

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

## THE DUAL ORIGIN OF HEBREW MONOTHEISM

ROBERT H. PFEIFFER

BOSTON UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

THE vital and lasting contribution of the children of Israel to the cultural progress of mankind is religious monotheism, not a mere numerical reduction of numerous gods to a single one, not a discovery of the ontological unity of all that exists, nor yet a metaphysical spiritualization of the universe, but a living faith in the unique righteous and benevolent ruler of the world. The pages of the Old Testament record the slow but somehow inevitable development of the idea of God, from its crude early stages up to the first indubitable formulation of monotheism in the writings of Second Isaiah, about 550 B. C., and its later vicissitudes. But in their study of this process, the critical students of the last hundred years have reached conclusions which are far from unanimity. Even the date of the appearance of monotheism in the religion of Israel seems to be a matter of dispute; at least such elusive doctrines as practical, latent, implicit, moral, monotheism have been attributed to men living long before the author of Is. 40 ff.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Some sort of monotheism has been ascribed, for instance, to: Abraham (B. Baentsch, *Allorientalischer und Israelitischer Monotheismus*), Moses (Oehler, *Theologie des A. T.*; P. Volz, *Mose*), Elijah (G. Hölscher, *Geschichte der Israelitischen und Jüdischen Religion*), the author of the J document (B. Luther, in E. Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, p. 167 f.), the author of E (O. Procksch, *Die Elohimquelle*, p. 199), Amos (D. Philipson, *Jew. Encycl.* 8, 660; Hölscher, *op. cit.*, p. 104; Knudson, *The Religious Teaching of the O. T.*, p. 87); Jeremiah (W. v. Baudissin, *Studien zur Semit. Religionsgesch.* I, 109, 148; J. P. Peters, *The Religion of the Hebrews*, p. 278).

As a matter of fact, however, we can only speak of monotheism in the O. T. before Second Isaiah by using the word in a sense other than the belief that there is only one god, or by reading this doctrine between the lines of our sources through inductions, deductions, and analogies of questionable force. In view of the fact that the existence of other gods besides Yahweh is never denied before Second Isaiah,<sup>2</sup> and furthermore since their existence is explicitly taken for granted in the pre-exilic literature,<sup>3</sup> it seems preferable, in the interests of clarity and exactness, to avoid the use of the term "monotheism" in speaking of the pre-exilic religion of Israel.

So far as we know, the Jewish doctrine of monotheism was clearly formulated for the first time in Is. 40 ff. The problem with which this paper deals is: What elements in the contemporary religious thought paved the way for the monotheistic theology of Second Isaiah and made it possible? Formulated in these terms the question comes within the scope of historical investigation, whereas Wellhausen's familiar question transcends it: "Why did not Chemosh of Moab, for instance, [instead of Yahweh] become the God of righteousness and the creator of heaven and earth?"

The view presented here is that Second Isaiah combined in his theology two distinct existing conceptions of the deity, a God of history and a God of the physical world, the first one strictly Israelitic, the second, represented chiefly by the Book of Job, apparently Edomitic.<sup>4</sup> The indebtedness of the author of Is. 40 ff. to the prophetic movement is universally recognized, whereas it is generally assumed that the Book of Job was written after the time of the exilic theologian. An attempt will be made here to show that the theology of Second Isaiah

<sup>2</sup> Is. 44 8; 45 5, 14; cf. 44 6; 45 5, 21 f. The other passages in which the existence of other gods is denied are indisputably later: Deut. 4 39, 39; 1 Ki. 8 30; 2 Ki. 19 16 — Is. 37 16; Ps. 83 19; 86 10; Neh. 9 6.

<sup>3</sup> W. v. Baudissin, *Studien zur Semit. Religionsgesch.* (1876) I, 47-177.

<sup>4</sup> The Edomitic origin of Job, Ps. 88; 89 6-19; Prov. 30; 81 1-4, and the transmission through Edomitic channels of the Egyptian material contained in Ps. 104 and Prov. 22 17-23 14. has been discussed by the author in his article *Edomitic Wisdom* (*ZAW Neue Folge* Bd. 3, 1926, pp. 18-26).

presupposes the conception of God developed in Job and that this book is earlier than Is. 40 ff.<sup>5</sup>

### *I. Yahweh, the ruler of the human world.*

The development of the conception of Yahweh up to the time of Second Isaiah reflects the historical vicissitudes of the children of Israel; the theology is not the result of abstract thinking, but of practical exigency. So plastic was the concept of the deity that it could adapt itself to the requirements of every national crisis, so unfettered by rational presuppositions that it thrived in incongruity, so endowed with vitality that it emerged sublimated from national disaster.

In our earliest sources Yahweh is the god dwelling on Sinai or Horeb, manifesting himself in natural cataclysms, volcanic eruptions, or storms; his voice is thunder, his arrows lightning. Through the instrumentality of Moses this fearsome deity delivered some Israelitic tribes from Egyptian bondage and became their god. Again and again he saved his people from utter annihilation, as at the crossing of the Red Sea, so that the very existence of Israel was thought to be dependent upon his solicitude. A god of war, he marched forth from Horeb to fight with his warriors against Sisera at Megiddo. By occupying the shrines of the Canaanites and by displacing the local *numina*, Yahweh assumed the functions of the numerous Baalim, the givers of agricultural bounty, and became the patron of fertility to whom Israel owed corn, wine, oil, wool, and flax. Thus his jurisdiction was extended and his character was refined. The god of Sinai became the God of Israel and the God of Canaan, the first god of that country as a whole; the god of wind and fire insured the existence of his people by giving them victory and bread. The deity of consuming anger, of unfathomable moods, of inexplicable blind fury, became of necessity, to safeguard the corporate

<sup>5</sup> The literary arguments proving that Second Isaiah was familiar with the Book of Job will be presented in a critical note at the end of this article. The priority of Job had been assumed for other reasons in *ZAW* 1926, p. 24 f.

existence of Israel, the defender of the weak, the avenger of the murdered and, without being impartially just when the interests of Israel were in question, he was the upholder of equity and morality. Acquiring new attributes without losing the old ones, the very inconsistencies of his nature contained the seeds of future development: a god of a mountain, of a nation, of a country; a god of battles and of harvests, loyal but dangerous, a person yet never represented by images (*JBL* 45, 211 ff.), a god among many but unique for Israel, requiring justice but not yet wholly righteous, the ruler of Canaan but active in Ashdod (1 Sam. 5), in Edom (1 Ki. 11 14) and in Damascus (2 Ki. 8 13), concerned with national affairs but guiding the actions of the individual (1 Sam. 25 28, 32, 34, 39): truly such a god had in his nature "something able to unfold into the highest reaches of morality and spiritual faith."<sup>6</sup>

The reforming prophets, beginning with Amos, took issue with the current conception of Yahweh as the god of Israel, in two respects: the chief concern of Yahweh was not, for them, the welfare or even the existence of the nation, but the vindication of justice and righteousness; as a consequence his field of activity was not confined to Canaan, but extended over other countries as well, wherever justice and righteousness were at stake. They proclaimed that this god of unspotted moral character and unlimited power, far from supporting Israel's selfish advantage consistently, could actually plan the annihilation of his people in the interests of justice, using foreign nations as "the rod of his anger;" that a ritually correct worship divorced from the practice of ethical standards and of social justice was an abomination in his sight; they discovered in the capricious course of political vicissitudes the invisible hand of the ruler of mankind directing the events of history to the accomplishment of his great ends.

## *II. A god creating the world and directing its course.*

Yahweh was primarily active in the human world; only sporadically was this deity brought into contact with natural

<sup>6</sup> C. Noyes, *The Genius of Israel*, p. 388.

occurrences. The intervention of Yahweh in the course of the physical world is either a survival of the prehistoric traits of the volcanic or meteorological divinity of Sinai (Gen. 19 24; Ex. 9 23 f.; Judg. 5 4 f.; 6 21; 13 20; 1 Ki. 18 38: the burning bush, the pillar of cloud and the pillar of fire, the East wind at the crossing of the Red Sea, earthquakes, etc.), or it is connected with the agricultural functions that Yahweh took over from the Baalim (giving or withholding rain), or else it is due to foreign influence (the flood). In all these cases Yahweh uses fire, rain, wind, thunder, lightning, and earthquakes in pursuit of his ends in the human world; he is never interested in the physical world *per se*, he is never regarded as the creator of inanimate nature or as its ruler,<sup>7</sup> with the possible single exception of a phrase in the Septuagint of 1 Ki. 8 53 (in the Hebrew 8 12): "The Lord has made known the sun in the sky."<sup>8</sup>

The so-called J creation story in Gen. 2 does not in the least contravene these statements, unless we regard Gen. 2 4 b as the beginning of the J account, as most critics do; however J. Morgenstern (*AJSL* 36, 199 ff.) has shown conclusively that this half verse is redactional and that J begins with v. 5: "The Yahwist story not only makes no mention at all of the creation of heaven and earth, but takes the eternal existence of these for granted" (*ibid.*; cf. Stade, *Bibl. Theol. A. T. I*, 240). Even the creation of animals and man would perhaps not have been attributed to Yahweh by an ancient Israelite had he not been operating with literary material of foreign

<sup>7</sup> "Der Gedanke der Erschaffung und Erhaltung der Welt durch Jahve fehlt völlig, wie auch der Sprache ein besonderes Wort (*term. techn.*) für den Begriff des göttlichen Schaffens noch fehlt." (B. Stade, *Biblische Theologie des A. T. I*, 92). Am. 4 13; 5 8 f.; 9 5 f.; Jer. 10 13 f.; 27 8; 33 25 are spurious.

<sup>8</sup> Ἡλιος ἐγνώρισεν ἐν οὐρανῷ Κυρίου. Some Mss. (see Holmes and Parsons) read ἐστῆκεν (has fixed) instead of ἐγνώρισεν: it is difficult however to determine which reading is original. Most critics would add this phrase to the Hebrew, regarding it as genuine, but Stade (in Stade and Schwally, *The Books of Kings*, SBOT, Hebrew Text, p. 101 ff) has argued very forcibly in favor of the Massoretic Text, and I am inclined to accept his conclusions.

origin: at any rate we do not find that any one else before Second Isaiah really thought of Yahweh as the creator of mankind.

If Yahweh was a god whose realm of activity was human history, the god of Job and of the other "Edomitic" sections of the Old Testament shows no solicitude for human affairs and is active only in the realm of physical nature and of living creatures: he is no more interested in men than in the beasts of the field (Job 38; Ps. 104). The purpose of the Book of Job is actually to prove that God is not just, establishing equity in the human world by an exact retribution for human actions, but merely powerful, an irresistible, supreme force of nature, creating, organizing, upholding the physical world and animating through his spirit the living beings. The welfare of mankind is not his concern: when God approaches a man he brings irreparable calamity; his presence is terrifying and crushing, for he speaks not in a still small voice but in a whirlwind; his purposes are inscrutable, his actions are past finding out.

This deity of the Book of Job has nothing in common with the Yahweh of pre-exilic Israel, not even the name. In a poem which betrays no knowledge of Israel's history and religion and depicts a god wholly indifferent to human needs and aspirations, it would be vain to seek for any traces of that solicitude of the Lord for his chosen people that survived the prophetic moralization of Yahweh and the doctrine of absolute monotheism. The god of Judaism, though theoretically a universal deity, retained illogically a peculiar relation to the seed of Abraham, individually and collectively. The divine spirit was conceived in the Hebrew Scriptures as the ultimate source of human excellence in word and deed, whereas in "Edomitic wisdom" it was nothing more than the animating principle of living creatures (*ZAW* 1926, p. 23 f.). Divine wisdom, which in Job 28 23-27 (v. 28 is a gloss) was the guiding principle of divine creative activity and was therefore hopelessly beyond human reach (28 12-22), came down to earth, according to Prov. 1-9, after assisting God in the work of creation, and went preaching through the streets exhorting

mortals to adopt its words as the norm of their conduct, until Ben Sirach identified wisdom with the law of Moses (cf. Deut. 4 8; Ezr. 7 25).<sup>9</sup> In like manner, when the doctrine of creation, under the influence of "Edomitic" writings, became current in Judaism through Is. 40 ff. and Gen. 1, it was treated merely as the opening chapter in the history of God's plans in the human realm, primarily within the chosen nation: God created the world for the benefit of man if not of Israel. This anthropocentric point of view is characteristically absent in Job and Ps. 104. A comparison between this magnificent psalm and Gen. 1 is instructive. K. Fullerton<sup>10</sup> has shown that the works of creation described by the poet correspond substantially in scope and in order with the first five creative acts outlined by P: significantly the last crowning act, the most important in the opinion of the priestly author, the special creation of man, is totally absent in the Psalm, man being obviously regarded as one of the animals (cf. the parallel between lions and men in vv. 21-23; see also vv. 14-15).<sup>11</sup> Man's importance in creation is likewise rated very low in the Book of Job, where the creation of man is only alluded to incidentally: God is "his maker" (4 17; cf. 31 15 a), he has fashioned him in the womb (31 15 b) in a mysterious manner (10 8-11) and keeps him alive (10 12); man is therefore the work of God's hands (10 3; 14 15). There is not the pride of a king of creation in these words, on the contrary they are a

<sup>9</sup> For references see A. Bertholet, *Bibl. Theol. des A. T., begonnen von B. Stade*, vol. II, p. 177 f.

<sup>10</sup> "The feeling for form in Psalm 104" *JBL* 40 (1921), p. 43 ff. Prof. Fullerton seems to think that Gen. 1 is the source of Ps. 104, although it is evident that the Psalmist's conception of creation is in many points more mythological and archaic (cf. H. Gunkel, *Genesis*<sup>1</sup>, p. 111). The priority of Gen. 1 appears to be a well established dogma of biblical criticism.

<sup>11</sup> It may in part be due to this identification of man with the other animals that the creation of animals and man takes place, in the priestly account, on the same day in spite of the fact that they are clearly regarded as distinct creative acts. The creation of man is likewise the last and supreme work of Marduk in the Babylonian "creation" poem.



humble appeal to the creator to spare the work of his hands. Is man better than animals? Nothing indicates it: just as the same creator fashioned slave and master (31 15), so God says to Job: "Behold now behemoth, which I made with thee" (40 15; cf. 12 7-10). The real proof of the prodigious power of God is not the creation of human beings, miserable creatures "whose foundation is in the dust, who are crushed before the moth!" (4 19; cf. 14 1 f.), but rather the fashioning and upholding of the physical world, unfathomable in its vastness, bewildering in its complexity (9 5-10; 26 7-14; 38 4-35), the animation and preservation of every living thing (12 10; 38 39 ff.). This deity was radically unlike the God of the Israelites, but such was the emotional fervor, the firm persuasion, the literary skill of the nameless poet, that Second Isaiah, himself also a poet and a theologian, could not help being influenced by the Book of Job: without renouncing his faith in a God of mercy and lovingkindness, coming to his people "as a shepherd that feedeth his flock, that gathereth the lambs in his arm" (Is. 40 11), he was willing to attribute to him the creative functions and immensurable power of the god of Job, and, accepting the challenge of the problem of theodicy, he undertook to discover a less depressing solution.

### *III. Second Isaiah's synthesis of the two conceptions.*

Second Isaiah is the first of Old Testament writers who declares explicitly and emphatically that God is both the ruler of history and the creator of the physical world; the fusion of these two sharply distinguished ideas of the deity, that had been current independently before his time, could hardly be reconciled with the existence of a multitude of gods and would have as its natural corollary the doctrine of monotheism.

A true exponent of the faith of his fathers, Second Isaiah asserts with unshakeable assurance the peculiar relation between Yahweh and Israel. Yahweh is still the God and the Holy One of Israel, Jacob's redeemer and savior, his creator and king, the nation's maker and husband. Jacob is his servant, Israel his elect, the Israelites are his sons and daughters; he

brought his people from the uttermost parts of the world and called it by name.<sup>12</sup> But Yahweh's jurisdiction and solicitude are not confined to Israel: he raised up Cyrus from the east, giving nations before him and making him rule over kings, so that the exiles might go free. He has chosen Israel not for unmerited blessings nor for terrestrial eminence, but for a lofty mission demanding the utmost humiliation and self-sacrifice: "I will also give thee for a light of the nations, that my salvation may be to the ends of the earth."

With the enthusiasm of a discoverer and with the zeal of a neophyte Second Isaiah proceeds to identify the God of Israel with the creator of the world. It is clear from his utterances dealing with the creative and providential activities of God that he assumed in his readers a knowledge of this matter, for he touches on creation only incidentally and in a general way, subordinating consistently the cosmological operations of the deity to its plans in the human realm. He wants to prove not that God is the creator (the book of Job and Ps. 104 had settled that matter to his satisfaction) but that "the creator of the ends of the earth . . . giveth power to the faint" (40 28 f.). In brief formulas devoid of picturesque details, epithets of the deity or axioms of self-evident truth, Second Isaiah declares that Yahweh has created heaven and earth,<sup>13</sup> the stars,<sup>14</sup> in fact all things (44 24) both good and bad (45 7; cf. 54 16) for the benefit of man (45 12, 16); in view of the divine plan for the redemption of mankind, the creation of Israel<sup>15</sup> may be regarded as the crowning operation of the divine activity. So great is the writer's interest in history that the mighty primeval struggles of the Almighty against mythological dragons and a raging chaotic sea, alluded to in Job and Ps. 104,<sup>16</sup> are reduced to mere symbols of the Exodus from Egypt (51 9 f.); in similar vein, the drying of the deep is mentioned in the midst of the restoration

<sup>12</sup> Cf. G. Hölscher, *Die Propheten*, p. 326.

<sup>13</sup> Is. 40 21 f.; 42 5; 44 24; 45 12, 18; 48 13; 51 12, 16.

<sup>14</sup> Is. 40 26; 45 12.

<sup>15</sup> Is. 43 1, 7, 15; 44 2, 21, 24; 54 5; cf. 51 16.

<sup>16</sup> Job 9 13; 26 12 f.; 38 10 f.; Ps. 104 6.

of Judah (44 27), and is cited elsewhere as a proof of God's "power to deliver" (50 2).

This conception of the deity, according to which Yahweh, the supreme sovereign of mankind, directing the course of history with justice and love, was identified with the creator of heaven and earth, left no room for polytheism. "The author's monotheism is not a theological reflection on the nature of God, it is his religious faith: Israel's god is the only God; the almighty is the saviour of his people."<sup>17</sup> Profoundly devoted to the god of his fathers, intensely concerned with the destiny of his people, Second Isaiah had neither the inclination nor the opportunity for speculation concerning the mysteries of the universe. Fortunately he had access to the work of a thinker who, failing to discover any traces of God's benevolent and just control of the life of individuals and of nations, had sought refuge in the contemplation of nature; there, in the stars and in the sea, as well as in the life of the wild animals, he recognized by unmistakable signs, the mysterious sway of the Almighty.

#### CRITICAL NOTE

##### *The priority of Job over Is. 40-55.*

The parallels in thought and expression between the Book of Job and Is. 40-55 are sufficiently numerous and close to make it reasonably certain that one of the two authors was acquainted with the other. Most critics, having decided that Job cannot be earlier than 500 B. C. (an opinion which is not demonstrable) assert that its author was influenced by Second Isaiah. No one, however, not even those who, like Franz Delitzsch and Cheyne, maintain that Job is the earlier of the two works, has taken the trouble to examine the parallels to see whether it is possible to determine with reasonable assurance which one of the two authors is dependent on the other. The material presented here is by no means exhaustive, although I hope that nothing of importance has been overlooked, but it is significant: in no case is Job clearly the borrower, whereas aside from many comparisons that leave the question of priority

<sup>17</sup> G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, vol. I, p. 228.

open, in some cases Job appears to be the source of Second Isaiah.<sup>18</sup>

1. *Parallels in utterance.*

a) Words occurring only in Job, Is. 40  $\pi$ , and postexilic passages.

1) Flora. גרע (Job 14 8; Is. 11 1; 40 24), גרף (Niph. "to be withered," Job 13 25; Is. 41 2; etc.), צמאיים ("plant growth," Job 31 8; Is. 34 1; 42 5), ציץ (Job 14 7; Is. 40 8-9). יבש הציר (Is. 15 6; 40 7 f.; cf. Job 8 12).

2) Fauna. עכביש (Job 8 14; Is. 59 5), עש ("moth," Job 4 19; 13 28; 27 18 [? cf. LXX]; Is. 50 9; Hos. 5 12 is spurious), פנים (ובנות יענה (Job 30 29; Is. 43 20; etc.; Mic. 1 8 can hardly be genuine). Mythological monsters of the sea (רהב, תנין, Job 9 13; 26 12; 7 12; Is. 52 9; etc.).

3) Cosmology. God's activity: נמה שמים לבדו (Job 9 8; Is. 44 24), יסד ארץ (Job 38 4; Is. 48 13, 16; Ps. 104 5), עשה (in the sense "to create"), רנע (Qal, "to agitate the sea," Job 26 12; Is. 51 15; Jer 31 35), שים (in connection with clouds, Job 38 9; Is. 50 3; cf. Ps. 104 3), חת (Job 22 14; Is. 40 22; Prov. 8 27), קצת הארץ (Job 28 24; Is. 40 28; 41 5, 9).

4) Miscellaneous. יהלל (Job 12 17; Is. 44 25; etc.), ריק (Job 7 19; 30 10; Is. 50 6).

b) Idiomatic expressions.

אין חקר (Job 5 9; 9 10; Is. 40 28), נמה קי (Job 38 5; Is. 44 13; etc.), קמץ פיהו (Job 5 16; Is. 52 15; etc.), דרכו נסתרה (Job 3 23; Is. 40 27), על לא חמס (Job 16 17; Is. 53 9), אומץ פה (Job 9 4; Is. 40 26), ינע לריק (Job 39 18; Is. 49 4), רבות (multa, Job 16 2; 23 4; Is. 42 20).

c) Figures of speech.

God is called a נאל ("kinsman," "redeemer") in Job 19 25; Prov. 23 11 and often in Is. 40  $\pi$ . Human life with its misery is called צבא ("military service") in Job 7 1; 10 17; 14 14; Is. 40 2; human beings are called worms (Job 25 6; Is. 41 14;

<sup>18</sup> The following passages of Is. 40 ff. are expansions of the verses of Job given in parenthesis: 41 20 (12 9); 40 14 (21 2); 40 22; 45 12; 48 13; cf. 44 24 (9 9); 51 17, 22; cf. 30 (21 20); 51 15 (26 13). Is. 53 9 combines Job 16 17 and 6 20.

if Duhm's emendation of the latter passage is to be accepted, *הַתְּלַעָה* and *רִפְּהָ* are mentioned together in both verses and only there); the moth devours men like a garment (*כִּבְנוֹד יֵאָכְלוּ עֵשׂ*, Is. 51 8; cf. Job 13 28). *הָרַץ עִמָּל הַתְּלַעָה* (Job 15 35; Is. 59 4). *צִמְצוּמֵי* ("offspring," Job 5 25; 21 8; 27 14; Is. 44 3; etc.). "To drink the wrath" (*חִמָּה*) of God (Job 21 20; Is. 51 17, 20, 22; Jer. 25 15).

## 2. Parallels in thought.

### a) The deity.

Wisdom and might (Job 9 4; 12 13, 16) are the divine attributes that both authors emphasize. No one can teach God knowledge (Job 21 22; Is. 40 14), his thoughts are unsearchable (Job 11 7; Is. 40 28: this latter passage and Job 26 12 are the earliest references to the *תְּבוּנָה* of God). He is hidden and cannot be found (Is. 45 15; Job 9 11; 23 8 f.). He is mighty in strength (*אֲמִיץ כֹּחַ*, Job 9 4; Is. 40 26), irresistible in his actions (Job 11 10; 23 13; Is. 43 13): who can say unto Him "What doest thou?" (*מַה תַּעֲשֶׂה*, Job 9 12; Is. 45 9)? He stretcheth out the heavens alone (Job 9 8; Is. 44 24; cf. 40 22; 42 5; 45 12; 48 13; 51 13, 16; see above, 1 a) 3)), he defeats Rahab (Job 26 12 b; Is. 51 9), and stirs up the sea (*רִנַּע*, Job 26 12 a; Is. 51 15). He formed man in the womb (Job 31 15; Is. 44 24), and gives him breath (Job 12 10; Is. 42 5). Man is like clay in the hands of a potter (Job 10 9; Is. 45 9; Jer. 18 2 ff.).

### b) Man.

The misery of the human lot, the pathos and tragedy of existence, are keenly felt by both authors (see above, c). Figures of speech: man is like grass (Job 14 1 f.; cf. 8 12; Is. 40 6, 24; 51 12), ephemeral (Job 4 19 ff.; Is. 40 6 ff.; 51 12). His way is hidden (Job 3 23; Is. 40 27). God frustrates (*מַכְשֵׁל*, Job 5 12; Is. 44 25) human ingenuity, and makes fools of men (Job 12 17; Is. 44 25); nations are as nothing before him (Is. 40 15, 17; cf. Job 12 23), he abases rulers and magistrates (Job 12 17, 21; Is. 40 23 f.; 41 5; 43 13, 16; 44 25). Especially poignant is the fate of the innocent sufferer: although no violence was to be found in him (Job 6 30; 16 17; cf. 27 4; Is. 53 9) and his right was with God (Job 16 19–21; Is. 49 4; 50 8, 9 a), he was sorely

afflicted (a leper? cf. Cheyne, *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, ad Is. 53 4), deserted of friends (לֹאֵל, Job 19 14; Is. 53 3), despised (Job 19 18; Is. 53 3); men smote him and spat upon him (Job 16 10; 30 10; Is. 50 6).

### 3. Conclusion.

It is clear from this survey that the similarities between the two books are confined to the peculiar *Weltanschauung* of Job; there is, on the contrary, no trace in Job of the religious ideas of Israel and of the personal views of Second Isaiah. The most striking parallels are within the sphere of the conceptions of the physical world, of the cosmological functions of the deity, and of the sadness of human life. In these matters the Book of Job was far more original, specific, and comprehensive; were we to regard Is. 40 ff. as the source of Job in these matters, we would have a mountain hanging from a thread. How can the advocates of the priority of Second Isaiah explain the fact that this author uses two of the divine names typical of Job, *el* and *eloah* (the latter, according to Duhm, ad Is. 44 8, probably does not occur in the O. T. before Job)? And the fact that the *terminus technicus* for creation in post-exilic literature (בָּרָא) is used by Second Isaiah but not by Job (the same is to be said of יָצַר and פָּעַל)? And why should the author of Job ignore the creation by *fiat*, if he had read Is 41 4; 44 27; 45 12; 48 13 f. (God's word is personified in Is. 55 11)?

The fundamental conceptions of Second Isaiah represent a development of the views of the Book of Job. According to Hölischer (*Die Propheten* p. 330 ff.) "the significance of Second Isaiah can be determined through three points" namely monotheism, missionary zeal, and the solution to the problem of theodicy. In these matters Second Isaiah could have known the book of Job, but the reverse would be unthinkable. The monotheism of Second Isaiah, based on a combination of a God of history with a God of nature, implies the negation of the existence of other gods, a corollary which is not yet explicitly stated in Job. The practical consequence of this monotheism, the conversion of the heathen, is emphatically stressed by Second

Isaiah, but is totally absent in the Book of Job. The problem of theodicy had been formulated in the sharpest terms by the author of Job and had been illustrated with the fact of undeserved suffering. Second Isaiah faced the issue squarely, admitted the facts adduced by Job, but, instead of concluding that God could not be at the same time almighty and merciful, he found a solution in the idea of voluntary vicarious suffering. Job, in his despair, had made an appeal from the god of power, who crushed him, to the god of mercy and justice, his witness in heaven (16 19-21); these two gods become one and the same in Is. 40 ff. "The view of suffering taken in Is. 53 can never have presented itself to the author of Job. Either the two are entirely independent, or Job is earlier than Deutero-Isaiah, would seem to be the inevitable verdict" (W. T. Davison, *HDB* II, 671).