

*Rebo. Arzahan  
Yshua Heemel*

To pluck up and to break down,  
To destroy and to overthrow,  
To build and to plant.

And the word of the Lord came to me, saying, Jeremiah, what do you see?  
And I said, I see a rod of almond. Then the Lord said to me, You have seen well, for I am watching over My word to perform it.

The word of the Lord came to me a second time, saying, What do you see?  
And I said, I see a boiling pot, facing away from the north. Then the Lord said to me, Out of the north evil shall break forth upon all the inhabitants of the land. For, lo, I am calling all the tribes of the kingdoms of the north, says the Lord; and they shall come and every one shall set his throne at the entrance of the gates of Jerusalem, against all its walls around about, and against all the cities of Judah. And I will utter My judgments against them, for all their wickedness in forsaking Me; they have burned incense to other gods, and worshiped the works of their own hands. But you, gird up your loins; arise, and say to them everything that I command you. Do not be dismayed by them, lest I dismay you before them. And I, behold, I make you this day a fortified city, an iron pillar, and bronze walls, against the whole land, against the kings of Judah, its princes, its priests, and the people of the land. They will fight against you; but they shall not prevail against you, for I am with you, says the Lord, to deliver you.

Jeremiah 1: 4-19

#### COMPLACENCY AND DISTRESS

Although Isaiah had insisted that Jerusalem would withstand the onslaught of her enemies, Jeremiah, like Micah, was told that the enemies would overwhelm Jerusalem and all the fortified cities of Judah: "Out of the north evil shall break forth" (1:14). They maintained that the state of Judah had forfeited the privilege of God's protection.

And yet, Jeremiah did not think that evil was inevitable. Over and above man's blindness stood the wonder of repentance, the open gateway through which man could enter if he would. Jeremiah's call was addressed to Israel as a whole as well as to every member of the people (18:11):

Return, faithless Israel, says the Lord,  
I will not look on you in anger,  
For I am merciful, says the Lord.  
Jeremiah 3:12 [H. 3:11];  
cf. 4:1; 25:5; 35:15<sup>1</sup>

Like a basket full of birds,  
Their houses are full of treachery;  
Therefore they have become great and rich,

<sup>1</sup> On the refusal to return, see 5:3; 8:5; 22:27; 44:5.

They have grown fat and sleek.  
They know no bounds in deeds of wickedness;  
They judge not with justice  
The cause of the fatherless, . . .  
They do not defend the rights of the needy.  
Jeremiah 5:27-28

Jeremiah, looking upon the garishness of Jerusalem, felt hurt by the people's guilt and by the knowledge that they had a dreadful debt to pay. The Lord's severe judgment would be meted out; He would not swerve aside. It was hard for God to deal harshly with His beloved people. Rather than inflict a penalty on the whole people, the Lord had tried to purify them:

Behold, I will refine them and test them,  
For what else can I do, because of My dear people?  
Jeremiah 9:7 [H. 9:6]

Yet, all attempts at purification were of no avail.  
Filled with a sense of security, the people scorned the warnings of the true prophets, saying,

The prophets will become wind;  
The word is not in them. . . .  
They are sure that the Lord, . . . will do nothing,  
No evil will come upon us,  
Nor shall we see sword or famine.  
Jeremiah 5:13; 5:12

Indeed,

They are all stubbornly rebellious,  
Going about with slanders;  
They are bronze and iron,  
All of them act corruptly.  
The bellows blow fiercely,  
The lead is consumed by the fire;  
In vain the refining goes on,  
For the wicked are not removed.  
Refuse silver they are called,  
For the Lord has rejected them.  
Jeremiah 6:28-30

Jeremiah's was a soul in pain, stern with gloom. To his wistful eye the city's walls seemed to reel. The days that were to come would be dreadful. He called, he urged his people to repent—and he failed. He screamed, wept, moaned—and was left with a terror in his soul.

## THE AGE OF WRATH

Utterances denoting the wrath of God, the intent and threat of destruction, are found more frequently and expressed more strongly in Jeremiah than in any other prophet. For this reason, Jeremiah has often been called a prophet of wrath.

However, it would be more significant to say that Jeremiah lived in an age of wrath. His contemporaries had no understanding of the portent of their times, of the way in which God was present at the time. They did not care for time. But a prophet has a responsibility for the moment, an openness to what the moment reveals. He is a person who knows what time it is. To Jeremiah his time was an emergency, one instant away from a cataclysmic event.

*Cut off your hair and cast it away;  
Raise a lamentation on the bare heights,  
For the Lord has rejected and forsaken  
The generation of His wrath.*  
Jeremiah 7:29

Jeremiah hurled a dreadful word at his people, accusing them of provoking or exciting God's anger, an expression not used by earlier prophets (cf. 7:18-19; 11:17-18; 25:6; 44:3-8): "The sons of Israel and the sons of Judah . . . have done nothing but provoke Me to anger by the work of their hands, says the Lord. This city has aroused My anger and wrath, . . ." (32:30-32). The words he proclaimed are merciless: "Thus says the Lord God: Behold, My anger and My wrath will be poured out on this place, upon man and beast, upon the trees of the field and the fruit of the ground; it will burn and not be quenched" (7:20).

*Behold, the storm of the Lord!  
Wrath has gone forth,  
A whirling tempest;  
It will burst upon the head of the wicked.  
The anger of the Lord will not turn back  
Until He has executed and accomplished  
The intents of His mind.  
In the latter days you will understand it clearly. . . .  
A lion has gone up from his thicket,  
A destroyer of nations has set out;  
He has gone forth from his place  
To make your land a waste;  
Your cities will be ruins  
Without inhabitant.*  
Jeremiah 23:19-20, cf. 30:23-24; 4:7; 5:6

The days would come when

*the dead bodies of this people will be food for the birds of the air, and for the beasts of the earth; and none will frighten them away. And I will make to cease from the cities of Judah and from the streets of Jerusalem the voice of mirth and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride; for the land shall become a waste. . . . [Jerusalem will be] a heap of ruins, a lair of jackals [and] the cities of Judah a desolation, without inhabitant.*

Jeremiah 7:33-34; 9:11

## GOD'S LOVE OF ISRAEL

God's love of Israel is one of Israel's sacred certainties which Jeremiah, like Hosea and Isaiah before him, tried to instill in the minds of the people.

*Thus says the Lord;  
The people who survived the sword  
Found grace in the wilderness; . . .  
With everlasting love have I loved you,  
Therefore I have continued My faithfulness to you.*  
Jeremiah 31:2-3

It was in love that God and Israel met.

*The word of God came to me, saying: Go and proclaim in the hearing of Jerusalem, Thus says the Lord:*

*I remember the devotion of your youth,  
Your love as a bride,  
How you followed Me in the wilderness,  
In a land not sown.  
Israel was holy to the Lord,  
The first fruits of His harvest.  
All who would destroy him would be held guilty;  
Punishment would come to them,  
Says the Lord.*

Jeremiah 2:1-3

"Father!—To God Himself we cannot give a holier name," said Wordsworth. Child—God Himself does not use a more tender word. In spite of Israel's failure, the voice of God avers:

*For I am a father to Israel,  
And Ephraim—he is My first-born.*  
Jeremiah 31:9

Ephraim is "a precious son," "a darling child." Such was God's anticipation:

*I thought  
How I would set you among My sons,  
And give you a pleasant land,  
The most glorious inheritance among the nations.  
And I thought you would call me, "My Father,"  
And would not turn from following Me.  
Jeremiah 3:19; cf. 3:4*

Following the prophet Hosea, Jeremiah employed the analogy of married love to express the relationship of God and Israel. "I was their husband, says the Lord" (31:32).

*Surely, as a faithless wife leaves her husband,  
So have you been faithless to Me, O house of Israel,  
Says the Lord. . . .  
If a man divorces his wife,  
And she goes from him  
And becomes another man's wife,  
Will he return to her?  
Would not that land be greatly polluted?  
You have played the harlot with many lovers;  
And would you return to Me?  
Says the Lord.  
Lift up your eyes to the bare heights and see!  
Where have you not been lain with?  
By the wayside you have sat awaiting lovers,  
Like an Arab in the wilderness,  
You have polluted the land  
With your vile harlotry.*

*Jeremiah 3:20; 3:1-2*

#### THE INNER TENSION

Jeremiah depicted the dramatic tension in the inner life of God. As in Abraham's debate with God over the threatened destruction of Sodom, there was an implied desire not to let the judgment fall upon Judah.

*Go to and fro in the streets of Jerusalem,  
See, I entreat you, and know!  
And look in its broad open places  
To see whether you can find one  
Who does justly,  
Who practices faithfulness,  
Says the Lord.*

*Jeremiah 5:1*

On account of their sins, the land would be subjected to devastation. Yet the judgment seemed to be painful to the Supreme Judge, and Jeremiah

tried to convey that God sought to justify His judgment. The words of God betray an inner oscillation:

*How can I pardon you?  
Your children have forsaken Me,  
Have sworn by those who are no gods.  
When I fed them to the full,  
They committed adultery  
And trooped to the houses of harlots.  
They were well-fed lusty stallions,  
Each neighing for his neighbor's wife.  
Shall I not punish them for these things?  
Says the Lord.  
Shall I not avenge Myself  
On a nation such as this? . . .  
They judge not with justice  
The cause of the fatherless, . . .  
They do not defend the rights of the needy.  
Shall I not punish them for these things?  
Says the Lord.  
Shall I not avenge Myself  
On a nation such as this? . . .  
Their tongue is a deadly arrow;  
It speaks deceitfully.  
With his mouth each speaks peaceably to his neighbor,  
But in his heart he plans an ambush for him.  
Shall I not punish them for these things?  
Says the Lord.  
Shall I not avenge Myself  
On a nation such as this?*

*Jeremiah 5:7-9, 28-29; 9:8-9 [H. 9:7-8]*

"The Lord wrests the decision to judge from Himself: He would at once forgive. He has attempted to do so by means of disciplinary training, but He can no more forgive, He must avenge himself. . . . He has been deceived, offended, betrayed: it is His own possession, with which He must part."<sup>2</sup>

#### THE SORROW AND ANGUISH OF THE LORD

A great hope was Israel; "the first fruits" were a foretaste of a harvest of blessing.<sup>3</sup> But as time passed, God's hope was dashed. The people deserted their Redeemer and worshiped instead "the works of their own hands" (1:16). God's pain and disappointment ring throughout the book of Jere-

<sup>2</sup> P. Volz, *Der Prophet Jeremia* (Leipzig, 1922), p. 60. See E. A. Leslie, *Jeremiah* (New York, 1954), p. 60, whose translation is the one quoted above.

<sup>3</sup> "The Lord once called you a green olive tree, fair with goodly fruit" (1:16; cf. 2:21).

It should be clear by now that being a prophet is no fun. In most cases, one has to carry an unpopular message to the people and face the usual scorn and humiliation that goes with it. Nobody wants to hear that unless drastic changes are made in the social order and the religious commitment of the people, God will execute judgment on the kingdom. On top of that, in the ancient and medieval worlds, as in much of the modern world, free speech was not guaranteed. Accusing priests and official prophets of misconduct would create powerful enemies, while predicting the defeat or downfall of the king could be viewed as treason. Of all the prophets, Jeremiah is the most explicit about the difficulty of carrying an unpopular message to a hostile audience. He tells us in the opening verses that during his ministry—which began in the days of King Josiah (around 627 BCE) and continued for more than forty years through the reigns of Jehoiakim and Zedekiah—the people of his hometown of Anathoth plotted against him (11:21-23). A priest named

—JEREMIAH 23:9

My heart is crushed within me,  
 All my bones are trembling;  
 I have become like a drunken man,  
 Like one overcome by wine  
 Because of the LORD and His holy word.

*Suffering for the Sake of God*

### Jeremiah

CHAPTER 5

*Kenan Seskin*

*Thinking about the  
 Prophets*

Pashhur had him beaten and put in the stocks, with his ankles and wrists locked up overnight (20:1-3). When Jeremiah opposes a Judean alliance with Egypt and urges surrender to the Babylonians instead, he is sent to prison (37:21). Eventually a group of priests and official prophets change that his message of surrender is sowing discontent among the soldiers and, with Zedekiah's approval, lower him into a cistern, where he goes without water and almost dies.

Fortunately, Zedekiah undergoes a change of heart and sends people to rescue him (38:1-28). After his release, Zedekiah has a private conversation with Jeremiah and warns him not to reveal its contents. Although Jeremiah never discloses the exchange, he is nonetheless sent back to prison, where he remained until Jerusalem fell to the Babylonians in 586 BCE. Following the destruction of Jerusalem, Jeremiah went into exile in Egypt. We do not know the circumstances of his death.

The people's animosity toward Jeremiah is especially strong because he goes much farther than the prophets before him. Whereas Isaiah said that God would never abandon Jerusalem, the site of the Holy Temple, Jeremiah insists that the Temple will fall if the people continue their evil ways. In one place, he reports God as saying: "Shall I not bring retribution / On a nation such as this?" (5:9). He even warns the people not to take refuge in the Temple when the day of retribution arrives (7:4).

Still, it would be wrong to think of Jeremiah as all doom and gloom, because he does offer words of consolation. For example, at 24:4-7, he promises that those who return from the exile will find favor if they turn back to God with all their heart. As we saw, he also envisions a time when God will make a new covenant with Israel and remember the people's sins no more.<sup>1</sup> But, of course, the new covenant is in the future—a hallmark of the Messianic Age, when Israel will finally come to its senses.

Meanwhile, the day-to-day situation Jeremiah witnessed was bleak. Jehoiakim used forced labor to build a luxurious palace at a time when fraud and violence ruled the day. The familiar pleas to care for the widow and the orphan were ignored. Murder and theft went on unchecked. Offerings were made to strange gods. Although he was mocked every

place he went, Jeremiah tells us that he cannot keep silent. God's words burn in him like a fire so that he cannot hold them in (20:9).

The details of Jeremiah's life raise important questions. How could an all-powerful God, a God who parted the Red Sea and destroyed the mightiest army on earth, allow the Temple, the seat of divine authority, to be destroyed by a pagan nation, in this case a nation that worships Marduk? Or, on a more personal level: How could an all-powerful God allow a chosen servant to be treated in such a disrespectful manner? I will address both of these questions, the second one before the first. But before I do, I want to turn back and examine the prophet par excellence—Moses, who also led a difficult and tumultuous life.

#### *The Reluctant Prophet Who Led the Israelites out of Egypt*

When God first calls to Moses at Exodus 3, the Israelites are enslaved to a brutal dictator who has ordered all Israelite male children to be thrown into the Nile. Under the circumstances, we would expect Moses to be eager to serve God and liberate his people. But the ensuing dialogue shows that Moses is anything but. Time and again he raises objections to God's plan for action: "Who am I that I should go before Pharaoh?" "Who shall I say has sent me?" "What if the Israelites will not listen to me?" "I am slow of speech." By Exodus 3:13, he pleads with God to choose someone else. Tired of hearing excuses, God becomes angry with Moses.

Why is Moses so reluctant?<sup>2</sup> One way to answer this question is to recall a passage from Plato's *Republic*, where the characters agree that the best people to rule a state are those who are least eager to do so.<sup>3</sup> After viewing civil disorder for much of his life, Plato thought that those who are eager to rule often put their own interests above those of the state. In other words, they want to rule so they can cash in on the benefits that come with high office. By contrast, those who are not eager to rule are more likely to put the interests of the state first, because they have no desire for wealth or power. In a biblical context, we can broaden this insight to say that a reluctant leader would not be inclined to put her own interests ahead of God's for the simple reason that, aside from God's exhortation, she would never accept the job. Measured by this

## Essay

*Who is to blame for our suffering?*

The terrible destruction that the hatarah foretells is attributed squarely to Israel's own failings. It represents God's punishment of a recalcitrant, disloyal people. Israel is its own worst enemy.

This teaching became the very foundation of Jewish self-perception. The causes of persecutions, exile, and even mass slaughter were laid primarily at our own door, for had we acted differently none of this would have befallen us. "Because of our sins we were exiled," says the traditional prayer. In this view, God sent us these dreadful afflictions to bring us back to the path we should tread; and our persecutors were divine messengers to teach us the basic lesson.

One cannot quarrel with the basic assumption that we are responsible for what we do or fail to do, and that there are inevitable consequences. We are masters of our fate, both positively and negatively. But was the cruelty of our oppressors part of the divine plan? Can all the evils that befall our people be traced to the will of the Eternal?

There are those who, even after the Holocaust, would answer "yes." As a people we had fallen short of our potential, had betrayed our trust, and had violated our covenant with God. The result was terrible, but we, and not God, are to blame for the consequences.

However, only a small minority of our people would assent to this theology. To be sure, there were some rabbis who, after a terrorist attack killed more than a score of children in Maalot in Israel's north, blamed the tragedy on uninspected mezuzot in the town. The overwhelming majority of Jews (and especially in Israel) rejected this explanation as a perversion of religion.

But, one may argue, is this not after all what Jeremiah and other prophets preached? Does not this train of thought make God responsible for Auschwitz?

We think not. Jeremiah warns and pleads so that his vision of disaster may not come to pass. He depicts the coming terror in order to sway his listeners. We read his predictions as warnings; and after the fact, he and the other post-exilic prophets turn to consolation. But at the same time they say: continue to act as once you did, and the same consequences will ensue.

We thus understand prophecy to have one emphasis before the fact, and another afterward. Jeremiah identified God as the One who would punish Israel; but not as the One who allowed women to be raped and children to be slaughtered. However, he probably would have agreed that, once the wild beasts of terror and war are unleashed, there is no telling what will happen next.

Jeremiah's own life and his tragic end mirrored his view of history's unfolding.

PAUL HARARAH COMMENTARY

theism. This is the meaning of the chosenness of Israël. It symbolizes God's love of mankind.<sup>73</sup> The idea is also formulated somewhat differently. The election of Israel has a twofold meaning. Historically, it served the purpose of arousing the national consciousness for the historic mission. Its higher symbolic significance lies in the fact that it prepared Israel for its messianic mission, for its elevation into mankind.<sup>74</sup> Election and chosenness are, of course, traditional terminology. With Cohen they cannot mean a divine act in history. Since revelation is rational enlightenment, to be chosen means to recognize and accept the idea of monotheism as one's truth and mission.

How far removed Cohen's ideas on the subject of Israel and messianism are from the way the Jewish people understood itself and its historic way one may judge by the fact that the word exile does not occur once in his discussion. Of course, if the state is an unnatural framework for monotheism, statelessness is not exile; on the contrary, one might say it is the ideal situation for the Jew.<sup>75</sup> There is Jewish isolation, but it is enforced upon Israel from without because of the, as yet, unrealized ideal of worldwide monotheism. The isolation, the unrealized idea of mankind, brings suffering upon Israel. Israel suffers as the symbol of mankind, it suffers for the sake of mankind. And this is another aspect of its chosenness.<sup>76</sup> Cohen also says that suffering became Israel's life force. With others it is an indication of decline and the end; but Israel's world mission begins with its martyrdom. Suffering is a means of self-sanctification. It is a symbolical expression of reconciliation with God. Suffering is the precondition of redemption. It liberates man from the "sediments" of his empirical humanity. It is his ascent to the ideal moment in which he becomes himself. Redemption need not be postponed to the end of days; it is attached to every moment of suffering. Every moment of suffering is also a moment of redemption. Thus, suffering is no contradiction to Jewish survival; it is its very basis.<sup>77</sup>

In the various discussions of the subject of suffering, Cohen becomes almost poetic in its praise. He practically offers a philosophical ode to it. Yet, notwithstanding some significant words he did say about Jewish martyrology through history, one wonders whether he had a personal realization of what was involved in it for the untold masses—and not just individual saints—of the martyrs of Israel. How much understanding did he have of the vitality and staying power of the Jew and his faith, if he saw in Jewish suffering the life force that secures

its survival? He does acknowledge that Israel is a priestly nation, not a nation like any other, it is a people of faith; not as Israel, but as an anticipation of mankind. Israel is unique—for the time being—because the others have not yet become what they are supposed to be, mankind. One might say, in accordance with Cohen, that Israel is a negative nation; its uniqueness is imposed upon it by the inadequacy of others. In essence, there is no such thing as a Jewish identity. His universalism is so world-estranged that he thinks it necessary to disclaim any trace of anything specifically Jewish even in Jewish martyrology. He writes: "Jewish bravery is . . . simply a virtue of history, of the historical man and not of the individual. And messianism breaks the backbone of nationalism so that the bravery of the Jews not be degraded to a mere national virtue. The human bravery of the Jew is as historical virtue, the virtue of bravery, human bravery, the bravery of the truth of the religious ideal of mankind."<sup>78</sup> Poor Cohen! How afraid he was that he might find in his Jewish people something specifically Jewish.

Cohen's interpretation of Judaism and Israel is, of course, a philosopher's attempt to lend scholarly dignity to the typical assimilationist ideology of German reform Jewry of his generation. We might forgive him his time-boundness. Nor is there any need, at this late hour in history, to discuss with any seriousness the assimilationist fervor of a former reform Jewry. All that is by now, at least intellectually as well as ethically, dead as the dodo. Yet, even at this hour he should be taken to task for his scholarly and philosophical inadequacies and inconsistencies.

But for one vague reference to a complete dissolution of all national distinctions, Cohen sees as the goal of the messianic idea not the disappearance of all states but their organization in a union of states. In this respect, however, he did exempt Israel from the universal order to be. From the viewpoint of messianism history is the future. "The future becomes the reality of history. Therefore, only a spiritual world can fulfill this national existence," meaning the national existence of the Jewish people.<sup>79</sup> Cohen understood very well that just as man does not live by bread alone, neither can he live by the spirit alone. It was for this reason that in his *Ethik* he introduced the idea of God in order to guarantee the continuity of nature, full well realizing that without nature the ethical deed was not possible. Later on, in *Die Religion der Vernunft*

Eliezer  
Berkenkotz

he very wisely stated that man required the connection with nature. "He is not just spirit of holiness." In his "spiritualization" of religion Cohen had some trouble explaining how one could pray for such mundane things as bread to eat, clothes to wear, for health and bodily well-being. He solved the problem by the ingenious idea that the religious demands the empirical foundations of the I, as the "negative conditions" of its existence. It needs the biological and historical individual. Thus man is given care for his empirical, biological, and historical ego. Thus, he may pray for the earthly blessings of life without shame.<sup>80</sup> It is rather strange that having recognized all this, he still wanted only a spiritual world for Israel alone, as if man, and especially a people, could live in the realm of the purely spiritual. How little understanding he had for the essential feature of Judaism one may judge by his comment that in prayer the concept of God becomes the Kingdom of God. The praying community is the forerunner of the messianic kingdom of the future. It accepts the yoke of the Kingdom daily, thus preparing the future.<sup>81</sup>

It is rather strange to receive such an interpretation from a knowledgeable Jew who considers himself a socialist at that. He even makes reference to the majestic *Aleinu* prayer, in which the Jew expresses his hope for the establishment of the world as a Kingdom of God. The truth is that in prayer the Jew prays for it, hopes for it, but it is not in prayer that the Kingdom is established. It is not the praying community that builds the Kingdom but the doing community, the active one, the living, historical, community. Even though a people may forsake all hedonism, all power history, even though it may seek as its goal some form of ethical and spiritual realization, it needs "nature," it demands for its "negative condition" the empirical foundation of its spirituality, as long as it desires to remain on this earth with the goal of establishing the real world as a Kingdom of God. The entire problematic of Jewish existence, its authenticity, derives from it. Cohen's Kingdom of God, realized in prayer is Christian, not Jewish. Reserving the spiritual world for Israel, he proved that he did not understand the historical Israel. His Israel is a construct of his private predilection.

Cohen senses that his radically universalistic interpretation of messianism does not fully harmonize with the sources from which he has drawn it. He cannot help confessing that "but of course messianism is forever burdened with the providence for the believing people (*Glaub-*

*bevölk*), for the servant of God. And thus this conflict continued to remain in the prayers too. The return to Zion, the rebuilding of the Sanctuary, together with the sacrifices, is most intimately associated with messianic universalism. Therefore, the latter had inevitably to spiritualize and to broaden the former.<sup>82</sup> This, of course, is quite an understatement for the rejection of the idea of return to Zion. More important than that many prayers of the synagogue are for return to Zion and for the restoration of Jerusalem is the fact that all the writings of the prophets are saturated with the hope and the promises of Israel's return to Zion. There is no biblical propheticism without the promise and the assurance of return to the ancient homeland. Universalism and affirmation of a particular Jewish destiny inseparable from the land of Israel are the main themes of the prophets. Most important of all, however, is to understand that the two are found in the Bible together most naturally, without the slightest notion of a conflict between them.

It is not messianic monotheism that contradicts the idea of return to Zion, but the assimilationist interpretation of it. There is authentic universalism in messianism, as there is in it also, not as a burden but as an enthusiastic espousal, the vindication of the people of Israel, redeemed in Zion and Jerusalem. He who sees only the universalism does not understand its messianic version; he who sees only particularism does not understand Judaism and its people of Israel. The unique character of Jewish messianism lies in the fact that in it universalism and Jewish reality on empirical, biological and historical foundations, dwell together harmoniously. When one asks the question how that is possible, one is just trying the door handle to the antechamber of Judaism.<sup>82</sup>

## V. PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

### 1.

We believe that our discussion of the religion of reason shows that Cohen has not developed any new philosophical insights in order to establish "reason's share" (*Vernunftanteil*) in religion. He uses some of the basic concepts of his *Logik* for the purposes of establishing his philosophy of religion. We have seen how Being is thought as God as a logical requirement for the origin of Becoming—a thought which conforms to the thesis of Cohen's *Logik* that thinking is the thinking of origins. As he also says: "All pure knowledge (*Erkenntnis*) must be