

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

6-1-1952

A Survey of and Approach to the Problems of Old Testament Eschatology

Horace Hummel

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hummel, Horace, "A Survey of and Approach to the Problems of Old Testament Eschatology" (1952).
Master of Sacred Theology Thesis. 188.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/188>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

51737

A SURVEY OF AND APPROACH TO THE PROBLEMS
OF OLD TESTAMENT ESCHATOLOGY

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Old Testament Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

by

Horace D. Hummel

June 1952

Approved by:

Alfred von Rohr Sauer
Advisor

52863

Walter A. Roshke
Reader

51737

BV
4070
C69
M3
1952
no.3
c.2

51737

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter | Page |
|---|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION AND PROLEGOMENA: GENERAL APPROACHES FOLLOWED BY THIS THESIS | 1 |
| II. THE BASIC FORWARD LOOK OF THE OLD TESTAMENT -- ITS VOCABULARY OF HOPE | 18 |
| III. THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF OLD TESTAMENT ESCHATOLOGY | 32 |
| IV. THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF MESSIANISM | 58 |
| V. THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE PSALMS | 68 |
| VI. SPECIAL FEATURES OF OLD TESTAMENT ESCHATOLOGY. | 77 |
| VII. CONCLUSION AND EPILOGUE | 105 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 109 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND PROLEGOMENA:

GENERAL APPROACHES FOLLOWED BY THIS THESIS

An overview of the problems of Old Testament eschatology is exceedingly difficult to make. This is true, not only because of the large number of problems to be investigated and the special difficulties which each one poses, but also because "Old Testament Eschatology", taken as a unit, is quite a problem in its own right. In fact, the two component parts of this "problem", both the Old Testament and the doctrine of eschatology, have been among the most bitterly disputed and most divergently interpreted topics in the history of the Christian church. Nor is the end yet in sight. Obviously, however, even though one is aware of all the divergent interpretations and tenuous hypotheses on all sides of the questions, he must decide upon some unified and coherent approach to these larger issues before he can begin to investigate the various individual features.

That, in brief, is the task of this introductory chapter. It will be necessary for us to speak here in only the most general terms. To investigate all the problems of eschatology, its biblical basis, its variant interpretations, etc., would require volumes. Likewise, to evaluate all the interpretations of the Old Testament would demand the writing of another

"Theology of the Old Testament" and would involve us in all sorts of historical and hermeneutical labyrinths. Since neither of these investigations is the primary purpose of this thesis, we shall only state here where our sympathies and inclinations lie, without any comprehensive attempt to defend them or explicate them in detail.

We shall make mention here of only the major contestants still occupying the field. Tempting as it might be, we shall have little space for historical investigations, except as these have direct relevance for views that are still actively championed.¹

Regardless of how we define the term "eschatology", few would deny that the Old Testament contains a very definite and often quite explicit one. There is undeniably a forward look, a futurism, a "Zielstrebigkeit"² throughout the Old Testament. This is true of the historical and poetic books as well as of the prophetic ones. Thus Eichrodt writes on the opening

¹For a good, concise summary of the history of Old Testament interpretation, see: Otto Proksch, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1950), pp. 20-49. For a most complete study of the problem up to the middle of the nineteenth century with an exhaustive bibliography, see: Ludwig Diestel, Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der christlichen Kirche (Jena: Mauke's Verlag, 1869), 781 pp. A good and eminently readable study in English is: Frederick Farrar, History of Interpretation (London: Macmillan & Co., 1886), 553 pp.

²Ludwig Koehler; Theologie des Alten Testaments (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1947), p. 317.

page of his great Theologie:

Wer ihre geschichtliche Entfaltung ueberblickt, dem muss sich die Wahrnehmung aufdraengen, dass ein maechtig vorwaertsstrebender Zug durch sie hindurchgeht. Wohl gibt es auch Zeiten wo sie stationaer zu werden, sich zu einem starren System zu verfestigen scheint; aber immer wieder bricht ein vorwaertsdraengender Wille hervor, der sich nach einer hoeheren Lebensgestalt ausstreckt und dem Bisherigen den Charakter des Unfertigen aufpraegt.³

When we follow the New Testament's Messianic interpretation of the Old Testament, then much of the Old Testament is eschatological in a much narrower, but much more definite sense. Every religion, even the most materialistic, has a purposiveness to it, and in that sense it must also possess an eschatology. Just because, then, eschatology in this widest sense (which we cannot ignore) includes all of religion and is at the root of much of it, it will be obvious why this thesis will perforce be limited to only an "overview."

How we orient ourselves towards Old Testament eschatology will also determine a large portion of our Old Testament hermeneutic. However, only a brief glimpse at the panorama of church history will suffice to show that Christianity has never agreed basically upon an hermeneutics of the Old Testament. That statement still holds true when we extend our view back into the New Testament. Whatever view is taken of the hermeneutics which the New Testament applies to the Old, no one can deny

³Walther Eichrodt, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1950), I, p. 1.

that the various New Testament authors are not themselves altogether unified on the subject. While it is true that a sense of "fulfillment" ⁴ is present everywhere, this varies all the way from the *ἵνα πληρωθῆ* of Matthew to the typological interpretation of the author of Hebrews. In spite of this divergency in its earliest tradition, the church was still entirely unified in its acceptance of the Old Testament and recognition of its importance. Accordingly it was also unequivocal in its rejection of Marcion's heresy. Proksch notes appropriately in this connection:

Es ist ein Ruhm der christlichen Kirche, dass sie diese Verbannung des Alten Testaments aus der Heiligen Schrift verurteilt hat, obwohl sie mit seiner Anerkennung eine grosse und schwere theologische Aufgabe uebernahm, fuer die sie auch heute wieder zu kaempfen hat.⁵

Different actors play the roles in succeeding generations, but the drama always remains essentially the same. The church will not discard the Old Testament, but it is never quite sure just what to do with it. Even the fourfold type of exegesis common in the Middle Ages was not wide enough to suppress occasional expressions of discontent, and these become louder

⁴This writer is still waiting to see a first-class study of the use of *πληρῶ* in the New Testament, and a comparison of its use with such related concepts as *ἵνα κεφαλαιῶ*, *τελειῶ*, etc. Undoubtedly, the next Lieferung or two of Kittel's Theologische Woerterbuch will make its contribution to the study of this concept.

⁵Proksch, op. cit., p. 22.

and more insistent the closer we approach the Renaissance.

It is interesting to note in passing how often the church was on the wrong side of the fence. How often did it not condemn what we have come to regard as the correct hermeneutic of the Old Testament, even though at the same time it did support and maintain some correct, traditional doctrinal formulations. More than once those whom the Church banned as heretics were the most accurate and scientific exegetes of their time, while their "orthodox" opponents abounded in allegorical and spiritualistic misinterpretations of the Scriptures. One of the most glaring examples of this is the church's condemnation of the exegetical methods of Theodore of Mopsuestia together with the Nestorian heresy. (One can hardly refrain from speculating how different subsequent church history might have been if his hermeneutical principles had prevailed instead of Origen's, which dominated the scene even beyond the Reformation.)⁶ That it was the Jews alone who maintained any historical consciousness of the Old Testament throughout the Middle Ages, and that it was with their help and upon their labors that Nicholas of Lyra, Reuchlin, and others gradually laid the foundations for a historical-critical approach to the Old Testament, hardly needs repetition here.⁷ Finally, as far as the Reformation itself is concerned, it must be admitted that in general Calvin and the entire Reformed church after him

⁶Diestel, op. cit., pp. 129-35.

⁷Ibid., pp. 195-208.

pursued a much more historical and literal hermeneutic of the Old Testament than Luther and his heirs ever attained until comparatively recent times.⁸

The rise of "higher criticism" in the nineteenth century has only complicated this picture. It is this movement, ill-defined and polymorph as it is, to which every student of the Old Testament ultimately must address himself. It is particularly important that we do this in this thesis because the picture of Old Testament eschatology which higher criticism presents is far different from the traditional one. Further, the problems of Old Testament introduction and hermeneutics which it raises are anything but superficial.

Higher criticism is to a large extent only a culmination of a long struggle in the church to obtain a clear historical consciousness with regard to its revelation. For a variety of reasons, and many of them commendable, the ecclesiastical powers had always viewed these efforts with suspicion. For instance, the first attempts at the end of the Middle Ages to approach the Old Testament literally were condemned as "Judaistic", and Lutheran exegetes a few centuries later often hurled the same epithet at their Reformed brethren. It has often been pointed out that ecclesiastical orthodoxy has always found it much more difficult to take the human nature of Christ seriously than His divine nature (that is, has leaned

⁸ Ibid., pp. 230-307.

more to the Alexandrian than Antiochian Christology). Undoubtedly, the same thing could be asserted and demonstrated concerning orthodoxy's reluctance to take the history side of the history-revelation paradox seriously.

Paradoxes abound in every theology based on revelation and are always uncomfortable. These paradoxes are all inevitable. Whenever Creator and creature, mortal and immortal, finite and infinite, etc., meet, a situation is produced which can be expressed only in terms of the seemingly impossible. Such a paradox is inherent in the divine act of creation, is seen most clearly in the incarnation, but inevitably arises also wherever an attempt is made to repeat, record, or explain divine revelation. So Prof. North writes:

. . . in sacred history, salvation-history, the alleged "bare facts" are transfigured by faith until they can be almost unrecognizable. In the community experience of generations they become blended of time and eternity, of earth and heaven. That is the paradox of Judaism and Christianity: they are mediated through history, and yet at no point can we have a cinematographic reproduction of the history.⁹

Only faith can fully comprehend these paradoxes. However, Christians and theologians in particular are always tempted to resolve these paradoxes in one direction or another. (Nowhere is the radical antithesis between faith and reason more apparent than here!) One may attempt to resolve or explain away the paradox in favor of either its human or divine elements; but either attempt does equal injustice to the true nature of both

⁹C. R. North, "Pentateuchal Criticism", The Old Testament and Modern Study, edited by H. H. Rowley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), pp. 59-82.

revelation and faith, and both attempts bespeak an equal ignorance of the ways of God with man.

Those who do attempt to resolve these paradoxes never quite succeed in covering up their tracks. Others will always protest the inaccuracy and very often will punctuate their protest by championing the opposite extreme. The longer some external authority restrains the reaction, the more inevitable and more vengeful its coming. Action and reaction, extreme countered by extreme, thesis and antithesis--- church history as well as secular history is compounded of these elements. Undeniably, the official hermeneutic of the church has often been determined or influenced by current polemical issues, as it attempted to defend the truth. Similarly, much of historical criticism, despite its claims to objectivity and scientific accuracy, is also undeniably informed by a reaction against the ahistorical hermeneutic of preceding generations (although this movement is not to be separated from its role in the larger reactionary character of much of the Renaissance, the Enlightenment, and similar movements). Thus almost every heresy contains its own claim to correctness, because, despite its radicality, it is attempting to compensate for an abuse, an inadequacy, an overemphasis in the traditional formulations.

All of this is most pertinent to our consideration of the history-revelation paradox. Traditional Christianity, in an attempt to maintain something true, often overemphasized the latter side of the paradox; higher criticism, in an attempt to

express something which is also true, overemphasized the former. To us of a later generation, who can perhaps see the issues a bit more clearly, belongs the task of clearing away previous abuses and of stating, as clearly as we can, without reactions of our own, the paradox itself. We are as time-bound as our predecessors, and we dare not suppose that our formulations will not contain their own inadequacies and exaggerations. Each generation must restate the paradox in terms of its own exigencies, and pray that its statement will be more kerygmatic than polemic. Perfection of formulation will never be attained in time, because we are a part of the paradox, and the paradox will stand until its Author resolves it. Here we always "know in part and prophesy in part". Each theological formulation is only an implicit recognition of the paradox, that is, an articulate confession of sins and plea for forgiveness.

This means that as we explain the Old Testament we must be at pains to do full justice to both the history and revelation aspects of that paradox. Revelation we will not deny or minimize, but revelation took place in history. The historical fact of the incarnation demands that we take history seriously. Indeed, there were miracles, special inspirations by dreams or whatever means, theophanies, and the like; so the Scriptures state explicitly, and we do not wish to deny it. However, we believe that most of the revelation is an integral and inseparable part of the historical process.

In other words, it is an object of historical as well as of theological investigation. The historian does not--cannot consider it primarily as revelation, but that neither makes him an infidel nor invalidates his conclusions. Accordingly, we can properly search out the apparent sources of a revelation without denying its ultimate origin in divine inspiration. Likewise, we can note parallels with contemporary historico-religious developments (Babylonia, Ugarit, etc.), trace the stages of the development of a theological concept, etc. Without denying revelation we can agree with Rowley:

This rather concerns itself with those elements in Israel's own religion which were incipient from the beginning and which became clearer and richer in the course of her story, and which gathered to themselves elements of older or even alien origin which could be related to her faith and made the vehicle of its expression, but which also gradually eliminated other elements of her ancient inheritance as well as resisted other alien elements because they were inconsistent with its own genius.¹⁰

To assert theological development in and through history is not to deny revelation, but to exemplify it. This is not to make the study of the Old Testament primarily that of comparative religions or to deny its essential importance for the New Testament revelation. Nor is it to assert that the "religionsgeschichtliche" school has not gone to extremes of its own or that its investigations exhaust the subject and leave nothing additional for faith to add.

¹⁰H. H. Rowley in Ibid., p. xxiii.

However, it is a far different thing to assert this in the abstract than to depict it concretely in some historical time-table, as the Graf-Wellhausen school has classically done with the Old Testament. The sources are far too few and too obscure to permit of such attempts at accurate dating, at least at the present time. The recent researches of Swedish scholars such as Pederson, Engnell,¹¹ plus numerous other individual protests, have indicated the arbitrariness of many of the critical school's presuppositions. Higher criticism had rapidly developed an intolerant "orthodoxy" of its own¹², although it exhibited far less unity of detail than the church's orthodoxy ever had. Undeniably, "historical criticism" was compounded of about three parts criticism and one part history. The church's hermeneutic sorely needed a reemphasis on history, but unfortunately this task was left largely to a group of men who had few sympathies with the church at all and hence often threw out the baby with the bath. Its historical orientation was Hegelian, if not Darwinian; and its bland assumption that evolution was always forward and upward (an implicit statement of its superiority over all preceding generations) contained much more of humanistic pride than of religious humility.

¹¹For a handy overview of the present state of pentateuchal criticism, with particular consideration being given to the Uppsala School, see C. R. North, op. cit., pp. 59-82.

¹²Cf. the use of the phrase, "critical orthodoxy" in G. W. Anderson's essay on "Hebrew Religion" in the same collection of essays, pp. 283-309.

Accordingly, while we emphatically disapprove of the naturalistic and negative expression of much modern criticism, we are forced to agree with some of its objectives and methodology. Regardless of to what extent one agrees or disagrees with any specific critical method now commonly employed, one who writes a paper of this sort is simply forced to make use of some of its terminology and even methodology, if his work is to possess any relevance at all. Thus in the chapters following, we shall often use terms as "Deuteroisaiah", "Thronbesteigungspsalmen", etc., without committing ourselves at all on their ultimate validity.

Our approach to Old Testament eschatology in this thesis, accordingly, is primarily a historical one. We shall attempt to honestly reproduce what the Old Testament itself says about eschatology, and we shall attempt to allow it to speak for itself, as we should in the case of any other literary document.

By this approach, however, we do not mean to indicate that the subject is thereby exhausted. It is a basic tenet of the Christian faith that everything in the Old Testament is incomplete, and can be understood fully only in the light of the Complete, that is, God's final revelation of Himself and His will in Jesus Christ. The truth of this theological fact we do not wish to minimize or qualify in any way.

At the same time, a statement of completeness always implies a previous incompleteness. To be sure, once the complete has come, the incomplete no longer has the primary interest it once had, but it deserves to be investigated in its own

right nonetheless. Our purpose in this thesis, then, is simply to study the incomplete as incomplete (as that is recorded in the Old Testament) before its completion or fulfillment in the New Testament revelation. We believe that such a study is particularly relevant here because of the frequency with which this historical approach has been neglected.

As a result of this approach, many of the definitions we have adopted in the writing of this thesis are not the traditional ones. This limitation of definitions will be particularly apparent in our distinction of the terms "eschatological" and "Messianic" in chapters three and four. Again, however, this is the case only because of the attempt to explicate what was consciously incomplete.

We cannot deny the right to the early Christians, nor the necessity of the task for all Christians, once they understood the fulness of God's revelation in Christ, to interpret the Old Testament (as well as everything else) in terms of the New. The complete revelation in Christ stated clearly what the incomplete could only look forward to hopefully. It was true that both testaments were unified in their monergism and theocentricity (to use later terminology), but it is easy to see how the early Christians simply could not speak of God's grace in the Old Testament without illustrating it with some of the fulness of grace they had experienced in Christ. Indeed, the Christian church must still do the same thing whenever it handles the Old Testament today. Whenever a Christian preacher

preaches on an Old Testament text he must really first make a New Testament text out of it, if he does not wish to lapse into Judaism or moralism. The incomplete must always be illuminated by the Complete.

Nevertheless, homiletics and exegesis are two separate tasks. What the church must say homiletically, she may be unable to say exegetically. To be sure, the preaching of the church must never ignore its honest exegesis, but in the case of the Old Testament it must always also go beyond this exegesis. Yet the exegesis itself must be characterized by strict historical honesty. The old indeed has been superseded by the new, but this cannot mean an identification of old with new or a refusal to admit that the old really was old.

As we indicated above, a serious and consistent acceptance of the history-revelation paradox demands its application to the Old Testament also. If that revelation was really to be a revelation and not an esoteric, cabalistic oracle, it had to fit the cradle or matrix of its time. Just as all revelations prior to the New Testament had been different (cf. Heb. 1 and the frequent expression of the O. T. hope in terms of contemporary materialism), so the New Testament revelation itself would have been designed to conform to a different matrix had it come in the twentieth century instead of the first. This is not to call the Scriptures a liar or to deny the timelessness and eternal authoritativeness of what came in that cradle any more than to propose a change in liturgies is to deny Him

Whom all liturgies praise. In this vision of timelessness mediated through time lies the real meaning of faith, as contrasted with sight. What can be proven historically requires no faith. Thus, in spite of changing historical forms, we still assert with Isaiah: " אֵלֹהֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ".

Accordingly, we are maintaining the viewpoint in this thesis that, while the New Testament clearly depicts the nature of a "Claubens-interpretation" with which every Christian must agree, the details of its Old Testament hermeneutic are chiefly of historical interest for us.

However, none of this now leads us to conclude with Marcion or Harnack that the Old Testament might as well be discarded. The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is also the God and Father of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. "Der zeitliche Christ, der nur das Neue Testament kennt, ist das Widerspiel des ewigen Juden, der nur das Alte kennt."¹⁵ The value of the Old Testament for understanding the New is by no means restricted to the historical field. Even if one minimizes the Messianic element of the Old Testament, one finds there God's grace and love just as surely as in the New Testament, even though the reader of the latter knows far more of that same grace and love in Christ than his Old Testament brethren did.

¹⁵ Otto Proksch, "Marcion redivivus. Zum Kampf um das Alte Testament", Allgemeinen Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung, 1937, Nr. 10; quoted in Wilhelm Moeller, Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments in heilsgeschichtlicher Entwicklung (Zwickau: Johannes Hermann, nd.), p. 478.

Yet since the mode of salvation (faith) and its institutor ($\sigma\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\eta\rho = \text{Kύριος}$) were the same, and its antitheses essentially the same (polytheism, anthropocentricity, human pride, etc.) in both testaments, the Christian reader need only include with the Old Testament what has been revealed since its completion and he still has there a devotional work of incomparable power and beauty. This can by no means be said of any other historical document; therefore, this study is never merely "Religionsgeschichte", but always also "Heilsgeschichte". It is never merely a study of comparative religion, but always also a faith-full contemplation of the mighty and gracious works of our God. In that sense Proksch is certainly correct: "Wer Christus hat, hat mit dem Alten Testament das Neue; wer Christus nicht hat, verliert mit dem Alten Testament das Neue." ¹⁴

Furthermore, the continuity between the two testaments is more than a mere historical one. To a certain extent the eschatology of the Old Testament finds its "fulfillment" in the New Testament; but to a certain extent also New Testament eschatology builds upon and intensifies the force of Old Testament eschatology. God's purposes were the same in both testaments, even though He used different earthly similes, and even though all those purposes were understood much more clearly in the completeness of the Christian revelation. One simile (and finally every revelation is a simile: an effort

¹⁴Ibid.

to state in human language what language cannot express and only faith can grasp) runs very obviously through both testaments: that of the kingdom of God. Thus Eichrodt writes:

Es ist der Einbruch und die Durchsetzung der Koenigsherrschaft Gottes in dieser Welt, die die beiden, Auesserlich so verschieden Welten des Alten und des Neuen Testaments unloesbar zusammenschliessel, weil sie ruht auf dem Tun des einen Gottes, der in Verheissung und Forderung, in Evangelium und Gesetz ein und dasselbe grosse Ziel verfolgt, den Bau seines Reiches.¹⁵

It is in this general spirit, then, that we propose to attempt a survey of the problems of Old Testament eschatology in this thesis. Within the boundaries of our limited reading and incomplete comprehension of a vast subject, we shall attempt a study that will combine both scientific research and Christian faith, that will minimize neither revelation nor history. We are certain that only in that direction lies the future of a Christian exegesis, based upon a sound hermeneutic, that will steer clear of both the Scylla of re-pristination and biblicism on the one hand and the Charybdis of radicality and naturalism on the other.

¹⁵Eichrodt, op. cit., p. 1.

CHAPTER II

THE BASIC FORWARD LOOK OF THE OLD TESTAMENT---

ITS VOCABULARY OF HOPE

We have already indicated in the first chapter that in a very real sense the whole Old Testament -- like all revelation -- is ultimately eschatological. Inadequate as it is, "eschatological" is the best term we have for describing the result of the juncture of eternity and time, which characterizes revelation. When He Who is ever the same condescends to that which is ever changing, litanies and doxologies seem to be the only adequate descriptions. When the immutable comprehends the mutable, muteness is more appropriate than speech. And yet perforce eschatology we must call it.

Thus, although there is change all about, faith sees in all of history something permanent and unchangeable. Eschatology becomes the unifying and stabilizing factor in the labyrinthine intricacies and unpredictable permutations of earthly existence. Eschatology binds all of life to the creative and providential purposes of the Lord. In the biblical revelation there is never anything mystical about this, because Jahwe (and finally Christ Himself) always actually does come, and because His coming is always in a historical context. The theology of both testaments forms a marked contrast to the "theology of theophany" which

characterizes practically all religions outside the Jewish-Christian tradition. In the New Testament, with its "theology of incarnation", this contrast to all paganism is very obvious. Parallel to this in the Old Testament is its constant emphasis on God's coming and presence with His people.

This idea of the "coming of the Lord" runs like an unbroken thread through both testaments. Both deal with a God who came and is coming and is about to come.¹ This is the import of the message in which ultimately the eschatological hope embodies itself. It is from Jahwe's nature as creator and redeemer that the eschatological necessity springs. Thus, as we shall see again later, the Endzeit is often described in terms of the Urzeit. Man's sin has only interrupted God's original plan; God's redemption has and will restore everything in a "new creation". And yet the dialectical tension between God's love and Man's faithlessness remains; at this point the faith, the hope, the life of the pious believer in either testament centers.

Because God was really God for the Old Testament believer, because He was the Alpha and Omega of faith, the One who not only originated and controlled everything, but also He Who would conclude everything for His own ends and designs, this sense of divine purpose is always prominent in the Old Testament witness. The night may become ever so dark, but

¹This is already implicit in the divine name, Jahwe (יהוה); hence obviously its dominance in all of Jahwe's revelation. Cf. its beautiful periphrasis in the Apocalypses' $\delta \omega \nu \kappa \alpha \iota \delta \tau \eta \nu \kappa \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon \rho \chi \acute{o} \mu \epsilon \nu \circ \varsigma$.

the prophet still sees the light of deliverance and proclaims what he sees. Sometimes the light will be evident to the senses: such and such an adversary, Edom, Moab, or Assyria, will certainly suffer defeat. Sometimes, particularly in Deuteroisaiiah and in all the apocalypses, the light is almost purely eschatological (or even otherworldly). Very often the two merge, and the interpreter is hard put to distinguish the temporal and the eschatological.

Accordingly, not only every prediction of victory for the Jewish nation over their present enemies is a prelude to and assurance of the final victory at the end of time, but every prophecy of defeat against the nations, as well as the Klagelieder and imprecations of the Psalms, is also in the same way an assurance that Jahwe is guiding history toward the Day when all enemies will be defeated. The historical portions of the Old Testament are object-lessons of this faith, illustrations of Jahwe's Eingreifung into history, and the later eschatological and apocalyptic portions of the Old Testament often use those historical examples in typical and illustrative ways. What Jahwe had done before He would do again. Three events in Israel's history are probably most prominent in the prophetic presentation of the eschatological hope: (1) the Exodus (stated explicitly already in Ex. 15, but also compare Is. 43); (2) David's victories and kingdom; and (3) the return from the Exile (compare especially the pregnant phrase, הָיָה לְנוֹרָא). But this hope was also concre-

tized for the popular mind by other historical figures such as Moses, Zerubbabel, and possibly also some of the judges. It is not unlikely either (although Mowinkel has probably overemphasized this point) that popular patriotism and piety did often fasten many of its hopes on the ruling monarch, who was the Anointed representative of Jahwe on earth. Similarly, the deliverance from the flood (Is. 54) as well as God's initial act of grace in the creation (corresponding to the new creation, a constant emphasis of Deuteroisaiah) are also made into types of the eschatological culmination.

However, although Hebrew eschatology found its examples in and even constructed its framework from history, it always finally based its hope upon the explicit promises, that is, the covenant of Jahwe with His people. This point can hardly be emphasized too strongly.² God called His people out of Egypt (Hosea 11, 1 and all the historical psalms) for a purpose. To accomplish His purposes was Israel's only raison d'etre, and that small nation never forgot it. In fact, the

²We might also note in passing that from our point of view this basic dependence upon the covenant throughout the Old Testament constitutes one of the largest pieces of internal evidence against the higher critical isagogics. --- It is also noteworthy that the more historical approach to the Old Testament which has characterized Calvinism has been reflected in the federalistic and dispensationalistic (esp. Coccejus) emphases of its theology. It certainly is true that that emphasis loses much of its relevance when one attempts to construct a Christian dogmatics, and its excesses in the Reformed tradition are well known; but, as far as Old Testament exegesis is concerned, it represents a basic, historically oriented insight which Lutheran exegesis has too often overlooked.

less apparent and seemingly more impossible of fulfillment the promise contained in its election became, the more convinced and conscious Israel became of its existential validity. Eschatology depends upon faith, and Israel's eschatology flourished (as always in the church) when there was no recourse left to anything but faith. Finally, even this culminated in a "new covenant", which Jeremiah especially loved to proclaim.

Accordingly, we are not surprised when we find the whole Old Testament fairly teeming with expressions of hope and trust, even in sections which we do not ordinarily think of as eschatological at all. Corresponding to its basic forward look, the Old Testament possesses a vocabulary of hope which is without parallel in any other literature anywhere. Its hope and trust, as well as the expression it gives those hopes, are reflected faithfully and without any basic variation in the New Testament also. As we should expect, the hope-fulness of the Old Testament is nowhere more obvious than in the Psalter, whence its reputation as the "prayer-book of the ages". It will be our task in this chapter to investigate briefly some of the most important terms the Israelite congregation used in expressing its hope. "Here we are more interested in the devotional than in the prophetic expression of the hope; the latter we shall discuss in the next chapter, and the eschatology of the psalms as such will be dealt with again in Chapter VI.)

Inasmuch as all Old Testament hope was based upon God's faithfulness to His promises, we might well first glance at some of the chief Hebrew words expressive of deliverance, salvation, help, etc. All of these concepts were pertinent to the daily needs of the Israelites, both individually and corporately, but all of them also possess an unmistakable Vorwaartsdrang.

By far the most common of these is the root, יָשַׁע , used occasionally in the Niphal, but chiefly in the Hiphil as an expression of liberation, aid, and salvation. Etymologically, it is probably related to the common Arabic root, رَوَّع , to be wide, spacious.³ Thus it can be applied to liberation from confinement and dangers to the "wide, open spaces" of freedom. It is used with some approximation of its original sense occasionally in the Psalms (7,2; 34,7; 44,8), and noteworthy in the ancient song of Deborah (Judges 5). Then almost countless times, which we need not investigate further here, it is used of Jahwe's intervention in history, both in the present

³Much of the etymological material in the word studies in this chapter is derived from: William Gesenius, Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, translated by Samuel Tregelles (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949). What has not been derived from Gesenius is based on original studies, using as a guide the following three works: (1) Solomon Mandelkern, Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae (Lipsiae: Veit et Comp., 1896); (2) The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament (London: Longman, Green, Brown, and Longmans, 1843); and (3) Robert Young, Analytical Concordance to the Bible (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1920).

and in the future. We should note too that the Niphal participle, יֹשִׁיב , is used as an epithet of the coming king in Zech. 9,9, a passage which the New Testament applies to Christ.

These same remarks apply to the denominatives, יָשַׁב , יָשַׁב , יָשַׁב , as well as to the many proper nouns of which this stem is a part: Isaiah, Joshua, Elisha, Hosea, etc.

Probably next in order of frequency among the verbs describing salvation is שָׁצַב . This root too is not used in the Qal stem, and like יָשַׁב it is used most frequently and most significantly in the Hiphil. The basic meaning of שָׁצַב , of course, is to snatch away or pull out. Hence it is a very vivid and emphatic description of salvation by grace, and its use, especially in many of the poetic portions of the Old Testament, lends a heroic, even epic, flavor to those sections. Very frequently man are the subject of this verb, and it is from some momentary peril that they are delivered. But often also Jahve is the hero who is celebrated; He who is enthroned between the cherubim reaches down and snatches or rescues His people from (very frequently יָדו) their enemies, as a man would rescue a sheep from the claws of a wild beast (cf. Amos 3, 12). This wild-beast metaphor is also implicit in those dramatic but minatory passages where the phrase, שָׁצַב מִיָּדוֹ , is used (Ps. 7, 3; 50, 22; Is. 5, 29).

Besides these two basic words, there are a host of other stems in the Old Testament, all employing slightly different figures of speech, which in some way or another connote de-

liverance or salvation. Naturally we should expect this in a collection of literature which has as much to say on divine salvation as the Old Testament does. Among these we note here only some of the more common expressions. The stem, וִּשְׁׁו , with a basic meaning to be smooth and hence to slip away or escape is frequently used in the Hiphil with Jahwe as its subject to indicate salvation (Ps. 41,1; 89,48; 107,20; 116,4; Is. 46,4; Jer. 39,18). Very similar is the basic meaning and usage in both Hiphil and Piel of וִּשְׁׁו (2Sa. 22,44; Ps. 17,13; 22,4; 31,1; 37,40; 43,1; 91,14, etc.) The stem, יָצַח , with a basic meaning of draw off, loose (often of shoes or clothes; cf. the Arabic خلع and the Syriac ܫܠܚ) is used in the Piel frequently with causative force (2 Sa. 22,20; Ps. 6,4; 7,4; 18,9; 34,7; 50,15; 81,7; 91,15; 116,8; 119,153; 140,1). In a derived sense the stem, לָצַח , to help or aid, is commonly used in a specifically soteric sense (compare only Ps. 20,2; 40,13; 46,1; 121,1; 124,8; Is. 10,3). (We might also compare the frequent minatory phrase of the Koran: $\text{أَوْ كَالَّذِينَ مِنْ قَاوِيَةَ}$.)

Before we leave this topic we must also take a look at the two all-important expressions of redemption in the Old Testament, פָּדוּת and גְּאֻלָּה .⁴ The first of these stems is both more important and more common. Originally the stem, פָּדוּת , was probably used in a political-forensic sense (cf. Ruth 3

⁴See the interesting discussion of this topic in: Robert Girdlestone, Synonyms of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1948), pp. 117-26. Some of my material is derived from that source.

and 4; Lev. 25; perhaps Job 19,25); but the prophets, as usual, were not long in appropriating the secular vocabulary and endowing it with new, religious connotations. This is especially obvious in Isaiah (and Deuteroisaiah), unquestionably the literary genius of the Hebrew language (41,14; 43,1.14; 44,6.22.23.24; 47,4; 48,17; 49,7.26; 51,10; 52,3; 62,12; 63,4). Once again here it is practically impossible to distinguish the historical deliverance from the captivity and the endgueltig, eschatological redemption. This verb is already used of divine interposition in Gen. 48,16 and Ex. 6,6 (dramatically with יִצְרָחֵם) and in a soteric sense commonly in the psalms (19,14; 74,2; 103,4; etc.) In Is. 63,4 the stem is used in malem partem as avenger. In contrast יִצְחָק is not used in some of the peculiar technical senses of יִצְחָק, but it does emphasize strongly the idea of deliverance from bondage or servitude (cf. Ex. 21,8; Dt. 17,8; Mi. 6,4). Its probable original usage in connection with the payment of a ransom (יִצְחָק) accounts for its occasional usage in a theological sense together with that term (Ps. 49, 7.8.15; Jer. 31,11). It also figures very prominently in the prayers and praises of the Psalter.

It is noteworthy, in concluding our review of the Hebrew vocabulary of salvation, how consistently and how forcefully all these expressions (and many others) drive home the major monergistic and theocentric emphases of the Old Testament. In loco iustificationis, if we dare transfer Luther's phrase to the Old Testament, there is not even a hint of man's

ability to deliver or redeem himself. This is as true in the realm of creation as of eschatology, whether it is a physical or a spiritual danger from which man needs deliverance. How helpless the human object is, is pointed up by the constant use of the verbs of deliverance (נָשָׂא , שָׁלַח , שָׁלַח , and שָׁלַח) in either the Hiphil stem or in the Piel with causative force. Extramundane causation is absolutely necessary for any mundane salvation.

The obverse to God's faithfulness is man's trust, hope, and waiting. Man too must be faithful. He dare not have other gods before Jahwe; it is no accident that this is the first commandment. God's covenant was bilateral and always implied a human response to the divine initiation. Thus Eichrodt writes:

So vollzieht der Glaube in der Hingabe alles Eigenlebens an die richtende und rettende Gotteswirklichkeit das individuelle Tatbekenntnis zu der exklusiven Alleinherrschaft Jahves und verwirklicht damit von der Seite der personhaften Entscheidung her die Grundforderung des Jahvismus⁵

Around this pivot revolve all the sermons of the Old Testament, all the records of its historians, as well as all the prayers, supplications and thanksgivings of the Old Testament congregation. Thus there are many expressions of hope where this is not stated in so many words (cf. Lam. 3,21-27; Ps. 12,6; 14,7; 22,28 f.; 123, 2-4, etc.)⁶ Here too it is a case of

⁵Walther Eichrodt, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1950), III, p. 26.

⁶Ibid., p. 38.

something which is present everywhere in the Old Testament, but which becomes most explicit and vocal in the Psalter. Again the piety and faith of the believers finds its most acute expression in a few oft-repeated stems, which we must now study in some detail.

Since God's promises in their deepest sense are apparent only to faith, it is the Hebrew expression for faith, the Niphil of אָמֵן , which best summarizes the believer's primary relationship to his God. Both in the Septuagint and in the New Testament, אָמֵן corresponds almost exactly to πίστεω . Eichrodt comments: ". . . so praegt sich in אָמֵן doch auch eine geistige Gesamthaltung aus, die fuer das individuelle Gottesverhaeltnis schlechthin bestimmend ist."⁷ Its decisive character is very evident in passages such as Gen. 15,6; Ps. 116,10; and Is. 7,9.

Derivative from the idea of faith and complete committal to Jahwe, but still closely related to it, is the concept of hope. Its outstanding vehicle of expression in the Old Testament is נִצְחָה . It answers to ἐλπίσω in the New Testament, although the Greek word has more specifically theological and more definitely futuristic overtones than its Hebrew counterpart. Proksch describes it as "der volkstuemliche Ausdruck fuer das Credo und die fiducia, die ueberzeugte Hingabe an Gott geworden.

⁷Ibid., p. 27.

der dem Leben Sicherheit gewährt".⁸ This complete devotedness to Jahwe is this stem's most important emphasis. Proksch writes again:

Das Vertrauen schliesslich entspringt aus der Geborgenheit in Gott, die dem Glaubenden zuteil wird, so dass er nichts zu fürchten hat, so wie Israel in Geborgenheit wohnt.⁹

This force of the stem becomes clear in the adverb, πῶς, which is used some twenty-five times to describe devotion to Jahwe, although it is used occasionally in malam partem to depict "carelessness" toward God's commands (Is. 48,8; Eze. 30,9; Zeph. 2,15), and at other times without any moral judgment involved. In the Psalms the stem is used without exception of trust in Jahwe (so almost fifty times). On the contrary, in the prophets this use is rare (Is. 8,16; Zeph. 3,2; Jer. 17,7), but then, whenever it denotes a false trust in earthly powers, the context always sets it in direct antithesis to trust in God, together with either an implicit or explicit threat of punishment. (A good example of the use of the stem in these various ways can be found in the accounts of Hezekiah's encounter with Rabshakeh.) It is not easy to say with certainty to what extent these many expressions of hope are specifically eschatological, but no doubt Jewish believers

⁸Otto Proksch, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Gutersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1950), p. 623.

⁹Ibid.

were no more careful to isolate this aspect of their hope than Christians are. No doubt the eschatological consciousness became stronger and clearer in the later years of Israel's history. Bultmann writes:

Ist Gottes erwartete Hilfe zunächst die aus der konkreten Not, so wird sie immer mehr als die eschatologische Hilfe gedacht, die aller Not ein Ende macht. . . Die Haltung des harrenden und vertrauenden Hoffens wird immer mehr zum Ausdruck des Wissens um die Vorläufigkeit alles Irdisch-Gegen-waertigen ueberhaupt und zur Hoffnung auf die eschatologische Zukunft.¹⁰

One of the most picturesque of all the expressions of hope is $\pi\omicron\pi$, with its basic force of fleeing or taking refuge and thus frequently used with the metaphor, "under the shadow of the wings of God" (Ps. 57,2; 61,5). It is also common where God is compared to a rock or shield (Dt. 32,37; Ps. 46,1). Of its some fifty occurrences only about half dozen are used in an evil or indifferent sense (so Is. 30,2; Judg. 9,15). Eichrodt describes it as "die Vertiefung zum Wagnis des freien Vertrauens".¹¹

Most powerful and most poignant of the varied expressions is undoubtedly $\pi\iota\rho$, the $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\eta$ of the New Testament. Eichrodt comments:

Und ausserordentlich anschaulich spricht sich in $\pi\iota\rho$ nicht nur wie sonst der Zustand des angespannten Wartens, sondern die $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\eta$ das der Erfuellung

¹⁰Rudolph Bultmann, "ἐλπίς", Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, edited by Rudolph Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935), II, p. 520.

¹¹Eichrodt, op. cit., p. 27

gewisse standhafte Ausharren unter der aufgelegten Last aus, in der der Glaube bei aller Aussichtslosigkeit das wagende Dennoch zu sprechen vermag.¹²

Its use is a perfect commentary on the 'επ' ἐλπίδι παρ' ἐλπίδα of Rom. 4, 18. Its almost consistent use in the Piel makes still more vivid the restrained impatience and nervousness which the term already implies. It "signifies the straining of the mind in a certain direction in an expectant attitude."¹³ Well over half the time it mentions Jahwe or one of His gifts as its explicit object. Its derivatives, $\pi\lambda\pi\omega$ and $\pi\lambda\pi\eta$ are about the closest approach the un-abstract Old Testament makes to our concept of "eschatology."

Finally, although used rather infrequently (Is. 8, 17; 64,3; Zeph. 3,8; Hab. 2,3; Ps. 33,20), we should not overlook the significant word, יָדָו . It almost perfectly corresponds to the untranslatable German word, "Harren."¹⁴ Its waiting is full of confidence; it almost resolves the dialectic of eschatology and sees God's promises as already fulfilled. Here eschatology ceases and faith becomes sight. Here the faithful in all generations become one in their prayer that their Lord would hasten the Day.

¹²Ibid.

¹³Girdlestone, op. cit., p. 104.

¹⁴Proksch, op. cit., p. 624.

CHAPTER III

THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF OLD TESTAMENT ESCHATOLOGY

In this chapter we turn our attention away from the general expressions of hope and trust, which we considered in the last chapter, to a consideration of how some of the more explicit and characteristic features of Old Testament eschatology developed. These two, the subjective and the objective, can never be completely separated, particularly in the believer's experience, but in the student's research as well. The student of eschatology must always bear in mind that what he studies neither dropped down from the skies in full dogmatic panoply nor was legislated into existence by any prophet, priest, or king. It was always something which developed slowly, almost imperceptibly, and subject to a host of external influences, in the crucible of history. Yet this was not mere evolution; it was not even mere history. Faith insists that it was always revelation, an unfolding and developing according to God's specific plans.

Christians, of course, can look back and see how all the development prepared the way for the final revelation in Christ. However, that was not so apparent to the Old Testament congregation. To be sure, it never doubted that there was a culmination to all these preparatory revelations but it used various expressions to indicate how this would take

place. Accordingly, the Old Testament employs a great variety of pictures, types, idealizations of past glories, etc., to give expression to its faith. These we shall study in some detail in Chapter VI.

No one would deny that there was some development of Old Testament eschatology. Even those who found a complete doctrine of the Trinity and a complete Christology in the opening chapters of Genesis -- as well as men like Wilhelm Vischer¹ today -- must have admitted that. An admission of development is implicit already in a term like "Protevangel". However as to the character and degree of this development, there is no agreement at all.

It is here that problems of introduction become very important. It was part and parcel of Wellhausen's theory that no eschatology was possible before the Exile. Gressmann first seriously challenged that view, and Mowinckel's theories called for even more basic modifications. The date of many of the psalms, the possible antiquity of the apocalyptic style, and especially the dating of the second half of Isaiah (which is almost all eschatology) are questions which must be answered before one can trace the development of eschatology. Further, the genuineness of passages like Judah's blessing (Gen. 49), the Balaam prophecy (Num. 24), Nathan's promise to David (II Sam. 7), and others must be

¹Wilhelm Vischer, The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ, translated by O. B. Crabtree (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949).

either defended or denied.

However, it is not the purpose of this paper to investigate or pass judgment on introductory matters. We have already indicated in the first chapter where our sympathies lie and how we should approach them, if that were our business here. Our chief aim here is merely to state the issues as they stand. After a few definitions, we shall accordingly (1) study in more detail the nature of eschatology's development in history; (2) trace some of the specifically religious bases of eschatology, as indicated in the Old Testament itself, and (3) sketch the timeline of eschatological development, both according to the various critical schools and according to the Old Testament itself. In Chapter IV then we shall turn our attention to Messianism proper, as distinguished from eschatology.

That raises the question of the distinction between the two, and calls for a definition of terms before we go further. The traditional view would make practically all Old Testament eschatology Messianic. Classical Wellhausenianism would limit the concept of Messianism to post-exilic times. Both assertions are extreme. While the historical roots of eschatology and Messianism are somewhat different and their figures and illustrations completely divergent, the mood, the tendencies, the underlying sermon which each intends to preach is the same in both cases: God is guiding history for His own purposes and toward His own ends. Eschatology

proper describes Jahwe as performing this Himself.²

Messianism, in contrast, describes Jahwe as achieving His ends through some personal agent. Only rarely, however, does the Old Testament apply the term, "Messiah" to this agent. As we shall see in the next chapter, many different and varying pictures are used to describe him: a shepherd, a reincarnate Moses, a reincarnate David, a self-sacrificing servant, a glorious Son of Man, etc.

Undeniably, the Old Testament is essentially unified in its eschatological witness along the lines we have already indicated. No matter what exigencies may arise, Jahwe is still Lord of the universe with all that that implies. No matter what antitheses arise or what means the religious leaders of the nation must employ to fight them, the answer is always the same; the old canonical test of "at all times, in all places, by all men" certainly leads to an affirmative reply here. If there ever was any doubt of Jahwe's lordship, there is not a reasonable hint of it in the Old Testament. Only if the Old Testament is first rearranged according to some other scheme of development can this be called seriously into question.

²Hence all theophanies, miracles, and special revelations, not mediated through history, should properly be classified here. However, we believe, as we asserted before, that such revelations form the exception rather than the rule. Furthermore, to whatever extent they were the rule, they cannot be investigated at all. Like the whole concept of revelation, they can only be believed.

We must remember at the outset that the eschatological culmination at the last day, according to the Old Testament viewpoint, did not differ in quality as much as in quantity from what was happening in time every day before their eyes. Thus Messel writes:

Der Gesichtspunkt der goettlichen Kausalitaet schliesst den anderen, den des geschichtlichen Werdens, nicht aus -- in eschatologischer Schilderung doch wohl nicht mehr als in der Darstellung schon eingetretener Gottestaten.³

Hertrich is in full agreement:

Es geht in der Eschatologie nicht um das "Ende dieser Weltzeit" sondern um den Einbruch der Gotteswirklichkeit in diese Zeit. Dabei verkunden die Propheten nicht nur das Kommen Gottes in Jetzt und Hier, sondern zugleich wird auch alle Geschichte verstanden als eschatologisches Geschehen, das seinen Sinn empfaengt von dem "Heute" der prophetischen Predigt.⁴

On the other hand, an unmistakable dialectic also runs throughout the Old Testament. In its own way it is just as aware as the New Testament of the "now--not yet" character of God's grace. God would not continue to work in history indefinitely; He would end history. Here the first chapters of Genesis set the pace; they state the pre-suppositions upon which all Old Testament eschatology is based. Sin and death, the distinguishing marks of present existence, were

³N. Messel, Die Einheitlichkeit der juedischen Eschatologie (Giessen: Alfred Tospelmann, 1915), p. 7.

⁴Hertrich, "λεγμα", Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935), IV, p. 202.

destined to disappear at the end, as they had been absent at the beginning. Thus Sellin states as the second consequence of the Old Testament's Lebendigkeitscharakter:

dass die alttestamentliche Religion eigentlich von vorneherein und immer eschatologisch eingestellt sein muss, immerdar sieht sie dem kommenden, durchbrechenden Gotte entgegen, harrt auf ein Neues, ganz Grosses, Endgultiges; ihre eigentliche Domaene ist immerdar nicht die Gegenwart, sondern die Zukunft.⁵

In a similar vein, writing on Gen. 2, Proksch says:

Denn die Wirksamkeit Gottes in der Menschenwelt triebt einem Ziele entgegen, die Welt ist aus Gottes Willen hervorgegangen, um nach seinem Plane einem Ziele zugeleitet zu werden. Und dies Ziel ist nicht der Tod, sondern das Leben. Dies eschatologische Ziel ist nun schon in der Protologie vorgebildet im Bilde des Lebensbaumes . . .⁶

As in the New Testament, this eschatological dialectic gives an ethical and religious impetus to life. This understanding of the radical nature of evil and the resultant wrath of God constantly incited the Old Testament believer to righteousness of living and condemnation of evil. Eichrodt has seen this very clearly (and he also gives due credit to the doctrine of God's wrath):

Indem aber dieses Endziel der Geschichte zugleich als Neuschöpfung charakterisiert wird, bestaetigt es grundsatzlich und endgultig die Infragestellung

⁵Ernst Sellin, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1933), p. 16.

⁶Otto Proksch, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1950), p. 700.

der gegenwaertigen Wirklichkeit aus der neuen Gottesgewissheit heraus und zieht den unueberschreitbaren Graben zwischen diesem und dem Kommenden Aeon. Der Blick ueber die scharfe Grenzlinie hinaus befahigt zwar zum Ertragen der unvollkommenen Gegenwart, laesst aber nie eine traege Beruhigung bei dem nun einmal Gegebenen zu, sondern draengt immer wieder zur unbeugsamen Kritik an ihrer Unvollkommenheit und zu jener steten Bereitschaft, aus ihr auszuziehen, um mit allen Kraefte[n] der bleibenden Daseinsordnung sich entgegenzustrecken, die Gottes Zusage verbuergt.⁷

As we indicated in the previous chapter, the specific religious starting point of this consistent certitude throughout the Old Testament was the covenant.⁸ This covenant consisted not only in commandment, but also in promise (Gen. 17). It stated the destiny of the chosen people, which all Old Testament eschatology depicts. Proksch states this beautifully:

Das Ahnungsvermoegen, das den Schwerpunkt des nationalen Lebens nicht in der Gegenwart, sondern in der Zukunft sucht, das waehrend des Gesamt Ablaufs der Geschichte Israels unveraendert bleibt, haengt letztlich mit dem spezifischen Zukunftsglauben zusammen, der im Erwaehlungsgedanken liegt.⁹

This "zielstrebend" stamp is to be found literally everywhere in the Old Testament. The present good is to be re-

⁷Walther Eichrodt, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1950), I, p. 194.

⁸Even many severe literary critics of the Old Testament conceded this basic covenantal character of the Hebrew religion. It has always struck us as interesting that many critics, following Karl Budde, appealed to this belief in the covenant (although denying its revelation) to explain why Israelite religion developed and other Oriental ones did not, in spite of more favorable circumstances.

⁹Proksch, op. cit., p. 582.

placed by the better. Even though God has instituted the present institutions and revealed the present tenets of their religion, these all have a clear "not yet" written upon them. Each new historical development only makes this "not yet" stand out more clearly. As in the wilderness, there is no time to stop and build homes, but God's people must march on toward that which has been promised. The final goal, for which everything on earth has been created, is finally evident "in einem jenseits der irdischen Linie liegenden Gemeinschaftsverhaeltnis".¹⁰ The very organization of Israel's history in the Old Testament books as Heilsgeschichte characterizes past, present, and future as mere unfoldings of the plan which God had from the beginning. Even the monotonous genealogies, which seem at first to be eschatologically irrelevant, are "ein tiefer Ausdruck der Erkenntnis von dem Uranfang an Konstanter Heilsverhaeltnis zwischen Gott und seinem Volk".¹¹

Creation itself is an eschatological concept. No one preached this more clearly than Deuterocisaiah, for God is the first and the last (Is. 44,6). "Dass Gott der Schaeffer der Welt ist, besagt dass er die ganze Zeit, alle Zeiten beherrschend und gestaltend, zielsetzend und vollendend, umfasst".¹²

¹⁰Eichrodt, op. cit., p. 21.

¹¹Ibid., p. 22.

¹²Ludwig Koehler, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1947), p. 71.

The end corresponds almost perfectly to the beginning, and what intervenes -- that is, earthly history -- is only a Zwischenspiel. ". . . die Schoepfung ist das beginnende Geschehnis in einer Reihe von Geschehnissen, welche miteinander eine fest umgrenzte Weltzeit vollmachen".¹³ The "very good" of the first Paradise corresponds to the "all-glorious" of the latter one. The $\mu\nu$ of creation will reappear with the new covenant (Jer. 32, 42) and with the proclamation of the Evangelist (Is. 52,7). Hence undoubtedly stem the prophetic pictures of the Tierfrieden, the waters of life (Ps. 46, Eze. 47, etc.), and others.¹⁴ Yet we need Eichrodt's caution:

. . . Merkzeichen, dass mit der Welt der Zukunft, die hier ersteht, nicht das Resultat einer natuerlichen irdischen Entwicklung, sondern die schoepfungsmaessige Umwandlung der Welt durch Einbruch neuer gottgemaesser Wirklichkeiten gemeint ist . . . Nicht also ob damit die Endgeschichte in einen Endmythus aufgeloeset wuerde; die Beziehung zu den in der Geschichte gestalteten personhaften Gemeinschaftsverhaelt-nissen bleibt start und lebendig.¹⁵

All the individual features of Old Testament theology,

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ These we shall study in greater detail in Chapter VI. It was Hugo Gressmann; whose special interest was comparative Near Eastern religion, who made a most complete study of this field. He has shown indisputably -- although not without considerable exaggeration -- how parallel Jewish eschatological and Messianic thought often was to contemporary religious phenomena. -- That the Old Testament used mythological illustrations to enliven its homiletics need not disturb us, nor does that indicate that the sacred writers believed those stories to be true. We too use known fables to illustrate religious truths.

¹⁵ Eichrodt, op. cit., p. 194.

the way in which God deals with man and the way in which man should respond, accordingly have an eschatological orientation. God's love and mercy for His people did not express itself most fully in individual acts of grace, but rather in the covenanted promise to deliver His people from the bondage of this world. No one expresses this in more beautiful language than Deuteroisaiah. Forgiveness, around which all religious life centers, is finally eschatological too. Sometimes this is viewed in a ritualistic framework (esp. Eze. 40-48), but more often the prophets view it as a simple matter of repentance and grace. Repentance always includes a desire for unbroken communion with God and each individual act of forgiveness is a promise and pledge of it. God's justice (which is often paralleled with grace and forgiveness: Ps. 31,2; 43,10f.; 51,16; 85,11; 103,17; etc.) will ultimately triumph.¹⁶ He Himself will plead their cause (so often in Deuteroisaiah); the final judgment upon the wicked will vindicate the cause of the righteous once and for all. Here the present conflict between the individual's fate and the course of world events will be resolved, and the paradoxical unity of judgment and grace will become clear. This truth finds its most profound and most beautiful expression again in Deuteroisaiah, in the hymns celebrating the vicarious suffering of the Servant.¹⁷

¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 118-26.

¹⁷ Ibid., p.144.

Eichrodt summarizes all this nicely in the conclusion to his chapter on "Wesen des Bundesgottes":

Aber gerade durch diese Zusammenfassung aller Einzelmomente des irdischen Lebens in einen grossen Schuldzusammenhang, der die Verbindung mit Gott zerreisst und die Menschheit in die Gottes-ferne schleudert, offenbart sich die freiwillige goettliche Selbstbindung als eine alle menschlichen Masse ueberschreitende und alle menschlichen Kategorien der Vergeltung sprengende . . .¹⁸

Before we make our own attempt now to sketch the manner in which Hebrew eschatology developed in its historical setting, we should first note the guiding principles which leading schools of criticism since Wellhausen have followed in their critiques of the subject. Naturally a new estimation of the development of eschatology accompanied the radical revision of the traditional Old Testament chronology, which Wellhausianism propounded. The basic thesis of this school was that pre-exilic prophets were capable of only an Unheilsgeschichte. Accordingly, all Messianic prophecies or predictions of bliss were condemned as postexilic interpolations. The whole ritual of the priestly code and the final redaction of the Pentateuch were then supposed to have been motivated by a desire to hasten the coming of the kingdom of God.¹⁹

It was Gunkel who first questioned this thesis in 1895 with his Schoepfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit, and de-

¹⁸Ibid., p. 141.

¹⁹Or. August Von Gall's very "orthodox" exposition of the Wellhausian thesis in his Basileia tou Theou (Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitaetsbuchhandlung, 1926), pp. 190 ff.

rived the whole eschatological framework of the Old Testament from the Babylonian creation myth, thus indicating its possible great antiquity. Gressmann then in 1905 in his Ursprung der israelitischen-juedischen Eschatologie and again in his posthumous Der Messias (1929) painstakingly showed how each Messianic and eschatological feature in the Old Testament had its parallels with other Near Eastern rituals and legends.²⁰ While he agreed with Gunkel that the eschatology of bliss did not have as indigenous a ring to it as the opposite, it too (as Amos 5,18 indicated) must have flourished long before the exile. We let him speak for himself:

Die Selbstverstaendlichkeit aber, mit der vor dem Heil eine Zeit des Unheils vorausgesetzt wird, und umgekehrt . . . kann nur auf alte Traditionen zurueckgefuehrt werden. So zeigt sich schon hier im Eingang der Untersuchung, dass die Propheten von Ueberlieferungen Abhaengig sind, die sie nicht selbst geschaffen haben.²¹

Mowinkel's revision of the Wellhausenian assumptions was even more radical, and his views, in spite of all sorts of criticisms, still dominate scholarly thought on the subject today. Beginning with Gunkel's study of the Thronbesteigungs-

²⁰One of the basic defects of the whole Wellhausenian system had been its naive assumption, with which Gunkel and Gressmann specifically take issue, that Hebrew religion had developed in relative cultural and religious isolation (particularly evident in Wellhausen's manifesto, Reste arabischen Heidentums). Subsequent archaeological discoveries, in particular, have all but demolished that assumption.

²¹Hugo Gressmann, Der Messias (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1929), p. 71.

psalmen, he insists that these are parallel to the Babylonian New Year Festival of the accession of Marduk. These psalms were originally cultic hymns of praise to Jahwe, who annually made all things new, repeating his primordial triumph over chaos. Those who participated in the festival experienced anew Jahwe's acts of grace through the sacramental mediation of the Anointed king. Israel's Journey "von Erlebnis zur Hoffnung" became the shibboleth of his whole reconstruction of eschatology. The festival (later split into the three major festivals of Judaism) came to proclaim a future instead of a present salvation. The Anointed was no longer the regnant king, but the eschatological Messiah. Jahwe's final defeat of the forces of chaos was not past (as the nation's miserable political fortunes proved), but future. We let Mowinckel state his thesis for himself:

Die Eschatologie ist dadurch entstanden, dass alles das, was man urspruenglich als unmittelbare, sich im Laufe des Jahres verwirklichende Folgen der im Kulte erlebten alljaehrlichen Thronbesteigung Jahwaes erwartete, in eine unbestimmte Zukunft hinausgeschoben wurde, als etwas das "einmal" kommen werde, wenn Jahwa seinen Thron zum letzten Male endgueltig besteigt. . .²²

Mowinckel criticized Gressmann for merely studying the origins of individual features in the eschatology without finding any single source which synthesized them all.²³

²²Sigmund Mowinckel, "Psalmenstudien II. Das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwaes und der Ursprung der Eschatologie", Skrifter utgit av Videnskapselskapet i Kristiania (A. W. Brreggers Boktrykkeri, 1922), p. 220 ff.

²³Ibid., p. 221.

This synthesis Mowinckel of course found in the ancient New Year ritual, whose essential features were now reproduced in eschatology: Jahwe's kingship, deliverance from enemies, a new creation, a divinely appointed ruler, etc. The prophets fit even heterogeneous features of their eschatology into this theme.²⁴ Contrary to Wellhausen, Unheilsesthatologie was secondary, because in the festival the defeat of enemies was only subsidiary to the theophany of grace.²⁵ In particular, this scheme did enable Mowinckel to see clearly, for the first time in critical circles, the intrinsic unity of Heil and Unheil in eschatology:

Das ist kein sekundaerer, geschweige denn ein durch spätere literarische Interpolationen entstandener Zug, wie bisweilen die ältere Kritik nach Wellhausen anzunehmen schien, sondern etwas ganz Ursprüngliches. Der Thronbesteigungstag Jahwaes bringt Unheil ueber Israels Feinde und Heil ueber Israel, das sind von jeher die beiden Momente der Erwartung.²⁶

All sorts of criticisms have been leveled at Mowinckel's brilliant thesis and some modifications have been accepted,²⁷ but in general he still holds the field securely. (While Mowinckel's brilliant arguments, lucid style, and patient assemblage of evidence cannot but impress us, our chief doubt

²⁴ Ibid., p. 312.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 246.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 263.

²⁷ For a summary of recent opinion, see G. W. Anderson, "Hebrew Religion", The Old Testament and Modern Study, edited by H. H. Rowley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), pp. 283-309.

lies in the fact that not a bit of direct evidence for the thesis can be found in the Old Testament itself. Furthermore, the idea of an annually reappearing deity hardly sounds to us like Jahwe; if the Babylonian festival was copied in Israel at all, it must have undergone a much more radical revision to harmonize it with the basic tenets of Jahwism than Mowinckel indicates.)

We must now attempt to trace for ourselves the way in which eschatology developed under the guidance of the great religious leaders of the Jewish people, as this is indicated in the Old Testament itself.²⁸ Of course, just like the New Testament, the Old is not merely history, but preaching, or witness to a message. Its historical sections are subservient to its kerygmatic aims. As such it is less concerned with either origins or development in history. Its emphasis is rather on the revelation side of the history-revelation paradox. As we noted before, it consistently derives eschatology, like other doctrines, from the nature of Jahwe and from the covenant which He has graciously made with His people. Yet as the historian, on his side of the paradox studies the evidence which the Old Testament yields, he must note a certain progression in detail and clarity of original idea.

²⁸Here we are making no effort to pursue the eschatologies of the various schools (J, E, P, D, etc.), not only because the exact content of each varies widely with each literary critic, but also because of our deep skepticism about the whole hypothesis.

Our investigation here will be limited to the prophetic books. This is not simply to disregard the earlier prophecies, which the church has usually regarded as Messianic. However, any satisfactory investigation of these passages would inevitably involve us in a host of complex isagogical and exegetical problems, which space forbids us to enter upon here. Furthermore, because of their oracular nature, it is not always clear to what extent these early prophecies actually illuminate or illustrate the pre-prophetic eschatological hopes of the Israelites.

Eichrodt, together with the present trend, tries to isolate an eschatology of "Nebismus", that is, of the probably cult-based (so especially Mowinkel) "sons of the prophets" in the days before literary prophetism. As evidence, he employs passages like II Sam. 7, 8-16; 23, 1-7; Ps. 2; 45; 110; Amos 5, 18.²⁹ At any rate, Amos 5, 18 does prove, as Gressmann could not repeat too often, that a definite popular eschatology was extant well before that prophet's time. The popular mind had taken seriously only the "eschatology of bliss" and had perverted it into an expression of nationalistic pride. While Amos did not deny this "eschatology of bliss" it was one of his chief tasks to insist that Israel take the "eschatology of woe" just as seriously for itself, and that all eschatology was of the deepest ethical significance. (We see no com-

²⁹Eichrodt, op. cit., p. 193.

pelling reason to doubt the genuineness of the Heilseschatologie or Messianic prophecies in either Amos or any other of the pre-exilic prophets.) As far as we can determine, Amos set the pace in his preachment of eschatology, which all the prophets, even those after the Exile to some extent, followed. His forceful description of a אֲדָמָה instead of a אֲדָמָה remained very vivid, even in the New Testament. His fearful portrayals of the remnant (see 3,12 and 6,10) were expanded or adapted by later prophets, especially Isaiah. We may mention a few other emphases of his which became typical of prophetism's outlook: (1) his unequivocal condemnation of any optimistic evolutionism in history; (2) his penetrating view of history; Gerichtsgeschichte was at the same time Heilsgeschichte;³⁰ and (3) his assumption that Israel's future was contained in the ancient covenant with Jahwe, which must be interpreted eschatologically. Furthermore, Amos' semi-apocalyptic visions and pictures, if they did not find their first expression in Amos, are certainly paralleled in every prophet after him.

It does not serve our purpose here to investigate in detail the contributions and variations of the other pre-exilic minor prophets. In Jonah, Nahum, and Habbakuk (except perhaps the theophany of Chapter 3) there is no explicit eschatology. Micah and Obadiah parallel Amos in their

³⁰ Eichrodt, op. cit., p. 429.

essential features. Hosea spends relatively little time on eschatology proper, but preaches "Jahves nimmermuede Liebe"³¹ and eternal faithfulness to His covenant in a way that is very significant for the total prophetic viewpoint. In Joel and Zephaniah, on the other hand, eschatology almost fades into apocalyptic, very likely the beginning of a movement that would later dominate the scene.

The eschatology of Isaiah is of much more significance. (In our discussion of historical development, we are distinguishing Isaiah and Deuteroisaiiah. In spite of many obvious parallels between the two, Deuteroisaiiah undeniably represents a much later historical context than Isaiah, irrespective of whether this was due to prophecy or contemporaneity.) The prophet's call gave his ministry an eschatological coloring which is obvious in almost every verse; in fact, Isaiah 6 is a perfect summary of that prophet's message. Commenting on that chapter, Proksch writes well:

Der Prophet erwartet den Anbruch der neuen Welt; mitten in der Geschichte nimmt sie ihren Anfang, in der Gegenwart nur dem pneumatischen Auge sichtbar. Wie das Licht am ersten Schöpfungstage durchbrach und die Finsternis ueberwand, so bricht mit Jahwes Herrlichkeit das Licht der neuen Schöpfung an, in deren Morgengrau der Prophet steht.³²

Practically every major section is introduced by the technical phrase, "in that day", which definitely stamps it as escha-

³¹ Ibid., p. 245.

³² Proksch, op. cit., p. 429.

tological. The "Massahs" of chs. 13-23 are among the clearest examples of Unheilsschatologie to be found anywhere; other chapters of the book apply the same message to Israel itself. The apocalypse of chs. 24-27 is an original work of the highest sort. It is a moot question whether it was Isaiah or Deuteroisiah who employed the greater variety of figures; we mention only a few of the former's here: the root, the banner, the watchman, the highway, the purificatory flame, the constant light-darkness antithesis, and so on almost ad infinitum. However, it is the fact that Jahwe is that finally gives this prophecy its Eigenartigkeit.

Because Jahwe is holy, His now sinful people must be holy too; that is the goal of history; and both grace and judgment move relentlessly toward that goal.

Further development is evident also in Jeremiah. The lachrymose character of his whole outlook also affects his eschatology. Jerusalem's inevitable fate was but a prelude to the destruction of the world; "die Schauer des mundus advesperascens umgeben ihn wunderbar",³³ God's love has been spurned, and Jeremiah describes His resultant wrath in the blackest of terms. Yet God's love has not been frustrated; in a new aeon with a new covenant He will still accomplish His purposes. No one proclaims this "monergism" of divine grace more clearly than Jeremiah, because he sees

³³ Ibid., p. 261.

that everything is finally eschatological in character.³⁴

Ezekiel, by way of contrast, is a much more controversial and much more perplexing figure. The stupefying reality of the Exile, on the one hand, enables him to depict judgment in most appalling vividness, but, on the other hand, forces a radical revision, almost into the apocalyptic, of Israel's previous Heilseschatologie. In fact, from Ezekiel on it becomes increasingly difficult to distinguish the eschatological from the apocalyptic. Ezekiel's emphasis on a revived temple ritual (chs. 40-48) and his Vergeltungstheorie, while not without significance, are somewhat tributary to the mainstream of Israel's eschatological development.

The most towering eschatological figure in the whole succession of prophets is Deuteroisaiah. It is doubtful if there is a single verse in his whole prophecy which is not eschatology pure and simple. His prophecies are either eschatology or nonsense; he was either describing the new aeon or he was a raving chauvinist. It is hardly an exaggeration to assert that all previous prophetic thought receives its final Auspraegung here, and what follows is largely pale afterglow. Combine this with Deuteroisaiah's unexcelled literary talents, and one can hardly do better than simply to advise the reading of his book to learn his eschatology.

³⁴Eichrodt., op. cit. p. 133.

Central in his thought is the kingship of Jahwe. Previous prophets had avoided this figure, probably because of its similarity to pagan usages and abuses in popular customs. Deuteroisaiiah rehabilitated the old term, but applied it in an entirely new way: God's kingship simply meant the new aeon. Because it was not empirical at all, it could best be described according to Eichrodt in terms of the ancient creation myth, to which it corresponded.³⁵ Just because Jahwe was $\omega\iota\tau\pi$ and the universe was not, the goal of history was a $\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\eta\ \kappa\tau\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$, in which the sinful $\eta\mu\iota\omega\sigma\mu\epsilon\tau$ had passed away. Deuteroisaiiah's opening manifesto, "Verbum Dei manet in aeternum" (40,8), was the oft-repeated assurance that all God's old promises, centering in the covenant, would not attain their goal until Jahwe again revealed His glory to all flesh and Himself became their Redeemer and/or allowed His Servant to die for them. Proksch writes: "Wie $\zeta\kappa\gamma\omega\iota\ \omega\iota\tau\pi$ Jesajas Praegung, so ist $\zeta\kappa\gamma\omega\iota\ \zeta\kappa\lambda$ Deuteroisaiiah's Eigentum".³⁶

Mowinkel is certain that Deuteroisaiiah's whole scheme is nothing but an inept revision of the old Thronbesteigungsmythos. Many of the features of the enthronement festival are certainly present here: the dispensing of grace when Jahwe enters Jerusalem, the procession following the king, the return of captives, the judgment of nations as Jahwe sits on the

³⁵ Ibid., p. 195.

³⁶ Proksch, op. cit., p. 224.

throne, etc. ³⁷ Yet Mowinckel is certainly too harsh in his disparagement of Deuteroisaiah's originality:

Die verschiedenen Ideen liegen bei ihm ueberhaupt kaleidoskopisch ueinander gewuerfelt vor. Er gibt nie zusammenhaengende eschatologische Schilderungen, sondern deutet immer nur vorhandene, laengst bekannte, gewissermassen dogmatisch fixierte Ideen an; er gibt gelegentliche lyrische Variationen der bekannten Themata und Vorstellungen, deren organischer Zusammenhang innerhalb eines geschlossenen Dramas ihm kaum bewusst ist und aus seinen Gedichten kaum haette erschlossen werden koennen. Er is somit kein Schoepfer der Gedanken; original ist er nur in seiner Theodizee, die persoendlich erlebt und errungen ist, und die er in der Gestalt des Gottesknechts niedergelegt hat. ³⁸

Eichrodt is more generous:

Hier ist zweifellos aus dem alten Gottkoenigsgedanken etwas Neues geworden, die ihm anhaftenden Maengel sind ueberwunden dadurch, dass er von der Sphaere des Kultus geloest und mit dem Gedanken der Weltreligion untrennbar verknuepft wird. ³⁹

After Deuteroisaiah and to a large extent dependent upon him, all prophecy stands entirely in an eschatological light. The return of the Diaspora in the Heilszeit continues to be a dominant theme; "sie ist ihr Introitus und bleibt ihr Finale". ⁴⁰ The rebuilding of the temple and reinstitution of the cultus "kann nur etwas Vorlaufiges sein und hat ihren Sinn nicht in sich selbst, sondern als Hindeutung auf die kommende Vollendung". ⁴¹ This is clear upon the first

³⁷ Mowinckel, op. cit., pp. 240-96.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 289.

³⁹ Eichrodt, op. cit., p. 92.

⁴⁰ von Gall, op. cit., p. 214.

⁴¹ Eichrodt, op. cit., p. 195.

reading of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. Zechariah is almost entirely apocalyptic in character, and even many of the ancient anthropomorphisms reappear (cf. Zech. 14,4). Jahwe no longer works His wrath through the nations, but through the "mythischen Schrecken" (Gressmann).⁴² Unheilseschatologie for Israel almost completely disappears. Thoughts of judgment, of the day of Jahwe, etc., yield to an increasing emphasis on the kingdom, which now becomes explicitly Messianic⁴³ (Zechariah compared him to Zerubbabel), as well as increasingly universalistic (esp. Malachi), a fitting transition to the New Testament.

The eschatology of the wisdom literature, such as it is, poses perplexing problems all its own. Here there is no systematized Messianic belief, no expectation of a great world-ruler (but only of a modest king), no fear that the end of this aeon is imminent.⁴⁴ Proksch writes:

Eine Eschatologie fehlt der Spruchweisheit, worin sie sich aufs staerkste von der Prophetie unterscheidet. Weder die nationale noch die persoenliche Zukunft wird in einer jenseitigen Welt gesucht; die Weisheitslehre ist ganz diesseitig.⁴⁵

Von Gall, who insists that practically all Jewish eschatology

⁴² von Gall, op. cit., p. 224.

⁴³ See R. H. Charles, A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1899), pp. 108 ff.

⁴⁴ T. K. Cheyne, Jewish Religious Life after the Exile (New York: The Knickerbocker Press, 1901), p. 147.

⁴⁵ Proksch, op. cit., p. 401.

comes from Persia, loves to gloat over its absence in the wisdom literature, which proves to his satisfaction that it was basically alien to the Hebrew genius and not a part of Hebrew theology until the age of Darius. He summarizes gleefully:

Man sah, dass nichts so heiss gegessen wurde, wie es gekocht war. Man hatte sich laengst eine gewisse praktische, nuechterne Lebensbetrachtung angeeignet, die alles nahm, wie es kam, und sich ueber nichts mehr wunderte. Es war ein rationalistischer Nuetzlichkeitsstandpunkt, aber man fuhr auesserlich gut dabei. Man lebte fromm dahin, erfuellte Gottes Gebote, es ging einem ja gut dabei. . . Diesen Leuten ist ihre praktische Lebensweisheit, ihre angewandte Religion brauchbarer als die ganze Eschatologie, die doch immer enttauescht hatte.⁴⁶

To be sure, we must admit that its absence here does raise questions, and does lend weight to the view that a once-copious Hebrew literature was later severely edited from an eschatological viewpoint. Probably we find here the same contrasting viewpoints that are represented by the Pharisees and Saducees in the New Testament.

Finally, we must take some note of the apocalyptic literature, although this is a study of its own. We have already noted that there are apocalyptic elements and features in all the prophets; and that these become increasingly prominent in post-exilic times. In many ways, Joel especially stands more in the apocalyptic than in the prophetic tradition.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ von Gall, op. cit., pp. 258-9.

⁴⁷ Hugo Gressmann, Der Ursprung der israelitisch-juedischen Eschatologie (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1905), p. 93. See also Charles, op. cit. pp. 118-20.

Ezekiel is strongly apocalyptic in tone; and in Zechariah it becomes dominant.⁴⁸ As Proksch well notes, it is easier to distinguish between the apocalyptic and the prophet than between apocalyptic and prophetic.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, we may well note here some of the chief features of the apocalyptic: (1) it is not developed out of history (hence later often was pseudepigraphical), but comes down from heaven; it is more Weltbetrachtung than Geschichtsbetrachtung;⁵⁰ (2) it divides the world strictly into two radically different aeons, a Diesselts and a Jenseits, and the former is totally irrelevant; it is entirely transcendental in tone; (3) increasing emphasis on Messianic mediation (cf. Son of Man in Daniel); and (4) increasing emphasis on the doctrines of immortality, resurrection, etc.

Many other features or modifications, some of which are prominent in the New Testament, might be included here, if we extended our study to the inter-testamental literature,

⁴⁸It is not our business to discuss here the dogmatic assertion that apocalyptic proper does not antedate Maccabean times. Suffice it to say that its consistent appearance in all the prophetic literature, including larger sections such as Is. 24-27, renders that assumption not so self-evident at all. We believe that apocalyptic should be considered not so much in contrast to as a natural, logical development from prophetism. On the other hand, regardless of how we date Daniel, the Isianic apocalypse, etc., these sections do constitute an Eigenart, which we may well discuss by themselves or in connection with the large non-canonical apocalyptic literature.

⁴⁹Proksch, op. cit., p. 407.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 408.

but at this point the Old Testament stops. However, via just that extra-canonical literature, the apocalyptic of the Old Testament does provide the link in God's own unrolling of history toward the "fulness of time", between the two testaments. In the next chapter now, we must retrace our steps and study what was specifically Messianic in this eschatological development.

CHAPTER IV

THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF MESSIANISM

We have already indicated in the last chapter what distinction we are making in this thesis between eschatology and Messianism. The former is the broader of the two terms and includes the latter. The Messianic idea is really only one feature of Jewish eschatology before the time of Christ. The entire sixth chapter of this thesis will be devoted to a special study of various other features. However, Messianism well deserves special attention here, not only because it has often been confused with other things which are not a part of it, but also because of its pivotal position in the New Testament's interpretation of the Old.

First of all, we must repeat a few of the basic judgments which we enunciated in our first chapter. We believe that its judgments ("judgments", that is, to the historian; "truths" to the believer) are frequently theological and homiletical rather than exegetical. We believe that the New Testament did to the Old what every Christian preacher still must do: it interpreted the incomplete in terms of the Complete and applied both to its time in terms it could understand.

Probably nowhere is this difference between what the Old Testament says and how the New interprets it more evident

than in the doctrine of the Messiah. Not that the New mis-interprets the Old! Rather it makes an historical evaluation of its past history from a specifically theological viewpoint; or, from the standpoint of faith, it completes what had consciously been left incomplete. Hence, it calls things "Messianic" which the Old Testament does not. It synthesizes into One what had been merely varying expressions of an underlying hope.

If we then simply take the Old Testament for what it says, we find that the concept of the Messiah as such is not so prominent as is usually thought. Far more often it is Jahwe who does the acting Himself without mention of a mediator: He is Israel's Redeemer, He will destroy Israel's enemies, He will still be supreme in the new aeon, etc. Even Sellin admits this:

Im allgemeinen wird sich sagen lassen, dass die grundsätzliche Auffassung der alttestamentlichen Religion die ist. Gott selbst werde an seinem Tage kommen und seine Königherrschaft antreten, dass aber bei vereinzelt Propheten und in einzelnen Perioden diese Hoffnung die Gestalt angenommen hat, dass der ueberweltliche Gott, der dem menschlichen Auge unzugänglich ist, seine künftige Herrschaft auf Erden durch eine nach seinem Bilde geschaffene menschliche Persönlichkeit, durch einen wunderbaren irdischen König als seinen Stellvertreter und Repräsentanten werden ausüben lassen.¹

In the Old Testament "Messiah" is primarily a title of honor with a wide application, even to the patriarchs in Ps. 105, 15 and to the heathen king Cyrus in Is. 45, 1. Usually

¹Ernst Sellin, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Leipzig:) Quelle und Meyer, 1933), p. 122.

of course, it is an epithet of the king (I Sam. 2, 10; II Sam. 22, 51; Ps. 18, 51). The fact that he has been anointed means that he rules by divine appointment and perhaps with divine prerogatives (I Sam. 24, 7. 11; 26, 9 ff; II Sam. 1, 14. 16; 19, 22; Lam. 4, 20). In post-exilic literature the same term is applied to the high-priest as Priesterkoenig.²

Various views have been held concerning the origins of Messianism. Wellhausen, of course, who practically identified eschatology with apocalyptic, summarily excluded any Messianism from pre-exilic literature. It remained for Paul Volz, whom we have quoted approvingly on a few general problems above, to carry this principle ad absurdum, as Gressmann himself calls it.³ Volz's method is extremely arbitrary and shows the principles of literary criticism at their very worst. Beginning with his stated purpose to prove "dass die Messiasidee dem Wesen des vorexilischen Prophetismus fremd ist",⁴ he simply excises from the text whatever does not suit his purposes. Thus he discovers what he wanted to, namely, that "Ezechiel ist der erste uns bekannte Jahweprophet, der die Messiasidee vertritt",⁵ although he is sure that even there

²Hugo Gressmann, Der Messias (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1929), p. 3.

³Ibid., p. 15.

⁴Paul Volz, Die vorexilische Jahweprophete und der Messias (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1897) p. 1.

⁵Ibid., p. 81.

it was a mere concession to popular hopes and alien to the prophet's real outlook.

Again, as with eschatology in general, it was Gunkel who claimed that the Messianic hope was an ancient oriental conception, which the Jews, as usual, revised to fit their religion of the covenant. Mowinckel, as we should expect, derives the Messianic idea from the old enthronement festival:

Das Korrelat zu diesem Gedanken vom Koenig als Inkorporation der nationalen Gemeinde ist die Idee vom Koenig als Inkarnation des nationalen Gottes . . . Der sichtbare Ausdruck dieser Einheit; dieser Verbindung zwischen Gott und Volk im Bunde, ist der goettliche Koenig -- in alter praehistorischer Zeit wohl der mit goettlichen Kraefte ausgestattetete, priesterliche und prophetische Funktionen ausuebende Hauptling, dessen Typus Moses ist.⁶

Brilliant as Mowinckel's exposition was, there have been many complaints that it oversimplified too much. Bentzen, a Danish scholar, has been especially vocal in this direction. As the title of his book indicates,⁷ he isolates three strands in the Messianic concept: (1) the royal idea of the Messianic king, the antitype of David; (2) the prophetic idea of a re-incarnate Moses, with emphasis on suffering; and (3) the priestly (?) concept of the Son of Man, with emphasis on transcendence. In harmony with the general Scandinavian trend to lay great stress on mythic origins, he proposes the Urmensch

⁶Sigmund Mowinckel, "Psalmestudien. II. Das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwees und der Ursprung der Eschatologie", Skrifter utgitt av Videnskapsselskapet i Kristiania (A. W. Broeggers Boktrykkeri, 1922), p. 301.

⁷Aage Bentzen, Messias--Moses redivivus--Menschensohn (Zuerich: Zwingli-Verlage, 1948).

(in type and antitype the quintessence of manhood) as the unifying element for all three.

When we attempt now to draw our own conclusions of the origins of Messianism, we are immediately confronted with all sorts of isagogical problems. In this case they are even more urgent than with eschatology proper, chiefly because of those passages in the pre-prophetic literature which the Christian church has almost always noted as "Messianic", and which it has often cited as justification for its hermeneutic of the Old Testament.

This is not the place to enter upon any detailed study of these individual passages, either exegetically or as to genuineness. Certainly, the case is not as simple as both sides have often claimed. Undeniably, there is a fragmentary, oracular, almost esoteric tone about the prophecies of the Pentateuch. Most of them are not cited by the New Testament as Messianic; in particular is this noteworthy in the case of Gen. 3, 15. If these really were understood as "Messianic prophecies", it is difficult to see how the rest of those books could continue on in such an even tone, apparently unruffled by such earth-shaking revelations. The ideas of a vaticinium ex eventu and of a pia fraus, the stocks-in-trade of Wellhausian criticism, are repulsive to us. In addition, we have no reason a priori to deny the possibility of eschatological or even specific Messianic hopes long before prophetism. Where the evidence is scanty, it is risky to be

dogmatic. We have already noted that an eschatological promise was explicit with the covenant. To make all these features the product of a coterie of post-exilic religionists, or something similar, besides ignoring what evidence there is, bespeaks a naturalistic prejudice with which we have no sympathy.

However, besides the introductory and exegetical difficulties which they pose, our chief reason for not discussing these earlier prophecies at greater length here is a result of our definition of terms. Because we are defining "Messianism" (for purposes of investigation) in this thesis as essentially a Davidic construct, we are treating these earlier prophecies instead as Heilshoffnung, that is, eschatological hopes. They represent the earliest national and religious aspirations of the Israelites; even Koenig describes them as "Spiegelbilder von Hauptwendungen des Geschichtsverlaufs".⁸ No doubt, they do represent the basic eschatological notion of the Hebrews (which was probably of great antiquity), that of a yearning for the return of the Urzeit.⁹ As Jewish national life took on a more definite, political (monarchical) character, its hopes naturally assumed that form too.

Most commentators on the subject, regardless of viewpoint,

⁸Eduard Koenig, Die Messianischen Weissagungen des Alten Testament (Stuttgart:Chr. Belser A. G. Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1925), p. 83.

⁹Walther Eichrodt, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1950), I, pp. 241-3.

lay great stress on II Sam. 7. Even Volz calls it "der unmittelbare Vorlaefer des Messiasglaubens".¹⁰ Kraus asserts: "Dieses Wort ist unableitbar aus irgendwelchen voelkischen Wuenschen oder Ideen".¹¹ As an explicit addition to Mowinkel's thesis, he asserts that the old amphyetyonic belief in Jahwe as king now altered itself into the belief that Jahwe had chosen David and his successors as His representatives. Jahwe now lets Himself be known through the davidids, as heirs of Nathan's prophecies.¹² Similarly Gressmann writes:

Der Messias sollte wirklich all die frommen Wuensche und Erwartungen erfuellen, die man vom regierenden Herrscher hegte; er sollte das wahr machen, was von dem gegenwaertigen Koenig hoechstens cum grano salis galt.¹³

Because David represented the acme of the Hebrew monarchy, he, more than anyone else became the type and foundation of Messianic hopes, as the New Testament too clearly testifies. Not only the king, but his kingdom and his Hofstil were idealized. As we have seen, in the popular mind this hope always remained more secular than religious. Evidently it was Isaiah who first took the political hopes of the people and transformed them into something endgueltig, that is, something truly

¹⁰Volz, op. cit., p. 14.

¹¹Hans Kraus, Die Koenigsherrschaft Gottes im Alten Testament (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1951), p. 92.

¹²Ibid., pp. 92-9.

¹³Hugo Gressmann, Der Ursprung der israelitisch-juedischen Eschatologie (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1905), p. 269.

and explicitly eschatological and spiritual for the first time. Thus Proksch comments:

So hat Jesaja dem Messiasbilde seine reichsten Farben und seine groesste Tiefe gegeben, in der es in die Zeit der Erfuellung hineinleuchtet. Jesaja hat Epoche gemacht. Die koenigliche Gestalt, die er in seinen messianischen Bildern immer wieder entworfen hat, ist aus der Hoffnung Israels nicht wieder verschwunden.¹⁴

In the same tone Micah meditates (5,2) on the contrast between the king's humble origins and his glorious accomplishments. Jeremiah (23, 5ff. and 33, 15ff.) beautifully summarizes the work of David's descendant in the phrase, *יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ*.

However, no doubt all these ideas received a tremendous impetus, especially in the popular mind, once the empirical kingdom had been destroyed. This is evident in Ezekiel's beautiful prophecies of the second David, the shepherd-king, who will guide and feed his people forever (34, 23-25; 37, 24-25). Ezekiel's words remain the clearest statement of explicit Messianism in all the prophetic literature, in spite of Volz' insistence that Ezekiel is merely repeating what the people want to hear¹⁵ (a very un-Ezekelian picture!), and Gressmann's assertion that his Messianic statements stand in complete contradiction to his sacerdotal emphases elsewhere.¹⁶

Accordingly the almost complete absence of this theme from

¹⁴ Otto Proksch, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1950), p. 585.

¹⁵ Volz, op. cit., p. 88.

¹⁶ Gressmann, Der Messias (op. cit.), p. 256.

the wisdom literature calls for an explanation, but most disturbing of all is its omission by Deuteroisaiiah. In spite of his emphasis on the kingdom, it is always Jahwe Himself who rules, not the Messiah (and 55,3 is no exception). Royal expressions of the theme are still dominant in Haggai and Zechariah, but now it evidently is Zerubbabel (or even Joshua) instead of David, who is idealized (Hag. 2, 23; Zech. 4, 14; 6, 13). This was of course the same ancient principle of identifying the Messiah with the ruling figure; for a brief moment Zerubbabel promised to be a second David.

In the post-canonical era, after this hope faded, Jewish thought on the Messiah, (still well in the Ezekiel-Zechariah and perhaps Daniel tradition however) found it easy to take the final step into the apocalyptic, where everything is transcendentalized, and all sorts of ancient mythologoumena cluster about the heavenly figure,¹⁷ who is only vaguely recognizable any more as the reincarnate David. Gressmann is undoubtedly correct:

Fuer den, der das Alte Testament kennt, tut sich hier eineneue Welt auf. Fast alles mutet ihn seltsam an. Die Ideen der Eschatologie sind zwar bis zu einem gewissen Grade dieselben geblieben, aber das Gewand, in das sie gekleidet werden, ist fremd und eigenartig. Ein Weltherrscher begegnet uns hier wie dort, aber welche Verbindungslinie fuehrt von David oder dem Knecht Jahwes zu dem fliegenden Menschen?¹⁸

Thus it is clear what various expressions of Messianic hopes the Old Testament makes. It was only in "the fulness of

¹⁷Mowinkel, op. cit., p. 305.

¹⁸Gressmann, Der Messias (op. cit.), p. 401

him that filleth all in all" (Eph. 1, 23) that the goal of all these varying descriptions and often irreligious aspirations became clear. Only in the fulness of time could the eye of faith discern why in times past Jahwe Sebaoth had anointed wicked and faithless kings over His people: to prepare the world for Him who was anointed to be King of kings--"whose kingdom shall have no end".

CHAPTER V

THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE PSALMS

In no area of Old Testament scholarship have such contrasting views been expressed as in the interpretation of the Psalms.¹ Indeed, most of the old questions come to a head here. Next to date of authorship, that of the presence or absence of eschatology has been at the center of the discussion.

It will be clear from the outset that, as one attempts to determine the eschatology or messianism of the Psalter, the Schriftprinzip with which he approaches the whole task will be much more decisive than the exegesis of any one or group of psalms. While this is true, of course, of the Scriptures in general, it is particularly obvious in the case of the Psalms, which are not so capable of defending themselves as the prophetic and historic writings.

Ever since the New Testament (following the Jewish custom of the time), conservative Christianity has often overemphasized and exaggerated the Messianic content of the Psalter (Theodore of Mopsuestia is the only notable exception). The allegorical exegesis of the Middle Ages found no difficulty in making the

¹For a good summary of scholarly thought on the psalter during the last twenty-five years and present opinion, with special reference to Gunkel and Mowinkel, see A. R. Johnson, "The Psalms", The Old Testament and Modern Study, edited by H. H. Rowley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), pp. 162-207. Our discussion here is partly dependent upon that essay.

Psalms a commentary, say, on St. Paul, if not the very words of Christ. Only a glance at Luther's commentary on the Psalms will show how very much he still stood within that tradition. In more recent times, Hengstenberg has been representative of this strictly Messianic interpretation. In slight contrast, John Calvin was willing to admit that the psalms referred originally to Israelite worship and Jewish kings; but, because of the rhapsodic language employed and the heavenly attributes assigned to the king, he too believed that they were fulfilled typically in Christ.²

No doubt in reaction to such views, and together with its general prejudice against eschatology, the Wellhausen school summarily assigned the psalms to the Hasmonean age, where their significance for the history of the Jewish religion was negligible. The road back to a fair evaluation of the Psalter began with Hermann Gunkel, who still, more than any other one man, dominates the scene of Psalms-scholarship today. While Gunkel denied neither a post-exilic origin nor an eschatological meaning (a celebration in anticipation of Jahwe's ultimate rule over world powers) to many of the psalms, his basic (and no doubt permanent) contribution was his attempt to determine the Sitz im Leben of the Psalms, chiefly with respect to Israel's own cultus, but also in connection with the religious

²See Gustave Oehler, Theology of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, nd.), p. 524.

life of the whole Near East.

In many ways, Mowinckel's thesis is (and admittedly so) merely a development of Gunkel's original hypothesis. However, Mowinckel takes explicit exception to Gunkel's spiritual or eschatological interpretation of the Psalms. In his own words:

Gegen die eschatologische Deutung sind nun zwei Hauptbedenken geltend zu machen. Erstens, dass die Psalmen mit keinem Worte andeuten, dass sie auf die fernere Zukunft gehen wollen. Sie haben tatsächlich nichts von dem prophetischen Stil, nie wird durch prophetische Einleitungsformeln angedeutet, dass hier etwa Prophetien vorlägen; nie verrät sich eine Spur von dem prophetischen Selbstbewusstsein, wie eine Andeutung von extatischem Schauen der künftigen Dinge. Kurz, Prophetien sind sie nicht.³

Rather, all the psalms were cultic in origin and cultic in meaning. As was particularly evident in the case of the Thronbesteigungslieder, the psalms were expressive of sacramental benefits the worshipper received by his participation in the festival. Only after this ancient ritual had died out did these psalms receive a futuristic interpretation at the hands of the Jewish congregations. Israel travelled "vom Erlebnis zur Hoffnung"; what she once received sacramentally she now believed she would receive eschatologically. All Old Testament eschatology then was supposed to have derived from this source.

Most interpretations of the psalms today still place considerable emphasis on their historical and/or cultic origin.

³Sigmund Mowinckel, "Psalmenstudien. II. Das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwees und der Ursprung der Eschatologie", Skrifter utgitt av Videnskapsselskapet i Kristiania (A. W. Broeggers Boktrykkeri), p. 15.

At the same time, varying degrees of emphasis are placed on their mythic roots and original eschatological intent.⁴

In the face of such varied views, what shall we say of the eschatology of the psalter? This problem ramifies to such an amazing extent, as should already be evident, that we can do no more here than make a few observations and attempt to draw a few tentative conclusions on the basis of principles we have already enunciated.⁵

Central in the whole attempt to determine the original life-situation of the psalms, of course, is the question of their date. If the majority of them are only a century or two older than the Gospels, we should expect to find a quite explicit and detailed eschatology there. However, a glance at the psalms shows that such is not the case. While there is much here that might be eschatological (where the argument has turned all along), this is never as fervent or vivid or explicit as, in that case, it had been in the prophetic visions several centuries before. Above all, the traits of apocalyptic literature, which are now supposed to be in full bloom, are almost entirely missing. The entire Weltanschauung of the psalter is much more "primitive" and unalloyed than that.

To our way of thinking, all this points toward relatively

⁴See Hans Kraus, Die Koenigsherrschaft Gottes im Alten Testament (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1951), pp. 15-20.

⁵Since the author has had occasion to read none of Gunkel's works and only the second volume of Mowinckel's Psalmenstudien, to say nothing of the host of other works on introductory and other technical problems relating to the psalms, he can claim to no real understanding of the field; hence the tentativeness of his statements.

early authorship. We have already noted (in Chap. II) that the Old Testament's vocabulary of hope is concentrated in the psalter, and that its basic forward look is nowhere more evident than in these songs.⁶ We are of the opinion, accordingly, that the Psalter, besides being one of the earliest expressions of Hebrew eschatology, is one of the purest examples of that faith and hope, which, as we have often noted, was an intrinsic and indispensable element of the covenant-faith. These expressions of hope in the psalter represent the fundamental, of which the prophetic amplifications and emphases are the overtones. While the more striking and comprehensive illustrations of prophetic eschatology (the Day, remnant) are absent, the message is clearly the same: Jahwe rules, the nations will be defeated, Israel will be vindicated, etc.⁷ The stereotyped formulas of the psalter testify both to the antiquity of the covenant-faith and to their original liturgical use in the Israelite cultus. At the same time, the straightforwardness and simplicity of expression accounts for the Psalter's adaptability to the needs of both Jewish and Christian congregations century after century.

Mowinkel's disallowance of any original eschatology

⁶There is no need to repeat here what we have already discussed in some detail in Chapter II. For a concise summary of the Gebetsformeln of the psalter, see August von Gall, Basileia tou Theou (Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitaetsbuchhandlung, 1926), pp. 248-9.

⁷See Geerhardus Vos, "Eschatology of the Psalter", The Princeton Theological Review, XVIII (1920), pp. 9-20.

in the psalter is no doubt exaggerated (as most commentators agree), particularly if the revelation of the covenant was of any antiquity. To what extent it was the current regent or an eschatological (Messianic) king that the psalms originally visualized is very moot at the present. That the Israelite king ruled in Jahwe's stead we know, and that popular superstition may have overemphasized his power seems probable, but the estimates of him as a sacramental mediator, etc., still seem to be based too much on the naturalistic assumption of religious evolution out of crude forms, which has vitiated so much Old Testament criticism in the past. That view differs fundamentally from the idea of historical development (which was also revelation) out of the basic revelation of a covenant, which we have propounded in the preceding chapters of this thesis.

The composition of many of the psalms while the Hebrew monarchy was flourishing certainly is sufficient to account for the recurrent emphasis on the kingdom, a theme which prophetic and apocalyptic eschatology cherished with equal fervor. Accordingly, von Gall notes:

Schliesslich ist die Bitte um das Kommen des Reiches Gottes mehr oder weniger das einigende Band aller Psalmen, der rote Faden, der sich auch durch ihre Sammlungen zieht. Und schwerlich haette die aelteste Kirche den Psalter zu ihrem Gebet- und Gesangbuch gemacht, wenn sie nicht aus ihm als Grundmotiv die Melodie herausgehört haette: ⁸

⁸ Von Gall, op. cit., p. 213.

Interpretations of the kingdom theme in the psalter vary all the way from Mowinckel's complete repudiation of eschatology to traditional Messianism of the Christian church. Most likely we must grant a much deeper dialectic here than either viewpoint would. Without the frank futurism of prophetic eschatology, we see here a beautiful expression of the ancient belief that Jahwe controls history: the concrete historical forms through which He does this now are the best means to describe how He will do it at the end of history. Viewpoints differ here too. Proksch writes:

Wir finden also im Psalter den Begriff der *Βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ*, aber bereits als Gegenwart, nicht erst als Zukunft, wenn er sich auch in der Zukunft vollendet. Er haftet nicht am messianischen Reich, sondern an der Weltherrschaft Jahves ueber alle Voelker.⁹

Kraus' view is different: Die Propheten weisen auf das Ziel der Geschichte hin, die Saenger der Thronbesteigungpsalmen wissen sich bereits in die Zeit des Endes versetzt.¹⁰

Robinson's view is mediating:

It is possible, perhaps more than merely possible, that we have here rather the raw material from which the fabric of Messianic expectation was finally woven by later hands, but, on the other hand, we cannot altogether close our eyes to the possibility that, in their desire to exalt to the uttermost the monarchs whom they served, the poets brought near to them that glorious future when Jahveh's Anointed should hold sway over a new heaven and a new earth.¹¹

⁹Otto Proksch, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlage, 1950, p. 387.

¹⁰Kraus, op. cit., p. 128.

¹¹Theodore H. Robinson, "The Eschatology of the Psalmists" The Psalmists, edited by D. C. Simpson (London: Humphrey Milford, 1926), p. 103.

Outside of a few Thronbesteigungspsalmen, Christian interest in the psalter has often centered in those psalms which were quoted in the New Testament and applied to Christ. Of course, that was a necessary theological judgment, the same one which the church must make today if its use of the Psalter is to be truly Christian and not moralistic. However, that is of little concern to the exegete. Whatever applies to the psalter as a whole applies with equal measure to these psalms.

Following this principle and using the definitions we have already stated, it will be clear that what we call "Messianic" in the Psalter (as throughout the Old Testament) will depend upon our approach and definition of terms. (It is noteworthy that Theodore of Mopsuestia already identified the hero of Ps. 110 with Simon Maccabaeus!¹²) The possible connection of II Sam. 7 with the "Messianic" psalms is somewhat problematical; a close connection would favor an eschatological interpretation.¹³ Psalm 2 is probably the most strictly "Messianic" of all.

Particularly in the historical psalms, however, where God's past mercies are celebrated and His covenant invoked for continued mercies, do we find the common and irreplaceable denominator of all Old Testament eschatology. This faith is inseparable from Jahwe's nature as well as from His self-revelation to His people

¹²Ibid., op. cit., p. 102.

¹³See Proksch, op. cit., p. 388.

through the covenant. Of this basic theme everything else in the Old Testament is but commentary and variation on the basis of fresh historical examples.

It remains for us yet to investigate some of the major themes of Old Testament eschatology. In the light of what has been recorded in previous chapters, it might be more appropriate to call these themes only illustrations of the fundamental principles of Old Testament theology. God's purposeful activity with His people, indeed, in one way or another, all such themes are but variations of that theme of redemption.

All of these themes easily fit into a system and are relatively easy to explain except the one to which we have thus far come, the eschatological belief. Both because of its originality and because of its primacy, a greater literature has generally given us such Eschatological themes of the latter-day harvest than almost any other theme. The four Gospels (Matt. 13: 1-4; 13, 1-9; 13, 4-9; and 13, 18-51; 13) are no doubt offered in the light of the fact, where Christian thought has continued to live, as there have been Christians, as the regard of the harvest is most justified. However, there are very few Old Testament eschatological themes, in spite of the fact that they are so closely related to the harvest.

CHAPTER VI

SPECIAL THEMES OF OLD TESTAMENT ESCHATOLOGY

It remains for us yet to investigate some of the major themes of Old Testament eschatology. In the light of what we have asserted in previous chapters, it might be more appropriate to call these themes only illustrations of the foundation-principle of Old Testament theology: Jahwe's purposeful covenant with His people. Indeed, in one way or another, all these themes are but variations of that Theme of redemption.

All of these themes easily fit into a system and are relatively easy to explain except the one to which we must first turn our attention briefly. Both because of its originality and because of its poignancy, a greater literature has probably grown up about Deuteroisaiah's theme of the Suffering Servant than around any other theme. The four Servant Poems (42, 1-4; 49, 1-6; 50, 4-9; and 52, 13-53, 12) are no doubt climaxed in the last of the four, where Christian interest has centered as long as there have been Christians, as the record of the Ethiopian eunuch testifies. However, here one more or less confronts an unicum in Old Testament theology, in spite of certain weak parallels that may be drawn with Jeremiah's laments.¹

¹See Otto Proksch, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1950), p. 589.

It is noteworthy that in this concept Deuteroisaiah picks up a strand of the covenant-revelation which is almost neglected elsewhere in the Old Testament. Usually the emphasis is on Israel's ultimate triumph (even if through temporary tribulation), the glories of the new aeon, etc. However, the covenant had not only assured final victory; it had also been a seal of the continued condescension of Him who dwelt between the cherubim in order to guide and redeem His people. This last emphasis had too often been taken for granted. Hosea had already taken up the idea, but it remained for Deuteroisaiah to illustrate it in the unforgettable fashion of which he above all others was capable. Eichrodt notes:

Diese endzeitliche Erscheinung der berith aber ist kein ritueller Einzelakt, keine neue Verfassung oder Organisation, sondern verkorpert sich in einem menschlichen Personenleben, in dem Gottesknecht, der als Bundesmittler fuer das Volk bestimmt ist. In ihm offenbart sich der goettliche Gemeinschaftswille als ein Wille zum stellvertretenden Leiden, durch welchen das Bundesvolk mit seinem messianischen Herrscher zu einer unloesbaren Gemeinschaft zusammengeschlossen und mit Gott versoehnt wird . . .²

As in other instances, later prophets failed to follow in this master's footsteps, and again returned to a reiteration of the less sublime and near-political themes already common. Zechariah indeed speaks of a servant, but in a rather off-hand way and with none of the theological content of the Servant Poems. It remained for the Christians, with their deeper understanding of Jahwe's

²Walther Eichrodt, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1950), I, pp. 20-1.

grace through the cross, and contemplating on the events of the Passion, to see in these words the beginning of that Revelation which would exhibit both suffering and service in their noblest light.

We cannot even begin here to investigate all the various exegetical opinions that have been expressed of the Ebed songs. There is little historical evidence with which one can work, and the exact function of the servant seems to vary in the different songs. Be that as it may, the Ebed would not be "Messianic" according to the definition of that term which we have adopted in this thesis. On the other hand, in the total context, and from the standpoint of Christian theology, it must be admitted that the figure is very Messianic, because of its sublimity and because of the absence of political overtones often connected with messianism proper. We have already noted Deuteroisaiah's emphasis on the new aeon. It is by his atonement for sin and service for his people that the Ebed makes this new aeon a reality. In that way we might assert that all the messianic beliefs of the Hebrews converge in this one sublime figure.³ The very absence of an explicit historical setting and the unknown lineage of the figure exhibit the totally eschatological character of Deuteroisaiah's prophecy in a most forceful way and leave this picture still more vividly etched on the memory.

³Hugo Gressmann, Der Messias (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1929), p. 337.

Much more common in the Old Testament and much clearer, both in origin and purpose, is the theme of the Day of Jahwe. Like some ominous thunderclap in the distance, we can hear this theme on nearly every page of the prophetic discourses. Although this concept contains both Heils- and Unheilsehato
logie and often shows clearly the necessary dialectic between the two, the latter is by far the more prominent. As we shall note shortly, it is intimately connected with the ideas of Jahwe's wrath and the impending doom of this aeon. It is not exaggeration when Koehler writes: "Die Anschauung von dem Gerichte, das Gott haelt wenn sein grosser und furchtbarer Tag kommt, ist das Grundgeruest der prophetischen Verkuendigung."⁴

The origins and development of the concept of the Day are not unusually difficult to trace. In fact, many of the basic elements of Old Testament theology, as well as the means by which God unfolded His successive revelations through history, converge and become very obvious here. We have noted often enough that the cornerstone of the Hebrew faith was the covenant; all the Israelite assurance of its election, God's mastery of history and control of the universe, etc. It is noteworthy what a mighty testimony to this faith the ancient songs recorded in Ex. 15 and Judges 5 give. As Eichrodt notes:

Von Anfang an wurde Jahves maechtige Gegenwart als

⁴See Ludwig Koehler, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Tuebingen: J. C. E. Mohr, 1947), p. 210.

Herrscher und Helfer nie intensiver erlebt als am Tage der Schlacht, der so recht "sein Tag" war. Da wurde man jubelnd seine unbegrenzte Macht inne, mit der er seine Hasser in die Flucht trieb und jede Antastung einer Herrschaft zusehenden machte . . . je drohender die Macht der Fremdvoelker emporwuchs, um so hoeher stiegen die Erwartungen fuer sein neu zu erringendes Herrschertum, um so wundervoller erschien die Zeit seines endgueltigen Sieges.

Just where the specific emphasis on the catastrophic events of one Day began is difficult to say. However, there is no reason to doubt that it was present from the very beginning—even though minus the dramatic emphases of the prophets. History is composed of days, and since Jahwe is the Lord of history, He must consummate His covenant on a specific day, just as He entered history on other days to separate light from darkness, to make promises to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, etc. Although day and night were both the same to Him and a thousand years in His sight but as yesterday, His coming in past, present, and future necessarily occurred on days of an earthly calendar.

As Israel developed as a nation and entered the arena of history, its historical consciousness, like that of any nation,⁵ grew correspondingly. Here is where religious and political pathways begin to part, and the specific antitheses of many of the prophetic sermons about the Day begin

⁵Eichrodt, op. cit., p. 233.

⁶Compare the deep historical consciousness and reverence for tradition of the ancient historical national groups of Europe in contrast to the flippant disregard of the past often obvious in the Americas.

to appear. The god, "history", began to be worshipped more than the God of history. Israel's national pride and ambitions as the goal of history replaced those which Jahwe had revealed together with His covenant. All the ethical implications of God's promises and continued presence were sidetracked. Jahwe and His covenant became nothing but symbols and shibboleths of this nationalistic fetishism.

Against such a complete perversion the prophets could do nothing but protest most vigorously. Beyond a doubt, Gressmann is completely correct in his almost monotonous emphasis on Amos 5, 18 ff. as proof of the fact that the Day-concept was already then hoary with age. Although Amos is evidently the first to grapple with this specific concept, his whole prophecy indicates that both the perversion of as well as the materials for a correct estimate of the concept were at hand in the nation's traditions. If not with explicit reference to this theme, previous prophets had certainly preached the same sermon.⁷ Thus Gressmann traces this preaching back to the Nebim,⁸ and similarly Sellin traces its origins to the sermons of Elijah, Micaiah, etc.⁹ Mowinckel

⁷The common Theory that Amos and the eighth-century prophets originated "ethical monotheism" we disregard completely. That we have no record of such an emphasis before that time is a horrible example of the argumentum e silentio. Furthermore the whole assumption is naturalistic through and through.

⁸Hugo Gressmann, Der Ursprung der israelitisch-juedischen Eschatologie (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1905), p.155.

⁹Ernst Sellin, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Leipzig: Quelle und Meyer, 1933), pp. 85 ff.

too notes the emphasis of these early, non-literary prophets on Israel's future misfortunes as a "voruebergehendes Ereignis in der Geschichte des Volkes",¹⁰ of which the Day was soon to become the symbol par excellence.¹¹

We may note yet one other possible origin of the term, "Day", in its technical sense, although it is perfectly possible, on the other hand, that prophetic usage first gave it this signification. Both in Hebrew and in Arabic "day" may mean as much as "day of battle".¹² The word is used in just this sense once in the phrase, "day of Midian" (Is. 9, 4). Whether this is its origin or not, this would account for the frequent battle or defeat-context of the Day-passages.

As with much of the rest of Old Testament eschatology, it was Amos, as far as the records tell us, who first made "day" into a terminus technicus, which it remained into the New Testament. He first combines "die Zeit des Bedraengnisses" with "der Tag des Kommens".¹³ He bitterly combats the popular

¹⁰ Sigmund Mowinckel, "Psalmenstudien. II. Das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwaes und der Ursprung der Eschatologie", Skrifter utgit av Videnskapsselskapet i Kristiania (A. W. Broeggers Boktrykkeri, 1922), p. 226.

¹¹ Naturally Mowinckel also derives the figure of the "day" itself from the Thronbesteigungsfest: the eschatological Day when Jahwe would come was a prophetic interpretation of the then-extinct cultic day when Jahwe did come. If such a festival ever was celebrated in Israel, all of Mowinckel's theorizing is most plausible here.

¹² R. H. Charles, A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1899), p. 85.

¹³ Mowinckel, op. cit., p. 266.

superstitious belief in a ג'ו' טו' טו' (even to the point of describing Jahwe as a Pestgott, 6, 10), and preaches primarily a ג'ו' טו'. All the ethical implications of Jahwe's activity in history and His consummation of History on that Day are revived and preached fearlessly. Furthermore, no ritualism or mere physical descent from Abraham would have any significance on that Day; a disobedient Israel would be no more immune to God's wrath than the pagan nations, to which popular superstition had limited it.

After Amos, this same dialectic of Heil and Unheil is carried out with varying emphases and applications by all the prophets. At the eclipse of the northern kingdom, Isaiah applies it with equal force both to Judah and to the foreign nations. After the Exile, with radically altered circumstances, the emphasis naturally shifts more toward Heilseschatologie, although the old dialectic still clearly exists. We must note too that, with typical independence, Deuteroisaiiah (with two possible exceptions: 52,6 and 61,2) almost completely avoids the term. As we shall note again later, Daniel rarely uses the exact terminology of previous prophets, but the import is the same.

Many of the Day-prophecies dealt with the destruction of Jerusalem, Edom, Moab, etc., and others with the blessings of the new aeon. Many of the former were clearly fulfilled in defeat on some historical day, and Christian faith clearly saw the fulfillment of many of the latter in their own day.

However, unless we indulge in some radical allegorizing (and as the restatement of the same prophecies in the New Testament proves), the final fulfillment of both still lies in the future.

At the same time this double dialectic of the Day-prophecies is often the despair of the exegete. In the midst of all sorts of other figures and illustrations, it is very difficult to determine how many of the picturesque prophecies of the future, on the one hand, were mere ad hominem metaphors to describe something near at hand, and on the other, how many were valiant attempts to describe something so far removed from human experience that only figures could begin to describe it. What the prophets meant metaphorically, we must not interpret literally (chiliasm), but what they meant literally we also must not allegorize. Whenever the prophetic vision was actually fixed on the "endgeschichtliche Ereignisse", mythical and traditional sources were no doubt tapped to make the revelations intelligible. Here, of course, we approach one of the tenuous distinctions between eschatology and apocalyptic: the former interprets natural phenomena (war, earthquakes, etc.) as God's means in history, while the latter predicts and describes disasters outside the historical experience of mankind (sun darkened, monsters, etc.)¹⁴

¹⁴Cf. Theodore H. Robinson, "The Eschatology of the Psalmists", The Psalmists, edited by D. C. Simpson (London: Humphrey Milford, 1926), pp. 88-9. Along the same lines Robinson distinguishes between "simple prophecy" and eschatology, but we believe our distinction is both more accurate and more useful.

Since the יְמֵי הַיּוֹם , in spite of many historical applications, ultimately refers to the juncture of the aeons of history and eternity (the correspondence of the יּוֹם of creation), it is a concept which truly embraces all of Old Testament eschatology. This is evident from the constant repetition of certain introductory formulas involving the "Day", which are used almost to the point of banality by the prophets, but are also among the more obvious features clearly stamping a discourse as eschatological. Although some of the typical emphases of the Day-passages (destruction of land, captivity, etc.) are occasionally used without these expressis verbis,¹⁵ this is definitely the exception rather than the rule. The same formulas are used indiscriminately to introduce prophecies of both threat and promises. Taking all the formulas together, twenty-five are threatening, and sixty-one are promissory to Israel. Some twenty-two others introduce Heidenorakeln.

Most common of the introductory formulas is בְּיּוֹם הַיּוֹם , a veritable storm signal in all prophetic usage. In Am. 8,3; Jer. 48, 41; 49,22,26; and 50,36, it is connected directly with a יְמֵי הַיּוֹם . At times it is doubtful whether the reference is merely temporal or whether the technical, eschatological phrase is actually being used. Excluding doubtful passages, the phrase is used a total of fifty-one times, thirty-five times to predict Heil, sixteen times to presage doom. The

¹⁵See Sellin, op. cit., p. 86.

plural is used less often, although with more variety, and prepares the way for the later shift of emphasis from the cataclysmic יְוֹם יְהוָה to the new aeon. יְוֹם יְהוָה is used once of both Heil and Unheil (Jer. 31, 29-30), but otherwise to introduce promises, chiefly in Jeremiah. $\text{הִנֵּנִי יְוֹם יְהוָה}$ is always introductory, to threats and promises for Israel as well as to prophecies against the heathen. Occasionally the variant בְּיְוֹם יְהוָה is used, always of promises, although in conclusion as well as introductory. The substitution of נָא for וְעַתָּה came more gradually (probably as the belief in a new aeon in contrast to another mere historical deliverance became more vivid) and points to a more apocalyptic picture than its parent. The two terms are paralleled once in Eze. 7, 12. However, בְּיְוֹם יְהוָה is used over a dozen times in all the prophetic literature from Amos to Daniel, and again both of threats and promises.¹⁶ In Daniel the emphasis has shifted from the Day of acute crisis to the whole series of afflictions before the end (cf. the later apocalyptic and Rabbinic emphasis on the dolores Messiae, also reflected in the New Testament), as contrasted with the glories of the new aeon. Daniel uses בְּיְוֹם יְהוָה (12,1) and בְּיְוֹם יְהוָה (10,14), once each in common with earlier prophets, but he prefers וְעַתָּה , וְעַתָּה , or וְעַתָּה ,

¹⁶Gressmann (Der Messias, op. cit., pp. 87-8) makes the noteworthy conjecture that the later collections of a prophet's writings were often made partly on the basis of these formulas. This is usually most noticeable in the collections of promises at the close of many of the books. The largest such cluster is found in Jer. 30-31,6.

all of which harmonize well with the apocalyptic tone of the book.

Infinitely more variegated are the many modifiers and clauses used to describe the Day. Very common and no doubt original is the forceful יוֹם יְהוָה. However, this is paralleled and amplified by a host of other modifiers, which we dare only sample here. The most memorable and most complete collection of these, of course, is the dies irae collection in Zeph. 1, 14-16. One of the most charming is Isaiah's (22,5) beautiful alliteration: פְּתוּחַת וּפְרוּסָה וּפְרוּסָה וּפְרוּסָה. Similarly most of the other modifiers deal with the concepts of God's wrath, warfare, destruction, etc. Thus we find כִּסֵּף לַיהוָה, עֲבֹרָה, מֵאֵף, חֲדָיוֹן אִפּוֹ, plus many others. Many of these same or similar expressions are used to modify ἡμέρα in the New Testament.

We have already noted that most frequently, especially before the Exile, the Day-passages are Unheilseschatologie. That fact brings us face to face with a prominent feature of Old Testament eschatology, the doctrine of the wrath of God.¹⁷ While that concept is considerably wider than that of the Day, it achieves very forceful expression and eschatological application there. We prefer to put the emphasis on God's wrath

¹⁷ In common with the sentimental and optimistic religionism popular in the past century, this doctrine, in both testaments as well as in preaching, has been sadly neglected. Of all the theologies of the Old Testament, with which the author is acquainted, he has found no better discussion of the subject anywhere than in Eichrodt.

rather than on the judgment. The forensic and royal implications of the latter, while commonplace in apocalyptic and the New Testament, do not receive comparable emphasis in the Old (except possibly the Psalms), where the punishment at the end of the world is more generally accomplished by a catastrophe or war than by a judgment.¹⁸ (Cf. Am. 1-2; Hos. 4,1 ff; 8,13; Is. 3,13 f; Mal. 3, 2 ff.)

The concept of God's wrath was obviously deeply rooted in Israel's religious consciousness, as the record of the expulsion from Paradise already shows. Even though the early descriptions are often anthropopathic and even manistic, they do indicate "ein stets waches Gefuehl fuer den furchtbaren Gerichtsernst".¹⁹ It was the prophets again who evidently used the raw materials of ancient traditions to develop their doctrine of Jahwe's wrath, and again history became their proof. Thus Eichrodt notes:

Damit wird die ganze Vergangenheit eine Zeit goettlichen Zuwartens bis zu dem Termin der endgueltigen Abrechnung; alle bisherigen Strafen . . . werden aber zum Hinweis auf die drohende letzte Zornesoffenbarung, die also Auswirkung des radikalen Gegensatzes zwischen Gott und Menschheit das Vernichtungsgericht herbeifuehrt. Der Gotteszorn wird aus einem zeitweiligen Unglueck zu dem unabwendbaren eschatologischen Verhaengnis, das etwas Endgueltiges ueber Gottes Verhalten aussagt, der Tag Jahves wird zu einem Tag des Zorns.²⁰

¹⁸See Robinson, op. cit., pp. 96-7.

¹⁹Eichrodt, op. cit., p. 235.

²⁰Ibid., p. 129.

After Amos and up to the Exile, this doctrine was applied with particular emphasis to the unfaithful Israelites themselves.

"Weil Israel von allen anderen Voelkern ausgezeichnet worden ist, darum muss es auch Gottes Gericht mit besonderer Schwere erfahren." ²¹

As usual too, the prophets never passed up a metaphor or pregnant word that would serve their purposes. Thus הִשָּׁקֵף is often connected with שָׁפַךְ (Jer. 4,4; 21,12) or activated by the parallel verbs, הִשָּׁקֵף and הִשָּׁקֵף , "als brodelnde Fluessigkeit ausgegossen".²² Particularly in poetry, הִשָּׁקֵף is frequent, "eizentlich den 'Unmut' ohne den Zusatz des Pathetischen".²³ The vivid verbs, הִשָּׁקֵף , הִשָּׁקֵף , and הִשָּׁקֵף are also used. Most picturesque of all, the doomed must drink of the cup of Jahwe's wrath (Jer. 25,15; Is. 51,17.22; Job 21,20). In the semi-apocalyptic writings the final destruction of the heathen is described as occurring before the very gates of Jerusalem (Eze. 38-39; Joel 4; Zech. 13-14).

However, in the eschatological dialectic Heil and Unheil were really completely inseparable. This fact is most obvious in the preachment of the "remnant", one of the most moving features of Old Testament eschatology. Like other features of their theology, the prophets no doubt rescued this expression

²¹ Ibid., p. 236.

²² Proksch, op. cit., p. 643.

²³ Ibid.

from a purely secular use and freighted it with theological meaning. In fact, a concordance study of the various words translated "remnant" shows that even in the latest times these same words continued to be used in non-theological senses.

Most common of these words is הַיָּרֵמָנָה , used a total of sixty-four times in the Old Testament. Next, used thirty-nine times, is שָׁרִיט (both Aramaic and Hebrew). Very frequent also and very vivid are the twin expressions, $\text{טָרַח$ and פָּרַח , both of which denote one who has fled in terror, but escaped from some battle or other catastrophe. Also used are קָרָח and רֵשִׁיט , which mean as much as "superfluity, residue", and even אֲחֵרֵיט once.

Again it is almost impossible to distinguish the Heil and Unheil in the use of these terms. When the terms are applied to foreign nations (as in Amos 1-2), they usually denote simply Unheil for them and Heil for Israel. However, when the remnant of Israel of Judah is spoken of, its chief emphasis is often difficult to discern. Certainly, no concept in the Old Testament depicts Jahwe's complete control of both creation and redemption as clearly as this one. Hertrich is correct in noting that the concept emphasizes the "Kommen Gottes in diese Weltzeit, in dem er sich Menschen als der Heilige offenbart".²⁴ As Jahwe had elected Israel originally in his covenant, so now He would elect or rescue those who had remained faithful.

²⁴ Hertrich, "λεῖμμα", Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935), IV, p. 205.

Thus the prophets often compare this process with the deliverance from Egypt (Is. 4, 2 ff; 11,16; Mi. 2, 12 f; Jer. 23,5, etc.) Because of the election, Israel's basic character was that of a remnant (Is. 46,3), a quality it would retain into eternity (Mi. 4,7).

It was Amos again, apparently, who attached ethical significance to the term, applied it to Israel as well as to the Heathen, and used it to attack the vain complacency of his generation. As Eichrodt notes in connection with the term:

Die Hoffnung der Propheten ist darum ein "Hoffen, da nichts zu hoffen ist" und liegt auf einer ganz anderen Ebene als die Erwartung aus dem Gericht noch mit einem blauen Auge davonzukommen.²⁵

Opinions vary widely as to just how the term is to be interpreted. Mowinkel believes the concept is basically one of grace, an echo of Jahwe's mythic triumph over chaos, and he notes well that the expression is never $\text{סְאֵרָוֹתַי} \text{ וְיָאֵשׁ}$, but always $\text{סְאֵרָוֹתַי} \text{ וְיָאֵשׁ}$.²⁶ On the other hand, Gressmann asserts that its earliest usage by the prophets was Unheil.²⁷ Although this sense is predominant in Amos, he too points forward in the startling וְיָאֵשׁ of 5,15: "perhaps Jahwe Zebaoth will compassionate the remnant of Joseph". Gressmann sees in this concept the bridge between Heils- and Unheilseschatologie,

²⁵ Eichrodt, op. cit., p. 190, n. 2.

²⁶ Mowinkel, op. cit., pp. 281 ff.

²⁷ Gressmann, Ursprung (op. cit.), p. 229.

especially in the precanonical and early prophetic literature.²⁸ Hertrich agrees that "der Restgedanke zumeist troestlichen Charakter hat";²⁹ While there may be some emphasis on "die Grosse des Gerichts", there is relatively little on "die kleine Zahl der Geretteten".³⁰

The concept probably receives its most forceful expression in Isaiah, as the laconic last verse of his call (6,13) indicated. He named his first son Shearjashub, and that message became an explicit part of his preaching (10,20 ff.) In later prophecy and in connection with its basic emphasis of God's grace and election, the term is applied more universalistically also to the Gentiles (Is. 45, 20 ff.; 66, 19 ff.; Eze. 36, 35f.; Zech. 9,7; 14, 16).

As we noted above, the final import of the וַיְהִי is that of a Day of Glory, rooted in the faith in Jahwe, who is merciful and faithful to His covenant. At this point all the features of Old Testament eschatology merge: Messianism, the apocalyptic, the new aeon, the kingdom, etc. On this Day Jahwe will finally restore all that sin had perverted, the restoration toward which the covenant had always pointed. To describe this endgueltig concept, portrayed by various pictures in the Old Testament, is the task that still lies

²⁸ Ibid., p. 243.

²⁹ Hertrich, op. cit., p. 202.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 209.

before us in this thesis.

The contrast between the aeons and the return of something that has previously been missing is emphasized by the expression, שׁוּב שְׁלוֹת. In many ways it parallels the idea of a Day of Glory. That the literal meaning of שְׁלוֹת should not be pressed in this phrase is evident from its frequent use in pre-captivity contexts (Am. 9, 14; Hos. 6, 11; Zeph. 2,7). Evidently שְׁלוֹת had early received the figurative meaning of "fate, lot, trouble". As שׁוּב, the second half of the phrase, meant "repent" with men as its subject, it meant "restore, renew" with Jahwe as subject, especially in the Hiphil. Early these two words were evidently combined to mean "to make an about-face, to bring in the Zeitwende".³¹ Its secular usage is clear in Job 42, 10. In eschatological dogma it meant that grace must follow the outpouring of Jahwe's wrath, the remnant will soon be rescued, the new aeon will begin. The particular fury of the catastrophes before the end would make the final rescue more blessed. Gressmann summarizes well:

Der terminus technicus dafuer lautet שׁוּב שְׁלוֹת die Wendung wenden, ein spezifisch heilseschatologischer Ausdruck, der die Wiederherstellung der Stadt oder des Landes in den fruheren Zustand bezeichnet, genauer in den Zustand am Anfang der Welt.³²

³¹With typical originality, Mowinckel (op. cit., p. 287) conjectures that the phrase originally meant "Happy New Year" in connection with the annual sacramental renewal at the New Year's festival, and only later came to have this eschatological meaning.

³²Gressmann, Der Messias (op. cit.), p. 147.

(Cf. Ps. 14,7; 53,6; 85,1; Eze. 29,14; 39,25; etc.) More and more in Jewish thought this work of restitution became the task of the Messianic king. Malachi ascribes a work of *ἔπι κατάρτισις* to Elijah (4,6--the last words of the Old Testament), and the concept is still stated explicitly in the New Testament (Acts 3, 21).

One of the best known metaphors used to describe the Endzeit is that of the kingdom. However, it is easy to see that this particular feature is much more prominent in Rabbinic thought and the New Testament than in the Old. As was the case with Messianism, with which the kingdom-concept is closely related, the danger is great here that we fail to allow the Old Testament to speak for itself.

Again it is risky to be dogmatic as to the exact import of the kingdom concept. Most knotty of all is the question whether it is merely another of many metaphors describing Jahwe's rule of heaven and earth, culminating in the new aeon, or whether it is predominantly conceived of as the antitype of the empirical kingdom of David, that is, specifically Messianic.

It seems highly improbable that the description of Jahwe as a king was a primitive element in Hebrew thought. Both the Old Testament and archaeology testify to the original tribal and nomadic character of Israelite society. Even if we assume severe editing at a late date, it is almost astounding how seldom Jahwe is described as a king, in spite

of innumerable other confessions of His omnipotence. Perhaps prophetic opposition to the ruling kings accounts for much of the absence of this metaphor.

On the other hand, the closest descriptions of Jahwe as a king are found in the psalms. It may be true that the familiar יְהוָה מֶלֶךְ of the Thronbesteigungspsalmen is metaphorical, that is, merely means that Jahwe is supreme, without any particular emphasis on kingship. However, although we are not in agreement with it, we dare not ignore Mowinkel's assertion that this is the starting point of Hebrew eschatology. The contrast between these frequent assertions in the psalms and its rarity elsewhere, particularly in the prophets, does suggest that the latter suppressed a popular opinion because of political circumstances, which reappeared only later when those abuses, occasioned by the empirical kingdom, had disappeared forever.

Obviously, later Judaism forgot "das ueberweltliche Pathos"³³ and the metaphorical quality of the term and perverted it into something chiefly political. Proksch notes:

Im Unterschiede von der Herrschaft Gottes, die in Natur und Geschichte allerorten und allerzeiten besteht und in seiner Schoepferstellung begruendet ist, ist das Reich Gottes ein eschatologischer Begriff, bei dem es die Vollendung seines Weltplan gilt. Man soll daher Reich Gottes und Herrschaft Gottes identifizieren, wie es besonders in der misverstaendlichen Wiedergabe der neutestamentlichen

³³ Proksch, op. cit., p. 39.

Βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ durch Gottesherrschaft so häufig geschieht, was auf reformierten Einflüssen beruht.³⁴

That Jahwe rules is certainly the indispensable minimum of Old Testament theology; and we are probably always on safe ground if we make every other feature of Old Testament thought a simple corollary of that basic principle. We believe such an approach resolves most of the difficulty about the kingdom-concept. Then it becomes merely another way of saying the only thing the Old Testament ever says. Proksch notes what a fundamental part of Jahwism this is:

Im messianischen Reich setzt Jahve sein Weltreich auf Erden durch, das sich durch seine Grosstaten in der Geschichte bereits anbahnt, aber erst am Juengsten Tage vollenden wird. Dieser Gedanke des Reiches Gottes hat seine Wurzel im Monotheismus; denn der Gott Himmels und der Erden, der Schoepfer der Welt, ueberlaesst die Welt nicht sie selber, als ginge sie ihm nichts an, sondern durchwaeltet sie und fuehret sie dem Ziele zu, das er ihr bestimmt hat.³⁵

Likewise Messel notes that the conceptions of Jahwe as king and judge merely emphasize different aspects of the same truth:

Dass Gott Koenig ist, und dass er Richter ist, sind zwei gleichdeutige Bilder. Hoechstens konnte man sagen, dass das erste Bild mehr das ruhende Verhaeltnis Gottes zur Welt, seine Stellung und Wuerde, bezeichnen kann, waehrend das andere immer sein aktives Verhaeltnis ausdrueckt, seine Wirksamkeit gegenueber der Welt oder genauer der Menschwelt, also seine Lenkung der Weltgeschichte.³⁶

³⁴Ibid., p. 591.

³⁵Ibid., p. 596.

³⁶N. Messel, Die Einheitlichkeit der juedischen Eschatologie (Giessen: Alfred Toepelmann, 1915), p. 181.

Although other prophets too spoke of the kingdom, it is in Deuteroisaiah again where we see most clearly how utterly impossible it is to isolate the kingdom-concept from other descriptions of the new aeon. In fact, here we become convinced that the "kingdom" is only one among many descriptions, and that we must search for some other more comprehensive term which covers them all. While there is hardly a characteristic of what we customarily classify under the kingdom which Deuteroisaiah does not mention, it is noteworthy that that particular metaphor is conspicuous by its near-absence. We believe that one of II Isaiah's own favorite expressions forms the best single summary of all the Old Testament's descriptions of the new aeon: "the new creation". We have often noted that the favorite prophetic scheme to describe the future is to recall the past; such is the case in the Endzeit-Urzeit, David-Messiah, and other correspondences, as well as in the recollections of the flood, the Exodus, the return from the captivity, etc. As the first creation comprehended everything historical, the new creation comprehends everything suprahistorical (eschatological). Into this framework we can easily (and without the danger of over-systematization that forever hounds the Old Testament student) fit, not only the series of "new's", but also the kingdom, the Day of Glory, Paradise-- whatever figure one prefers.

No one excels Deuteroisaiah in his use of everything and anything in the past history of Israel and in the creation

of the world to describe the new era. His most common scheme to emphasize the wholly-otherness of the new aeon is the sweeping $\eta\omega\tau\tau\eta\tau\text{-}\eta\omega\tau\kappa\lambda\eta\eta$ antithesis, which is often repeated.³⁷ Before we leave II Isaiah, it would also be well to note two descriptions of the new aeon which are almost peculiar to him. One of these is the $\eta\gamma\tau\omega$ (highway), over which the triumphant ruler and his rejoicing retinue travel as they return to the new Jerusalem (40,3-5; 41, 14-20; 43, 17-21; 49, 8-13; 55, 12-12). The other and more familiar is that of the $\eta\omega\tau\eta\omega$, the Evangelist, the messenger of good tidings, who announces and prepares the way for the new aeon and its Lord (40,9; 41,27; 52,7; 61,1). Proksch again makes a beautiful observation:

Das Heil erscheint mit dem verkuendenden Wort. Dadurch, dass er die Wiederherstellung Israels, die Neuschaffung der Welt, den Anbruch der eschatologischen Zeit ansagt, schafft er sie; denn das Wort ist nicht nur Hauch und Laut, sondern wirkungskraeftige Macht.³⁸

No doubt, there is a connection here with Malachi's descriptions of the $\eta\kappa\lambda\omega$ (3,1 ff.) and of Elijah (4,5); and its parallel to the ministry of John the Baptist in the New Testament is obvious.

The new creation will be introduced and governed by a new covenant, which at the same time provides a continuity between the aeons. Everything else may change, but it will

³⁷ See C. R. North, "The 'Former Things' and the 'New Things' in Deutero-Isaiah", Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, edited by R. H. Rowley (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950), pp. 111-26.

³⁸ Proksch, op. cit., p. 706.

still be Jahwe who guides and controls everything. As Jahwe had made covenants with Adam, Noah, Abraham, and Moses (supposedly the outline of P) at crucial junctures in the history of His people, so He would again bind Himself to them in the new era. Even Gressmann admits: "Das Bundesmotiv ist mit den Geschichten der eschatologischen Urzeit unlosbar verknuepft".³⁹

It is Jeremiah who brings this thought to its most classical expression, particularly in 31, 31-34. Malachi's description of the עֲלֵאן בְּרִית (3,1) depicts the indispensability of this covenant for life in the new era. Not only man will be included in this covenant, but the animals (Hos. 2,20) and day and night (Jer. 33, 30-25) as well, just as in the first creation. As the earlier covenants had been determinative of Israel's religious life in history, the new covenant would also be constitutive of relations between man and God in the new creation. Proksch writes:

Seine Verwirklichung liegt in vollstaendiger Gotteserkenntnis, die nicht auf Ueberlieferung beruht, sondern auf Erfahrung und dadurch ermoeeglicht ist, dass Schuld und Suende vergeben sind. Dieser neue Bund verhaelt sich also zum alten wie das Evangelium zum Gesetz; er ist im alten vorbereitet, aber Gottes Gesetz wird in ihm nicht mehr als Heteronomie, sondern also Autonomie wahrgenommen.⁴⁰

A new covenant is also discussed or implied in Eze. 16, 60 ff; 34,35; 37,36; Is. 54,8-10 (reference to Noachitic covenant);

³⁹Gressmann, Ursprung (op. cit.), p. 201.

⁴⁰Proksch, op. cit., p. 528.

55,3; 59,21; 61,8; Ps. 132, 11 ff.; 81; and 95.

When one attempts to describe life in the "new creation", he might best simply take those words literally. Everything good in the historical creation would be renewed in the new creation. Life would be a reproduction of circumstances when God first saw that everything was "very good". All the material, spiritual, and ethical blessings which were present then or which Jahwe had showered upon His elected people since the fall into sin would now be present again. Although the catastrophes preceding the end would devastate the land, Jahwe's creative power would fructify it again in the Heilszeit.⁴¹ The basic idea is not so much that of the rebuilding of a destroyed universe as of the total redemption of a perverted universe.⁴² Jahwe's activity in the new creation would merely be a continuation of what He had purposed in creation and covenant all along. Eichrodt states this very emphatically:

Indem der neue Himmel und die neue Erde aber nicht als eine phantastische Zauberwelt beschrieben werden, sondern zur Vollendung der geschichtsgebundenen Gottesoffenbarung des Koenigtums Jahves ueber Israel und die Voelker bestimmt sind, bleibt die Kontinuitaet mit der gegenwaertigen Schoepfungswelt am entscheidenden Punkt, der absoluten Unterworfenheit unter Jahves

⁴¹See Gressmann, Ursprung (op. cit.), p. 208.

⁴²Mowinkel (op. cit., p. 282) naturally seizes upon this as evidence for his contention that this whole eschatological conception derived from the original annual sacramental "re-creation" in the cultus.

Weltziele, gewahrt. Der eschatologische Schoepfergott ist nicht der Feind, sondern der Vollender der ersten Schoepfung.⁴³

The descriptions of the return of physical blessings from Paradise are often very striking.⁴⁴ Most obvious are the descriptions of the Tierfrieden (Hos. 2,20; Is. 11,6-8; 35,9; 65,25; Eze. 34,25. 28), of the rivers in the new land (Eze. 47, 1-11; Zech. 14,8; Ps. 36,10; 46,5), and of the trees of life in Eze. 47,12. This is probably the inspiration of the picture of the Sprout (Is. 9,6; 11,1; Mi. 5,1 f.; Jer. 23, 5 f.; Eze. 34,23 f.). The earth will again be more fruitful (Is. 29, 17; 30,25; 32,15); man's age will increase (Is. 65,20); there will be an abundance of children (Is. 49, 19 ff; Jer. 30, 19; Eze. 37,26; Zech. 8,5; etc.) The primeval cosmology, when Jahwe gave His own light without sun and moon, will return (Is. 60, 19 ff.) A second Adam must rule over the new creation (Messianism proper); although the figures of Moses and David later almost obliterated that of the Urmensch, features of the latter are still evident (cf. references to milk and honey in Is. 7, 14 ff., and connection with the Tierfrieden in Is. 11 and Micah 5).

In the spiritual and ethical realms too everything will be restored according to God's original intentions. Here,

⁴³Eichrodt, op. cit., II, pp. 51-2.

⁴⁴Their presence in this whole scheme, which is strictly eschatological, defeats at the outset all attempts by politically-minded Jews, millennialists, and Calvinists to develop them in historical life. We are certain the prophets did not so mean them either.

however, sources merge; not only the Urzeit is taken as a type, but all the forms and commandments through which Jahwe revealed Himself and His will to His people in history or those through which they worshipped Him are also transfigured into something fulfilled and perfected. (Particularly in Deuteroisaiiah is this synonymity of "new creation" and "redemption" obvious.) Thus Jahwe will again dwell in the nation's midst, as He did in Paradise ("Immanuel" in Is. 7, 14; Jer. 3, 15; Eze. 37, 17 f.; Hos. 14, 9 f.; etc.); and as He did through the Kabod or Shekinah in the cultus (Is. 40,5; Eze. 43,2 ff.; Ps. 57; etc.) The old theophanies will reappear (Mal. 3,1 ff.; Zech. 14, 3 ff.; Dan. 7; and often in the apocalypses). The work of God's spirit will be unimpeded (Is. 32,15; 44,3).

All the Heilsgüter will be present in full measure.⁴⁵ Basic theological concepts such as יְשׁוּעָה , מְשׁוּלָה , קִדְשׁ , טוֹרָה , etc., are transformed into eschatological concepts. The sittliches Ziel of prophetic preaching will finally be realized, a thought that is expressed innumerable times. Sin will be absent (Is. 11, 9; 28, 16; 32, 1-5; Jer. 24, 5; etc.); Israel will be אֱלֹהֵיהֶם as their Lord (Is. 61, 12; 52,1; Eze. 44,9; Zech. 14,21); Jahwe Himself will finally become the summum bonum (Ps. 17, 15; 73, 25; etc.) He will give joy to His people (Is. 29, 19; 61, 10; Jer. 15, 16; Ps. 9, 3; 89, 17; 103, 34; etc.) The joyous responses of the people (שִׂמְחָה and אֲשׁוּרָה) almost become an eschatological terminal in the Old

⁴⁵ See Sellin, op. cit., pp. 112-4.

Testament.

All of Israel will be gathered together (Is. 27, 13; 43, 6; Zech. 10, 6-11) and the twelve tribes will again be united (Is. 11, 13; Hos. 2, 2; 3, 5; Eze. 37, 15-22). The Gentiles will escort the returning Diaspora (Is. 44, 22; 60, 4-9; 66, 20); and all nations will be subject to Israel (Eze. 38, 18; Joel 2, 20; Zech. 14; etc.) Yet even the old particularism begins to vanish; God's grace will also be offered the heathen (Is. 56, 1-7; Zech. 14, 16 ff; Ps. 47, 2 ff.; 96, 1 ff.; etc.) These too will be gathered from all corners of the globe (Is. 63, 4-6; Mi. 4, 1-3; Zech. 2, 10-11). A great feast will be celebrated (Is. 25, 6; 27, 1 (feeding on leviathan!); 30, 29; Zeph. 1, 7). Jerusalem's glory will exceed that of any previous time (Ps. 48, 5; Eze. 40, 2; Zech. 6, 1 ff.); it will be known for its faithfulness (Is. 60, 14; 62, 2 ff.; Zech. 8, 3); and here on the Gottesberg-Jahwe will teach the Torah and judge all nations (Is. 2, 2-4 = Mi. 4, 1-4).

Here, where Old Testament eschatology left off, apocalyptic gladly took up, with a still greater use of fanciful and mythical illustrations. The New Testament returned to the more sober metaphors of the Old, for the most part, and, with its Messianic consciousness, and following Rabbinic emphases, synthesized everything under the $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\eta\gamma\iota\omega\varsigma$. In the $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\mu\alpha$ of their $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\sigma$, all these features of Old Testament eschatology found their rightful place.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION AND EPILOGUE

One must stop somewhere. So many factors -- historical, hermeneutical, exegetical, and more -- enter into a consideration of Old Testament eschatology, that libraries could be written on the subject, as libraries already have been. However, the time has come for us to stop.

We set out to make a survey and attempt an approach to the problems of Old Testament eschatology. We believe that we have accomplished that goal. We have attempted to trace origins; we have illustrated the Old Testament's vocabulary of hope; and we have summarized its description of the Endzeit. Most of our attempted approaches have been hermeneutical in nature. We have attempted to distinguish New Testament homiletics from Old Testament exegesis (without denying the validity of either approach in its field). We have attempted to allow the Old Testament to speak for itself, for the time being, without reference to New Testament syntheses and conclusions. We have attempted to do justice to both history and revelation. We have attempted to explicate a theory of development without becoming either evolutionistic or naturalistic. We have attempted to give due recognition to the revelation of the covenant as the basic motif of all Old Testament thought.

At the same time we are well aware that our survey and approach leave much to be desired. Not only do our suggested "approaches" themselves need considerable development and even modification, but there are many problems connected with Old Testament eschatology which we have not approached at all. Exegetical subtleties we have tried to avoid entirely. On most introductory questions we have taken sides only when this was necessary to give coherence to our own presentation.

One major area which we have not considered is the problem of the Old Testament's belief in the resurrection, eternal life, immortality, etc. However, like isagogics, the first eleven chapters of Genesis, or apocalyptic literature, we believe this is an area of study in its own right. Regardless of dogmatic convictions, no one would deny that these doctrines are far less prominent in Old Testament eschatology than in that of the New.

If the Hebrews possessed such beliefs, they certainly never made them a dominant part of their creed. The suggestion that these beliefs, while present in Israel, were never emphasized because of their frequent abuse in the Ahnenkulte and other rites of the heathen seems very plausible to us. Undeniably, the foundations and the core for later Jewish and Christian constructions of doctrines of resurrection and immortality are present in the Old Testament. On the other hand, that is not the same thing as asserting that the Hebrews themselves clearly enunciated such dogmas; nor do we see why this

must a priori be insisted upon. It seems to us that Isaiah's dictum (59,1), "The LORD's hand is not shortened that it cannot save", applies as well to those who would add something to the Old Testament revelation as to those who deny it. It was the same Lord who determined what was necessary for salvation in the Old Testament as in the New. However, for a further investigation of many of these problems, we refer the reader to the relevant titles in our bibliography.

Certain other problems we have also sidestepped. The absence of any appreciable eschatology in the wisdom literature raised questions about which we preferred not to conjecture. Scholarship on the Psalms is in such a state of flux at the present time that we attempted only to state the most prominent opinions. Of the eschatology of Deuteronomy (which, like other features of the book, seems to bear a prophetic stamp) we have said nothing. Finally, of the eschatological intent, if any, of the ceremonial and cultic laws of the Pentateuch, hardly anything has been said (except allegory and typology); we believe this area is deserving of more attention in the future.

We of the New Testament church still look forward together with the entire Old Testament. Although we live under a new covenant in our Savior's blood, we are still very much part of the old creation. The revelation of God's love in Christ has only made the conflict between the two aeons the more obvious and painful. We await the new creation with even

more longing than they. We do not expect to obtain final answers until the Creator Himself resolves the paradox of His entrance into history by taking us out of history. Yet this justifies neither relativism nor dogmatism on our part. It still is the Church's business to proclaim in this aeon -- as throughout eternity she will praise it -- the elemental creed of the church in both aeons: $\text{Ἡ ἴδιος ἑἷς ἦν ἰσθῶς}$; Κόπιας Ἰησοῦς ; Maranatha! Meanwhile, in the words of Gunkel, at the close of one of his major works: "Bin ich zu Ende, beginne ich".

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A New Standard Bible Dictionary. Edited by Melancthon W. Jacobus. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1936.
- Bentzen, Aage. Messias-Moses redivivus-Menschensohn. Zuerich: Zwingli Verlag, 1948.
- Browne, Laurence E. The Messianic Hope in its Historical Setting. London: SPCK, 1951.
- Charles, R. H. A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1899.
- Cheyne, T. K. Jewish Religious Life after the Exile. New York: The Knickerbocker Press, 1901.
- Coppens, J. The Old Testament and the Critics. Paterson, New Jersey: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1942.
- Dewick, E. C. Primitive Christian Eschatology. Cambridge: University Press, 1912.
- Diestel, Ludwig. Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der christlichen Kirche. Jena: Mauke's Verlag, 1869.
- Eichrodt, Walther. Theologie des Alten Testaments. 3 vols. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1950.
- Farrar, Frederic W. History of Interpretation. London: Macmillan and Co., 1886.
- Gesenius, William. Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon. Translated by Samuel Tregelles. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949.
- Girdlestone, Robert Baker. Synonyms of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1948.
- Gressmann, Hugo. Der Messias. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1929.
- Der Ursprung der israelitisch-juedischen Eschatologie. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1905.
- Heinisch, Paul. Theology of the Old Testament. Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1950.

- Hengstenberg, E. W. Christologie des Alten Testaments. 3 vols. Berlin: Verlag von Ludwig Gehmige, 1854.
- Koehler, Ludwig. Theologie des Alten Testaments. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1947.
- Koenig, Eduard. Die Messianischen Weissagungen des Alten Testaments. Stuttgart: Chr. Belser A. G., Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1925.
- . Theologie des Alten Testaments. Stuttgart: Chr. Belser A. G., Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1922.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim. Die Koenigsherrschaft Gottes im Alten Testament. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1951.
- Mandelkern, Solomon. Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae. 2 vols. Lipsiae: Veit et Comp., 1896.
- Messel, N. Die Einheitlichkeit der juedischen Eschatologie. Giessen: Alfred Toepelmann, 1915.
- Moeller, Wilhelm. Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments in heilsgeschichtlicher Entwicklung. Zwickau: Johannes Hermann, nd.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. "Psalmenstudien, II. Das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwaes und der Ursprung der Eschatologie." Skifter utgit av Videnskapselskapet i Kristiania. A. W. Broeggers Boktrykkeri, 1922. pp. 1-347.
- Oehler, Gustave Friedrich. Theology of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, nd.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. "Messianic Prophecy and Extra-Israelite Beliefs." The Church Quarterly Review Advertiser. CXIX (1934), pp. 1-11.
- . The Doctrine of the Last Things; Jewish and Christian London: John Murray, 1909.
- . The Evolution of the Messianic Idea. London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd., 1908.
- Pfeiffer, Robert H. Introduction to the Old Testament. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941.
- Piepenbring, Ch. Theology of the Old Testament. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., 1893.

- Proksch, Otto. Theologie des Alten Testaments. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1950.
- Sauer, Alfred von Rohr. "The Eschatological Prophecies of the Old Testament and Their Pertinence to Events of the Present Day." Proceedings of the Twenty-ninth Convention of the Northern Illinois District of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, pp. 16-42. (No Publication Facts.)
- Sauer, Erich. Das Morgenrot der Welterloesung. Guetersloh: Evangelischer Verlag, 1949.
- Sellin, Ernst. Theologie des Alten Testaments. Leipzig: Quelle und Meyer, 1933.
- Studies in Old Testament Prophecy. Edited by H. H. Rowley. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950.
- Sutcliffe, Edmund F. The Old Testament and the Future Life. (Distributed by Burns, Oates, and Washburn, Ltd., publishers to the Holy See), 1946.
- The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament. 2 vols. London: Longman, Green, Brown, and Longmans, 1843.
- The Old Testament and Modern Study. Edited by H. H. Rowley. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.
- Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Edited by Rudolph Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935.
- The Psalmists. Edited by D. C. Simpson. London: Humphrey Milford, 1926.
- Vischer, Wilhelm. The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ. Translated by A. B. Crabtree. London: Lutterworth Press, 1949.
- Volz, Paul. Die vorexilische Jahweprophetic und der Messias. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1897.
- Von Gall, August Freiherrn. Basileia tou Theou. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitaetsbuchhandlung, 1926.
- Vos, Geerhardus. "Eschatology of the Psalter." Princeton Theological Review, XVIII (1920), pp. 1-43.
- Wellhausen, J. Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1886.

Young, Edward J. An Introduction to the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949.

Young, Robert. Analytical Concordance to the Bible. New York Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1920.

EMERALD STAR BRAND
SOUTHWORTHY COTTON
COTTON FABRIC CO. (INC.)