

JBL, LXV, part II, June 1946

could be identified with an unattainable social ideal (p.25), can, if it's not a lapsus calami, only be described as a grotesque misunderstanding. One is more and more convinced today of the impossibility that a new social ideal can be ascribed to the prophets.

212⁷

If too much is dragged in here, so important pieces are lacking on the other side: because the anger and the inexorable sternness of God, of which the prophetic message is so full, find no recognition; they would join all-too-disjointedly in the ^(ascending) mounting line to the loving God. And so also, the desire of the prophets for the rebuilding of the temple and the new splendour of Zion, which stand in such a noteworthy connection to their legal statements, go unmentioned. Such a prejudice of the prophetic monotheism and universalism is able to be best ordered in the developmental scheme in that of Ezekiel, who also injects an exceptional position as the fore-runner of Judaism.

213⁰

When one can view the temple only as an obstacle of the prophetic universalism, then will Judaism ^{worked} will only be able to serve as a regression into the already ever-severe particularism with all the limited representations of the tribal deity, to which the also extant and often-in-noteworthy-independent-formulation-expressed-convictions of the government of the God of the world (cf. Isa. 40ff, Mal. 1.11, Ps. 93-99, etc.) stand in inextricable conflict. The return to the disagreement, which arose between the great insights of the spiritual leader and the vulgar faith of the Volk, as one finds everywhere in the living religions (p.33), can ~~embarrass~~ ^{embarrass} the embarrassment of the belief in development at this place only