CHRISTIANITY AND THE PIETY OF PRE-DESTRUCTION
HEBRAIC JUDAISM
BY RICHARD N. LONGENECKER, PH.D.

Throughout the course of the years since the first century, many comparisons
have been made and many distinctions drawn between Christianity and Judaism.
And with the modern ecumenical emphasis, this interest is being revived. It is, of
course, always possible to consider these two great monotheistic faiths from the
perspective of their contemporary manifestations and relations; but of greater signi-
cficance for theology is a comparison of the two as based upon their own normative
records of the first century. And this is the purpose of the present study: to compare
and contrast the spirituality of New Testament Christianity with that of the Jud­
ism which existed before the destruction of 70 A.D. and which was Hebraic, not
Hellenistic, in character. And, assuming that at least the main outlines of New Testa-
ment Christianity are known to the audience addressed herein, we will devote the
major portion of this study to an analysis of the piety of pre-destruction Hebraic
Judaism.

The Problem

Judging from the very diverse opinions expressed, an analysis of pre-destruction
Hebraic Judaism's spirituality seems well-nigh impossible. On the one hand, the
majority of Christian scholars have followed the position popularized by Emil Schurer;
i.e., that first century Pharisaism's motivation lay in its "faith in Divine retribution,"1
its "ethic and theology were swallowed up in jurisprudence,"2 and the combined re-
sult was a "fearful burden which a spurious legalism had laid upon the shoulders
of the people."3 Thus the many statements in Christian writings which easily equate
Pharisaism with "legalistic Judaism" or "legalism,"4 and the direct assertions that
the Pharisee of the first century lacked "inwardness, a sense of relative values, unity
and peace of his religious and moral life" while he lived in an atmosphere of "exter-
nalism, superficiality, casuistry and unsatisfactory religious fellowship."5 On the
other hand, most Jews agree with Solomon Schechter and Israel Abrahams: insisting
that the Judaism of the Pharisees, from which Christianity tore itself away, was no obsolete formalism, but a religion having the power to satisfy the
spiritual wants of those who were faithful to it.6 Christians have traditionally laid
stress on the Halakic portions of the Talmud and the practice of Pharisaism as
recorded in the New Testament and Josephus. The Jews have stressed the Haggadic
and the principles of Judaism. Neither group has failed to take into account all of
the evidence, but their emphases have been different. To the first, it is the prepon-
derance of dark elements in the literature and histories that is significant; to the
other, the streaks of light in the shadows. And thus scholarship has divided to this
present day.

The renewed attempt, which this study takes up, to understand the spiritual
climate of the Pharisaism of early Roman times is not necessarily an endeavor to
reconcile these two opposing views or to advocate either. As most previous investi-
gators have done, so we seek to ascertain the piety of first century Hebraic Judaism
on the basis of what we believe to be its valid sources and with an eye to both the
principles of the system and its practice; to both its possibilities and its actualities.
And in view of the indirect and analogous evidence unearthed at Qumran, such a re-
examination of Pharisaism's spirituality is pertinent at this time.
Sources

But before turning to the body of this study, it is necessary to delineate those primary sources upon which our considerations are based. Much could be said in this area; and certainly in an extended treatment of the subject, the extant literature of the Greek world, of Diaspora Judaism and of sectarian Judaism should not be ignored. Yet, in view of the necessary limitations of time and space, only three sources are here considered: the Jewish writings as incorporated in the Talmud, the works of the historian Josephus, and the New Testament canonical Gospels. And in each case, the question must be asked as to how truly the source reflects the piety of pre-destruction Hebraic thought.

Talmudic literature has been variously evaluated. Older Gentile scholars, such as W. Bousset and A. Schweitzer, insisted that it was not representative of pre-destruction Pharaisim at all. Many modern writers have agreed, arguing that the Judaism of R. Johanan b. Zakkai, or that of the second century R. Akiba, or later yet of Judah the Hasmonean is different from that before the first destruction to be called a new religion. An element within liberal Judaism, too, has its doubts that the Rabbinie Judaism of the first century can be adequately described from the Talmudic sources. On the other hand, most Jewish and some Gentile scholars maintain that we can form a picture of pre-destruction Judaism from the Rabbinical writings in our possession. The monumental work of George Foot Moore, e.g., begins on the premise that “the task of Johanan ben Zakkai and his fellows was one of conservation, not of reformation.” Moore insists that since the writings give no hint of a new departure or a new religion, we must accept them as possessing a basic continuity with that earlier time — though undoubtedly there has been a shifting emphasis within this fundamental solidarity through four or five centuries of thought and persecution. Though there has been development within the Talmud, there is, he maintains, “no indication that the development was on new lines or on different principles from that which preceded it.”

Without opportunity for elaboration, we believe that there are at least portions of the Talmudic literature which can be used by the historian in his quest to ascertain the piety of pre-destruction Pharaisim; portions and passages from which, it is true, a detailed picture is impossible, but from which a general impression can be obtained. These portions are those which seem to come from an early time and which is true, a detailed picture is impossible, but from which a general impression can be obtained. These portions are those which seem to come from an early time and which do not appear to be above reasonable suspicion of being written in reaction to Judaism’s political and religious misfortunes. The following four categories of such portions are here proposed, and upon these this study will base to a large extent its conclusions regarding pre-destruction Judaism’s piety:

1. Those practices and rules deemed by Johanan b. Zakkai and his followers to be very ancient; or, as Moore says, to be “customs the origin of which was lost in antiquity.” Quite often these are introduced by such a phrase as “Our Rabbis taught,” or “It has been taught,” though the context must also be noted.

2. Those actions and teachings of certain named persons who lived immediately before, during or personally had their roots in the period before the first destruction. The chief direct authority of this class is the tractate Pirke Abot, with its Haggadic teachings attributed to specific teachers — principally chapter one, dealing with the teachers up to 70 A.D., and chapter two, treating mainly Johanan b. Zakkai, whose roots were firmly planted in the pre-destruction period, and his disciples. And also, while “for a knowledge of the ideals of rabbinical ethics and piety, no other easily accessible source is equal to the Abot,” there are other passages of this type scattered throughout the Gemaras, Midrashim and Toseęptha.

3. Those passages and portions which would have no reason to be a reaction to either religious opponents or political trials, and which do not seem to be influenced by a particular local situation or passing fancy but which have parallels elsewhere in the literature. Here it is that the subjective element of the interpreter most enters. Yet, here are passages which must not be overlooked.

4. Those ancient liturgies, confessions and prayers: The Shema, The Shemoneh Ereh (The Eighteen “Benedictions,” “Blessings,” or “Prayers”), and the broad outlines of the 613 Commandments. It is true that the Benedictions were revised by Gamaliel II; but probably only revised. Minus the confessional insertion, there is no reason to doubt their pre-destruction quality. The antiquity and importance of the Shema as a recognized confession is attested by its inclusion on the Nash Papyrus and on a phylactery from the Wadi Murabbah finds; whereas in regard to the 613 Commandments, we can at least accept the broad outlines therein presented.

For a knowledge of the religious situation of first century Palestine, Josephus is somewhat disappointing. While his works promise much and are valuable historically, they reflect the fact that their author had little interest in religion for its own sake. Josephus’ value as a source for an understanding of Hebraic Pharaisim is minimized by his evident aloofness from the main stream of normative Judaism. And thus, when it comes to theological thought, he must always be used in a purely secondary measure and suspected of telling us no more than what was popularly held by the Jewish people and what would be acceptable to the better of the heathen thinkers.

In the canonical Gospels we have an historical record that is in many respects just the reverse of that of Josephus. Here the purpose is primarily religious, with the chronological recounting of historical events treated in a subsidiary fashion. They were in a very real sense ‘written out of faith and for faith’. It is therefore necessary to view all of the references of the Gospels to the contemporary religious scene in Palestine as secondary to and conditioned by the Christian perspective. But the recognition that the Gospels are not without bias and are not primarily interested in Judaism ’per se’ is not to discredit their trustworthiness in the area of our present concern. In fact, we agree with G. F. Moore that “the Gospels themselves are the best witness to the religious and moral teaching of the synagogue in the middle forty years of the first century.”

Externalism and Formalistic Piety

Probably everyone is more ready to see the flowers in his own garden, and the weeds in that of his neighbor. And yet it is poor gardening to dwell on either the exclusion of the other. While we might desire to dwell on the flowers, we must first of all deal with the weeds. And weeds there were in pre-destruction Pharaisim.

The testimony of the Talmud. — The legalistic externalism of the great proportion of the statements in the Mishnah and the quibbling casuistry of the major portion of the Gemaras have caused many interpreters to view all of Jewish piety as formalistic. And it is not difficult to see why, when even the earliest and noblest tractate contains such views as: “The rules about Bird-offerings and the onset of menstruation — these are essentials of the Halakoth”; or “Which is the straight way that a man should choose? That which is an honor to him and gets him honor in the eyes of his fellow men.”

However, both these statements are credited to Rabhas later than our time of interest; the first to R. Eleazar Hisma, from the beginning of the second century A.D., and the second to R. Judah, at the end of the same century. Therefore, in accordance with those sources we have designated as being valid for an understanding of pre-destruction Hebraic Judaism, it is not our purpose to include them here as evidence. Neither shall we include the great amount of material of a similar externalistic nature in the later Talmudic writings.
When we dismiss all of those writings which do not definitely have their roots in the pre-destruction period, we are left with a pitifully small amount of direct Talmudic evidence. And of this remaining material there are many that reveal a purely commercial view of righteousness which can rightfully be ascribed to the pre-destruction period; e.g., the saying ascribed to antiquity that “a man should always regard himself as though he were half guilty and half meritorious: if he performs one precept, happy is he for weighting himself down in the scale of merit; if he commits one transgress, woe to him for weighting himself down in the scale of guilt.”22 The words ascribed to R. Eleazar, who personally and through his teacher R. Johanan b. Zakkaï had its roots in the early period, also lean in this direction: “Know before whom thou toildest and who is thy taskmaster who shall pay thee reward of thy labor.”23

The testimony of the Gospels and Josephus. — The greater quantity of evidence revealing a formalistic piety in pre-destruction Pharisaism is contained in the Gospels and in the writings of Josephus. Many clashes between Jesus and the Pharisees over sabbath observance and ritual purity are recounted in the Gospels, and at least oneparable portrays the “elder brother” of Judaism as missing the significance of the occasion in his pride and self-pity.24 Such accounts are primarily setting forth the Jewish failure to appreciate God’s greater Revelation and working in their midst in and through His Son; though, of course, in the light of this failure the Gospels cannot view the Pharisaic righteousness as anything but externalism. The damming evidence from the Gospels against Pharisaic spirituality, however, is contained in: (1) John the Baptist’s denunciation of them as a “brood of vipers” who take pride in the external matter of their descent from Abraham; (2) Jesus’ more rebuke of them in characterizing them as stiff at heart while attempting to appear good; (3) Jesus’ contrasting of the Sermon on the Mount between the Pharisees’ formalism and true righteousness; (4) Christ’s application of Isaiah 29:13, “This people honor me with their lips but their heart is far from me,” to the Pharisees; and (5) our Lord’s long listing of woes pronounced upon the scribes and Pharisees — these who are proclaimed to be “hypocrites.”25 There is no need to say that these denunciations recorded in the Gospels arise from a later ‘lebensitz’ of the Church, for the Talmud itself speaks of similar hypocrisy within Pharisaism; and similarly condemns it.26

Josephus’ account of the Jerusalem Pharisee Ananias, who hypocritically used the pretense of a religious life to accomplish his political ends, is telling. Certainly externalism is evident in the historian’s insistence, which he implies is the accepted view within the Jewish nation, that “the purposeing to do a thing, but not actually doing it, is not worthy of punishment.”27 These words are spoken in connection with Antiochus Epiphanes’ attempt to plunder the temple of Diana in Persia. But Josephus clearly Imparted of all guilt since though he tried his best to get the treasure, Antiochus didn’t succeed. Now it is true that Josephus is a poor spokesman for the theology of Judaism. Yet the fact that this same principle is restated by fairly early Gemara’s, and that some modern Rabbis can speak with approval of “the principle adopted for Israel that an evil thought is not to be viewed as an evil deed,”28 makes it probable that Josephus’ expression had a wider acceptance than that of his own personal Pharisaism. Probably of a similar nature is his representation of the Jewish view of retribution. “Let him that is smitten be avenged immediately, by inflicting the same punishment on him that smote him.”29

“It therefore does seem that even though we disregard the later foliation of Judaism, much of which undoubtedly had its roots if not its flower in the early period, there were still weeds in the piety of pre-destruction Hebraic Judaism. But we must not linger over the weeds.”

Inwardness and Prophetic Spirit

The most difficult aspect of early Pharisaism for Christian scholars to see is that of inwardness. And indeed, the Judaism of the pre-destruction period was not all externalism.

The testimony of the Talmud. — The teaching of Antigonus of Socho, “be not like slaves that minister to the master for the sake of receiving a bounty, but be like slaves that minister to the master not for the sake of receiving a bounty;” was carried on by at least Hillel, Zadok and Johanan b. Zakkaï. In the discussions of proselyte baptism, there is the significant statement by Johanan b. Zakkaï insisting that one did not become really clean by the water of separation nor really unclean by a corpse — but that the provisions regarding cleanliness must be kept since it was the will of God.47 Inward motives and qualities are stressed. Johanan b. Zakkaï highly commends the expression of Eleazar, one of his five disciples, that a good heart is the foundation of all good and an evil heart of all evil.48

More pertinent still is the evidence of a realization in pre-destruction Judaism that one must start from the mercy and love of God, returning that love and manifesting it to one’s fellow man, if religion is to be meaningful. Probably the most important single factor in impressing mercy and love upon the consciousness of the Jew within his covenanted God was the daily recitation of the Shema. After the recital of the unity of God, and before the commands regarding obedience, the significant words of Deut. 6:5 were repeated: “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy might.” These same elements of (1) confession of God, (2) love from God to man and/or man to God, and (3) obedience to God’s instruction, appear in the same order in the Shemoneth Esreh, the enumeration of the 613 commandments, and were possibly included by many early Pharisees in the opening words of the “Ten Commandments.”49 There is abundant evidence that at least Hillel made much of the ‘hesed’ of God, both God’s shown to man and the need of a similar desire ‘hesed’ and not sacrifice.”50 In the teaching of Antigonus of Socho, “be like slaves that minister to the master for the sake of receiving a bounty, but be like slaves that minister to the master not for the sake of receiving a bounty;” and similarly condemns it. 35
as is attributed to Hillel, and that the same sentiment is contained in the Letter of Aristeas, makes it probable that the idea of love and consideration for one’s fellowmen had a broader acceptance in early Pharisaism than we sometimes imagine.

The testimony of the Gospels and Josephus. — Even though much is said to the contrary in the Gospels and the writings of Josephus, there is still the recognition within both sources of what might be called a more noble element in Palestinian Pharisaism. Mark’s Gospel recounts with approval the agreement of one scribe with Jesus that to love God and to love one’s neighbor was of far greater importance than all external action. And not all the Pharisees are presented in the Gospel narratives as in bitter opposition to Jesus. Likewise, Josephus relates that Alexander Jannaeus still recognized a godly element in Pharisaism, even though he characterized the group as a whole as soundless.

It therefore seems that we can recognize within pre-destruction Pharisaism not only the element of formalistic piety, but also at least a bit of true inwardness of spirit. It appears that there were Pharisees who could insist that “doing is a deadly thing — unless it is the result of heartfelt faith.”

The Correlation of the Two Elements

With the recognition of both a formalistic and an inward spirit within pre-destruction Pharisaism, the question arises as to how these two elements are to be viewed in the overall religious situation of the day. And it is at this point, in the interpretation of the data more than in the recognition of the elements, that divergence of opinion has arisen.

Past perspectives. — Various positions regarding the relation of these factors in the overall picture of Judaism have been advocated; and in order to clarify the discussion, we list them as follows:

1.) Some Jewish scholars have taken the line of whimsically shrugging off the baser elements in the Talmudic literature, insisting that they are “only the expression of a momentary impulse, ... or were meant simply as a piece of humorous by-play, calculated to enliven the interest of a languid audience.”

2.) Other Jewish apologists would refer all of that which they believe to be base or exaggerated to the realm of the incidental “made in the heat of polemics and through zeal for the preservation of a national unity,” and thus have never been a part of Judaism.

3.) Some Christian writers ignore the evidence from the Gospels and Josephus, either by excluding it as a source or explaining away the denunciations found therein, and minimize the objectionable features in the Talmud. The result is thus a general agreement with the first two Jewish positions; some going so far as to insist that “the Rabbinic Judaism of 4 B.C. to A.D. 70 was ... as bright and happy a religion as the world has seen.”

4.) A few have advocated that an individual Jew could, at one and the same time, believe that love was the only acceptable motive for service and yet that the motivation of desire to win God’s favor was rewarded by God.

5.) The vast majority of Christian scholars have minimized the evidences of an inward piety, and insisted that “Judaism believed in salvation through the observance of the Torah; the deliverance by an act of God was not the foundation of Judaism, but only a devotional accessory.”

The problem of religious orientation. — In evaluating the spiritual climate of any religious group or system, it is not enough simply to balance baser elements against nobler ones and accept the verdict of the weightier quantity. Religion is more than mathematics. In dealing with spirituality we are dealing primarily with motives, not just expressions; though, of course, any investigation regarding motives has only the expressions as factual evidence on which to base its judgments. And yet the investigator must always realize that he is dealing with religious outlooks and orientations, and must accept the fact that there can be differing religious orientations within a given religious group or community.

We find such differing religious orientations at variance within our own souls even before we see them manifested within a particular religious form of expression; but we can also view them at work in all the spiritual and ethical activities of man — whether individual or formal and organized. These differing orientations can be grouped roughly into two classes or types. To borrow Deissmann’s distinction in regard to mysticism, they are the “acting” religious orientation and the “reacting” religious orientation; that attitude which makes religion a means in order to and that which sees it as an expression because of. Deissmann’s words regarding mysticism are also pertinent here:

In both cases an action takes place. But in the first type the action is spontaneous performance of the individual or of the community, intended to produce in response to it a performance on the part of the deity, effective through its own execution, effective as ‘actio acta,” as ‘opus operatum.” In the second, the reacting type, on the other hand, the action of the man is an action in response, a reaction. Here it is God Himself who is really the ‘Leitourgos’, the ‘Theourgos’ in the highest sense; the individual or the community only says the amen.

In the constant demand for value judgments which Comparative Religion and Theology as a whole makes upon us, it is of the utmost importance to recognize the possibility of such differing orientations — indeed, even of opposing outlooks. And yet we must be aware that positive identification and precise analysis become extremely difficult, if not impossible. Precision of identification becomes impossible because such orientations cross all external lines and because the nature of our human knowledge is such that we can know nothing fully — much less the human spirit which defies the best of human scientific analysis. And yet we are forced to recognize as best we can, make value judgments, and view the details in their total perspective. It is this we endeavor to do in understanding the spirituality of pre-destruction Pharisaism.

Acting and reacting tendencies in Hebraicism. — All of our sources recognize differing religious orientations within pre-destruction Hebraic Judaism, though they express it differently. The Talmudic literature can distinguish between the “Reckoning Pharisee, who casts up his account of sins and virtues,” and the “God-fearing Pharisee,” and between the “acting” and the “reacting” Pharisees and their formalists. The Gospels can speak of the Pharisees as hypocrites and lacking the love of God, and yet commend a Pharisaic scribe for realizing that love of God and neighbor is basic to all spirituality. They can portray the Pharisees as agitating for Jesus’ death, and yet present cases of Pharisaic sympathy and tolerance.

Likewise, Josephus distinguishes between the genuine and the formalistic among the Pharisees.

The distinction in these contrasts often falls between what we shall call an acting legalism and a reacting nomism; i.e., between an ordering of one’s life in external and formal action according to the Law in order to gain righteousness and/or appear righteous and the molding of one’s life in all its varying relations according to the Law in response to the love and grace of God. To both classes, the Law was of great importance: but it was important for different reasons. To both “the joy of the commandment” was very real, but it sprang from different sources.

In interpreting the elements of formalistic and inward piety in pre-destruction Hebraic Judaism as stemming from acting and reacting religious orientations, there
is the intriguing temptation to go further in an effort to pinpoint individuals who portrayed each tendency and to determine the extent of the influence of each element over the Pharisaism of the day. The first line of inquiry can lead nowhere, for, as we have noted above, our human powers of analysis are at best inadequate in this area of motives and attitudes. Even if our sources were voluminous, unimpeachable and transparent, the best that could be done would be to point out a few individuals who seem beyond doubt to have possessed a reacting faith. Regarding the second investigation, matters are just about as bad. But judging from the legalistic emphasis that followed the repulsion of the Seleucid attempt at Hellenization, it was probably the case that each oppression and disaster from that time through at least the pre-destruction period only strengthened the forces of legalism. It was no accident that the Oral Law centered around those elements which had been previously attacked; i.e. sabbath observance and ritual purity. It might be suggested that the distinction between Shammai and Hillel corresponds to these tendencies; and it is true that the one could be said to be "precise" while the other "kindly." Yet both precision and kindness could spring from either motivation. These tendencies cut across all external lines and temperaments. All that can be said with certainty is that there was within pre-destruction Hebraic Judaism both a formalistic piety and an inward spirituality; an acting legalism and a reacting nomism. It remains to analyze more closely, and to portray, these tendencies.

The Religion of a Nomist

Much that has been written regarding pre-destruction Pharisaism has portrayed it as basically one in spirituality — a bleak and striving legalism. And though legalism can have a beneficial effect upon morality, its spirituality can be so described. But in recognizing a distinction of motive and emphasis between legalism and nomism, as we have so defined the terms, we cannot continue to allow the one characterization to apply to both orientations. It is incumbent upon us to consider the religion and piety of a nomist, allowing the usual characterization to remain valid for that of the legalist.

The analogy of Qumran. — Two common misrepresentations of a legal religion, such as Judaism, are: (1) that fidelity to Law is necessarily to be equated with legalism, as we are using the term; and (2) that a religion which stresses fidelity to Law is necessarily egocentric, not Theocentric. But both of these accusations are refuted by the analogous evidence to Pharisaism found at Qumran — if not by some of the previously known non-canonical writings and the Talmudic literature itself.

That the Qumran community, an Essene group, was more detailed in its legislation and more rigid in its observance than Pharisaic Judaism is beyond doubt. Josephus has long ago informed us of this fact, and now it is evident in its own literature. Yet, one of the most striking aspects of the evidence from Qumran is that of the coincidence of a nomism and a prophetic spirit. There is a scrupulous concern for ritual purity, but there is no indication of a merely mechanical, external observance. The emphasis is rather upon God's 'hesed', and from this basis spring the intriguing temptation to go further in an effort to pinpoint individuals who portrayed each tendency and to determine the extent of the influence of each for, as we have noted above, our human powers of analysis are at best inadequate.

For most Christians who take up the study of pre-destruction Judaism the object is to point out the differences between the Christian and the Jewish faiths. The question usually revolves around the quest for the unresolved tension in the experience of Judaism which becomes resolved in Christian experience; the search for the inadequacy of the former system which finds satisfaction in Jesus Christ. For the Jewish writers, of course, there is no such tension and inadequacy in Judaism. For Christians, there is such a tension in Judaism; though a major portion of Christian scholars have implied that this tension is that of the relation between externalism and inward piety — mere formalism and the prophetic spirit.

It is the thesis of the present study that the tension between Christianity and pre-destruction Hebraic Judaism — especially the nomistic element within pre-destruction Hebraic Judaism — was not primarily that of legalism versus love (externalism versus inwardness), but it was (and is) fundamentally that of promise and fulfillment. Pre-Christian Judaism in its principles and noble representatives need not be viewed as entirely legalistic; at least, not in the connotative use of that term. We have made
a distinction between the words legalism and nominalism, and suggest that it is the latter and not the former which best fits a certain element within pre-destruction Pharisaism. The change that took place in the conversation experience of the earliest Jewish Christians was not necessarily in the abandonment of an acting religion for a reacting faith; i.e., not necessarily the change from outward to inward piety. The primary tension of Judaism, which dominates all Old Testament and Jewish thought, is that of promise and fulfillment. And it was this which the earliest Christians found resolved in Christ.

"From the Prayer for the Coming of the Messiah" in the Shemoneh Eureh, the theme of recalled promise and anticipation is present. The cry "What delays it?" is neither accidental nor incidental in the Talmud. The Targums and non-canonical literature but underlining the longing of the community. And the Quiran community lived solely for the Messianic latter and not the former which best fits a certain element within pre-destruction Judaism, which dominates all.

"Theological Old Testament," the Characteristic Doctrines," Record and Revelation, ch. 34; 2:16. E.g., G. F. Moore, St. Paul's Conception of Recompense, p. 7. The statement of G. H. Dodd, that "the Pharisaic God was for practical purposes an Abrahamic" (The Meaning of Paul for Today, p. 57), is but another expression of this basic approach.

S. Schechter, Studies in Judaism, p. 173. On the whole, the works of Abrahams are more balanced and better informed than those of Schuricht.

R. T. Hefker, Pharisaism, p. 2. Cf. the similar sentiments expressed in the works of such men as G. F. Moore and P. C. Burkitt.

"Talmudic literature" here meant in its broader aspect: the Mishnah, the Tosaphot, the two Genizas and the Talmud. It is used to include those codifications and writings from about 70 to 500 A.D. Thus the earlier Midrash is included in what are usually termed the rabbinic Targums and the later Kabbalistic and ethical writings. In its narrow sense, "Talmud" refers to the Genizah: Palestinian or Jerusalem of c. 400 A.D. and Babylonian of c. 500 A.D.

W. Boussct, The Religion of the Israelis in external and internal Exile (ed. P. C. H. H. Hillebrand), p. 43; A. Hillebrand, The Dogma and His Predecessors, pp. 74-89. Silverman graphically says: "The picture which they draw for us shows an emaciated plain, but this yellow, wilted grass was green and forth indeed. What did the Maccabees look like?"


Ibid., Vol. III, p. 22.

The debt to A. L. Williams, Talmudic Judaism and Christianity, pp. 38-42, is closely evident in points 1, 2 and 3.


It should be observed, there seems no doubt that "the authorities are whose names are quoted are a help, if not as infallible index, to fixing their date" (L. Finkelstein, The Book of Jubilees and the Rabbinic Halakot, Harvard Theological Review, Vol. XVI, No. 1, Jan., 1923, p. 39).


The Nab Papyrus, a small piece of papyrus containing the Deuterothe and the Shema, has been variously dated from the second century and the fourth century and the first century B.C. The papyrus, which is one of the latter half of the first century B.C. for its date (cf. H. H. Rowley, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 13, for an excellent summary on the various dates which has been suggested for it), is included in the Dead Sea Scroll "of the Qumran community," which is on p. 13:1-16, Brit. 11:13:21 and Dent. 6:4:9, and this in close conjunction with an apparent marriage contract dated in the seventh year of the reign of Hadrian (c. 134 A.D.), offers further evidence for the antiquity of this celebrated prayer (cf. Y. Yadin, The Message of the Scrolls, p. 70).
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18. The Nab Papyrus, a small piece of papyrus containing the Deuterothe and the Shema, has been variously dated from the second century and the fourth century and the first century B.C. The papyrus, which is one of the latter half of the first century B.C. for its date (cf. H. H. Rowley, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 13, for an excellent summary on the various dates which has been suggested for it), is included in the Dead Sea Scroll "of the Qumran community," which is on p. 13:1-16, Brit. 11:13:21 and Dent. 6:4:9, and this in close conjunction with an apparent marriage contract dated in the seventh year of the reign of Hadrian (c. 134 A.D.), offers further evidence for the antiquity of this celebrated prayer (cf. Y. Yadin, The Message of the Scrolls, p. 70).
peace and purity, peace, loving mankind and bringing them nigh to the Law" (Pirke Aboth 1:2, Mishnah); and (3) "Trust not in thyself, even the day of thy death, and judge not thyself; till thou come to his place" (Pirke Aboth 1:2, Mishnah).

36. Pirke Aboth 2:10 (Mishnah): "R. Eleazar said: Let the honour of thy fellow be dear to thee as thine own."
37. Pirke Aboth 2:10 (Mishnah): "R. Meir said: If it were but a question of mercy, to say 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.'"
38. Pirke Aboth 2:10 (Mishnah): "R. Meir said: If no evil should happen, too, so shalt thou act on the same principle towards thy subjects and offenders."
39. Pirke Aboth 2:10 (Mishnah): "R. Meir said: For this reason, for it is your heart and your will, the will, the moral discipline that is most essential in teaching."
40. Pirke Aboth 2:10 (Mishnah): "R. Meir said: This is the will of the Lord, to comfort them which mourn with the comfort of the Lord." (Isa. 51:11, 12). Hence, to teach the law as the working of God's Holy Spirit (6-7), and an attitude of uprightness, humility and submission (8). Likewise, the whole attitude of the Sages toward the public sacrifices at Jerusalem and the relationship of sacrifice to spiritual life is further evidence at this point; cf. J. M. Baumgarten, "The Sages on the Yom Kippur Sacrifice," Harvard Theological Review, Vol. XVII, No. 1 (Jan., 1935), pp. 31-35.
42. In the opening words of IQS (1:2), and before the command to obedience, there are the words "to seek God ... followed by a like formula." The command "to seek God" is undoubtedly taken from H Hist. 13:12 (cf. W. H. Stowe's, "The Scriptures and the Dead Sea Sect"), Vol. IV, pp. 32-39, for an expression of the more moderate emphasis of the majority of scholars). At any rate, Josephus clearly tells us that they were dispersed into every city (War II, 4. 4), and that their own masses for such urban members in 11:29-22. The fact that there were laws designated for the camps implies that there were Essenes not living in camps; see the Damascus Document 7:12, 12; 13:29, 14:3. There is even the intriguing suggestion made by R. N. G. H. \"How the Elders in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,\" The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. J. Strugnell, pp. 122-123, that there was a personal contact between Hillel and Essenes; a contact established through Hillel's continued friendship with Menahem, who preceded Simon as a leading Pharisaic teacher, but who later separated to become (possibly) the Essene Menahem.
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56. Wheaton, Illinois