are to be sincerely congratulated on their enterprise in undertaking the publication of this work in an English version; nor does it detract