

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 significance 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 Judaism 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 Testament 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 result 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 "externalism, superficiality, casuistry and unsatisfactory religious fellowship."⁵ On the other hand, most Jews agree with Solomon Schechter and Israel Abrahams: insisting that "it is hardly an exaggeration to maintain that there is no noble manifestation of real religion, no expression of real piety, reverence, and devotion, to which Jewish literature would not offer a fair parallel."⁶ And concurrently, some Christian scholars argue 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."⁷ 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 preponderance 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 investigators 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 literature⁸ has been variously evaluated. Older Gentile scholars, such as W. Bousset and A. Schweitzer,⁹ insisted that it was not representative of pre-destruction Pharisaism 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 Patriarch, was sufficiently different from that before the first destruction to be called a new religion.¹⁰ An element within liberal Judaism, too, has its doubts that the Rabbinic Judaism of the first century can be adequately described from the Talmudic sources.¹¹ 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.¹² 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."¹³ 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."¹⁴

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 Pharisaism; 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 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,¹⁵ 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."¹⁶ 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.¹⁷ The chief direct authority of this class is the tractate Pirke Aboth, 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,"¹⁸ there are other passages of this type scattered throughout the Gemaras, Midrashim and Tosephta.

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 in-

fluenced 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 Esreh (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 Murabbaat finds;¹⁹ while 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 Pharisaism 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."²⁰

Externalism and Formalistic Piety

Probably everyone is more ready to see the flowers in his own garden,²¹ and the weeds in that of his neighbor. And yet it is poor gardening to dwell on either to 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 Pharisaism.

The testimony of the Talmud. — The legalistic externalism of the great portion 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.²² 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";²³ or "Which is the straight way that a man should choose? That which is an honor to him and gets him honor from men."²⁴ However, both these statements are credited to Rabbis 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.²⁵

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 more statements showing an inward piety than of a mere externalism. Yet there are expressions of externalism and that reveal a purely commercial view of righteousness which can rightfully be assigned 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."²⁶ The words ascribed to R. Eleazar, who personally and through his teacher R. Johanan b. Zakkai had his roots in the early period, also lean in this direction: "Know before whom thou toilest and who is thy taskmaster who shall pay thee reward of thy labor."²⁷

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,²⁸ and at least one parable portrays the "elder brother" of Judaism as missing the significance of the occasion in his pride and self-pity.²⁹ 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 damning 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;³⁰ (2) Jesus' same rebuke of them in characterizing them as evil at heart while attempting to appear good;³¹ (3) Jesus' contrasts in the Sermon on the Mount between the Pharisees' formalism and true righteousness;³² (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;³³ and (5) our Lord's long listing of woes pronounced upon the scribes and Pharisees — these who are proclaimed to be "hypocrites."³⁴ 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.³⁵

Josephus' account of the Jerusalem Pharisee Ananias, who hypocritically used the pretense of a religious fast to accomplish his political ambitions, indicates that at least one Pharisee's religion was but formal.³⁶ And the earlier indication in 'The Jewish War' that the sacred seasons in Jerusalem were often used by the religious leaders for purposes of sedition and political advantage implies that Ananias' action might not have been an isolated incident.³⁷ As indicated in their rule over Queen Alexandra³⁸ and their joining in the intrigues of Herod's court,³⁹ not all of the Pharisees held to the ideal of the earlier Hasidim in leaving governments entirely alone as long as there was religious freedom. And Josephus' description of them as those "who were in a capacity of greatly opposing kings" is telling.⁴⁰ Certainly externalism is evident in the historian's insistence, which he implies is the accepted view within the Jewish nation, that "the purposing to do a thing, but not actually doing it, is not worthy of punishment."⁴¹ These words are spoken in connection with Antiochus Epiphanes' attempt to plunder the temple of Diana in Persia. But Josephus clears him 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 Gemaras,⁴² 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,"⁴³ 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 retaliation: "Let him that is smitten be avenged immediately, by inflicting the same punishment on him that smote him."⁴⁴

"It therefore does seem that even though we disregard the later foliage 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; and let the fear of Heaven be upon you,"⁴⁵ was carried on by at least Hillel, Zadok and Johanan b. Zakkai.⁴⁶ In the discussions of proselyte baptism, there is the significant statement by R. Johanan b. Zakkai 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. Zakkai 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 in this early period 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 Shemoneh Esreh,⁴⁹ the enumeration of the 613 commandments,⁵⁰ and were possibly included by many early Pharisees in the opening words of the 'Ten Commandments'.⁵¹ There is abundant evidence that at least Hillel made much of the 'hesed' of God, both God's shown to man and the need for the man of God to manifest such to his fellow-men.⁵² In this respect, he was a true follower of the Hasidic movement.⁵³ And, although a non-ritualistic emphasis was bound to arise with the enforced discontinuance of the sacrificial system, it is still significant that R. Johanan b. Zakkai took the words of Hosea 6:6 as his motto after the destruction of the Temple: "I desire 'hesed' and not sacrifice."⁵⁴ This appears to be a re-emphasis of what was already accepted in at least some Hebraic circles before the fall of the Temple. Further, it must be pointed out that at least two of the Talmudic passages — Sotah 31a (Babylonian Talmud) and Shabbath 88b (Babylonian Talmud) — speak of the proper and best motivation in the religious life being that of the love of God.⁵⁵

Even those who most hotly dispute the presence of inwardness as a real element in pre-destruction Hebraic Judaism agree with Bacher that the "love of man was considered by Hillel as the kernel of the entire Jewish teaching."⁵⁶ The utterances ascribed to Hillel show him to have possessed a true inward spirituality, whatever characterization might be given to the rest of Judaism.⁵⁷ But the fact that one of R. Johanan b. Zakkai's students is credited with a similar expression of the Golden Rule

as is attributed to Hillel,⁵⁸ and that the same sentiment is contained in the Letter of Aristeas,⁵⁹ makes it probable that the idea of love and consideration for one's fellow-men 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.⁶⁰ And not all the Pharisees are presented in the Gospel narratives as in bitter opposition to Jesus.⁶¹ Likewise, Josephus relates that Alexander Jannaeus still recognized a godly element in Pharisaism, even though he characterized the group as a whole as scoundrels.⁶²

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."⁶³

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."⁶⁴
- 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.⁶⁵
- 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.⁶⁶ 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."⁶⁷
- 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.⁶⁸
- 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."⁶⁹

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. Theology 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 'Theourgios' in the highest sense; the individual or the community only says the amen.⁷⁰

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 "God-loving Pharisee."⁷¹ It speaks of both the 'ish hesed' Hillel⁷² and the good-hearted Johanan b. Zakkai,⁷³ and warns regarding the bite and wounds of the mere formalists.⁷⁴ The Gospels can speak of the Pharisees as hypocrites and lacking the love of God,⁷⁵ 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,⁷⁶ and yet present cases of Pharisaic sympathy and tolerance.⁷⁷ Likewise, Josephus distinguishes between the genuine and the formalistic among the Pharisees.⁷⁸

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 arrangement 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.⁸⁰ 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,⁸¹ 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.⁸² 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,⁸³ 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;⁸⁴ and (2) that a religion which stresses fidelity to Law is necessarily egocentric, not Theocentric.⁸⁵ 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,⁸⁶ 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 true righteousness, true motivation and true strength to be pleasing unto Him in obedience to His commandments.⁸⁷ A mere formalistic piety is strongly condemned.⁸⁸ Though they possessed a great assurance of their own election and were convinced that the true revelation of the meaning of the Law and the Prophets had been given them, the Essenes were also acutely aware of their own sinfulness and possessed a real humility.⁸⁹ Theirs was the need to depend upon God alone for righteousness, wisdom and strength; and theirs was to be that attitude of seeking God "with all their heart and with all their soul."⁹⁰ To judge from the merely external criterion of the proportion of legal to prophetic biblical writings found to

date at Qumran, the study and reading of the Essenes seems to have been balanced. W. D. Davies has well summed it up in saying: "The community is aware of itself as under 'the Law' and yet as a 'household of the spirit'; it reveals no sense of an essential incompatibility or essential tension between life under 'the Law' and life under 'the Spirit'."⁹¹

The significance of this evidence from Qumran for Pharisaism is not so much that here was a nomistic group with the spirit of prophetism which influenced Pharisaism for the better — though that is not out of the question.⁹² But rather:

1.) The Qumran literature shows that fidelity to the divine law does not necessarily imply for a Jewish group a legalistic and egocentric piety.

2.) The men of Qumran and the men of Pharisaism very probably had their roots in a common subsoil, that of the Maccabean Hasidim;⁹³ and thus the basic elements of the one community would probably be more or less common to the other. This new evidence from the caves of the "separating" Hasidim necessitates that we revise many previous opinions regarding the spirituality of the nomistic element within the "continuing" Hasidim.

Nomistic Pharisaism. — With the somewhat parallel evidence from Qumran, it now seems more probable than ever before that the religion of a nomistic Pharisee was truly spiritual and noble. While he insisted that faith was whole-hearted trust in God and fidelity to His instruction, his emphasis, as opposed to the legalist, was upon God and trust in Him. He agreed that "God demands obedience," but likewise insisted that such was "only as the proof and expression of something else; the intimate personal attitude of trust and love."⁹⁴ And yet he did not forget for a moment that such faith "is of value only in so far as it is productive of faithful action."⁹⁵ Thus 'emunah' was both "trust in" and "fidelity to"; reliance and faithfulness.⁹⁶ The emphasis must always be upon the former, though without negating the importance of the latter. In this he was a true child of Old Testament piety. Through his endeavor "to make a hedge about the Torah," to create as it were "applied prophecy" so that a man might be saved from transgression before it was too late,⁹⁷ the nomistic spirituality was probably often hidden under a mass of legislation. From our Christian viewpoint, we cannot but disagree with their methods and means. The taut and precise ordinances still first met the eye of the worshipper. But behind the chancel-rails glowed the Shekinah. We see it in comparing the legislative writings with the psalms and hymns at Qumran, and there is no reason to doubt a similar phenomenon in Pharisaism.

The Tension between Christianity and Judaism

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 nomism, 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 conversion 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 Esreh⁹⁸ through the whole body of Talmudic literature,⁹⁹ the theme of recalled promise and anticipation is present. The cry "What delays it?" is neither accidental nor incidental in the Talmud.¹⁰⁰ The Targums¹⁰¹ and non-canonical literature¹⁰² but underline the longing of Judaism. And the Qumran community lived solely for the Messianic consummation.¹⁰³ Here was the real tension of pre-destruction Hebraic Judaism.

W. F. Lofthouse has well characterized nomistic Judaism as well as the Religion of Israel in saying: "The religion of every part of the Old Testament is the religion of promise . . . When the Hebrew . . . looks within his own heart he knows the blessedness of trust in Jahweh; but fightings are without as fears are within; it is when he awakes that he will be satisfied."¹⁰⁴ Christians have awakened to life in Christ Jesus.

FOOTNOTES

1. E. Schurer, *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, Div. II, Vol. II, p. 91.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 120.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 124.
4. E. g. R. H. Charles, *Ap. and Ps. of the O. T.*, Vol. II, p. 786; J. S. Stewart, *A Man in Christ*, pp. 83-92; H. W. Robinson, "The Theology of the Old Testament: The Characteristic Doctrines," *Record and Revelation*, p. 348; E. Stauffer, *New Testament Theology*, pp. 92-93.
5. F. V. Filson, *St. Paul's Conception of Recompense*, p. 7. The statement of C. H. Dodd, that "the Pharisaic God was far practical purposes an Absentee" (*The Meaning of Paul for Today*, p. 37), is but another expression of this basic approach.
6. S. Schechter, *Studies in Judaism*, p. 173. On the whole, the works of Abrahams are more balanced and better presented, and therefore more convincing, than Schechter's.
7. R. T. Herford, *Pharisaism*, p. 2. Cf. the similar sentiments expressed in the works of such men as G. F. Moore and F. C. Burkitt.
8. 'Talmudic literature' is here meant in its broader aspect: the Mishnah, the Tosephta, the two Gemaras and the earlier Midrashim. It is used to include those codifications and writings from about 70 to 500 A.D. Thus the term excludes the earlier (probably) Targums and the later Kabbalistic and ethical writings. In its narrow sense, 'Talmud' refers to the Gemaras: Palestinian or Jerusalem of c. 400 A.D. and Babylonian of c. 500 A.D.
9. W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (2nd. ed.), p. 541; A. Schweitzer, *Paul and his Interpreters*, pp. 48-49. Schweitzer graphically says: "The picture which they draw for us shows only sun-scorched plain, but this yellow, wilted grass was green and fresh once. What did the meadows look like then?"
10. Cf. B. S. Easton, *Christ in the Gospels*, pp. 89-108; F. C. Burkitt, "What Christians Think of Jews," *Hibbert Journal*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 2 (Jan., 1930), pp. 267-269.
11. E. g., C. G. Montefiore, *Judaism and St. Paul*, pp. 14-15.
12. E. g., L. Finkelstein, "The Book of Jubilees and the Rabbinic Halaka," *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. XVI, No. 1 (Jan., 1923), p. 39; G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*, Vol. 1, pp. 71, 87, 172-173. Vol. III, p. 17.
13. G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, Vol. I, p. 131.
14. *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 22.
15. The debt to A. L. Williams, *Talmudic Judaism and Christianity*, pp. 38-43, is clearly evident in points 1, 2 and 4.
16. G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, Vol. I, p. 29; cf. Vol. III, pp. 6ff.
17. While it can never be proved, there seems no doubt that "the authorities in whose names statements are quoted are a help, if not an infallible index, to fixing their date" (L. Finkelstein, "The Book of Jubilees and the Rabbinic Halaka," *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. XVI, No. 1, Jan. 1923, p. 39).
18. G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, Vol. I, p. 157.
19. The Nash Papyrus, a small piece of papyrus containing the Decalogue and the Shema, has been variously dated from the second century A.D. back to the second century B.C. Of late, scholarship has tended to favor the latter half of the first century B.C. for its date (cf. H. H. Rowley, *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 13, for an excellent summary on the various dates assigned). The finding in the Wadi Murabbaat caves of a phylactery containing the three passages of Exod. 13:1-16, Deut. 11:13-21 and Deut. 6:4-9, and this in close conjunction with an apparent marriage contract dated in the seventh year of the reign of Hadrian (c. 124 A.D.), offers further evidence for the antiquity of this celebrated prayer (cf. Y. Yadin, *The Message of the Scrolls*, p. 70).

20. G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, Vol. I, p. 132.
21. Abrahams' sentiments could be just as fervently expressed by any religionist in favor of his own position: "Amidst the weeds of Pharisaism are flowers, amidst the Evangelic flowers are weeds. I cannot overcome my preference for the flowers, I am no gatherer of weeds" (*Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, p. vii).
22. E. g., P. P. Blaser cites as an example the fact that short passages in the Pentateuch regarding Sabbath rest (Exod. 16:23, 30; 31:12-17; 34:21; 35:1-3; Num. 15:32-36) are expanded to 39 articles and 1521 passages in the Mishnah (*Das Gesetz bei Paulus*, p. 39).
23. Pirke Aboth 3:19 (Mishnah).
24. Pirke Aboth 2:1a (Mishnah).
25. Cf. C. G. Montefiore and H. Loewe, *A Rabbinic Anthology*, pp. 202-232, for quotes and comments on what Montefiore has elsewhere called "the cheap doctrine of tit for tat and measure for measure" ("The Old Testament and Judaism," *Record and Revelation*, ed. H. W. Robinson, p. 447). All but one of the examples cited are later than our time of interest. Also note the many expressions of justification by works and laboring for reward attributed to R. Akiba and his disciples in Pirke Aboth (Mishnah) 2:16; 3:2, 3:16-17; 4:10-11.
26. Kiddushin 40b (Babylonian Talmud).
27. Pirke Aboth 2:14 (Mishnah).
28. Mk. 2:23-28 and par.; Mk. 3:1-5 and par.; Jn. 5; Jn. 9.
29. Cf. the latter part of 'The Prodigal Son.'
30. Matt. 3:7-9, though here it is also directed to the Sadducees, and in Lk. 3:7 to the whole multitude.
31. Matt. 12:33-37.
32. Matt. 5:20-6:18.
33. Mk. 7:1-23; Matt. 15:1-20.
34. Matt. 23:1-35; Lk. 11:39-44.
35. See Sotah 22b (Babylonian Talmud), Berakoth 9:14b (Jerusalem Talmud) and Sotah 5:20c (Jerusalem Talmud). Also H. Loewe, "Pharisaism," *Judaism and Christianity*, Vol. I, ed. W.O.E. Oesterley, p. 186, where a summary of passages is given in support of the thesis that "the Pharisees were just as prone as Jesus to blame ostentation in religion."
36. Life 56. Cf. Life 39.
37. In recounting the Jewish opposition to Alexander Jannaeus, Josephus says: "The nation of the Jews made an insurrection against him at a festival, for at those feasts seditions are generally begun" (War I. 4. 3).
38. War I. 5. 2.
39. Antiq. XVII. 2. Hf.
40. Antiq. XVII. 2. 4.
41. Antiq. XII. 9. 1.
42. Note Kiddushin 40a (Babylonian Talmud): "Evil intention is not combined with deed"; which I. Epstein explains as: "There is no punishment for mere intention" (*The Babylonian Talmud*, Soncino, Seder Nashim VIII, p. 198, n. 14). Cf. Peah 1:1 (Jerusalem Talmud).
43. E. g. Z. H. Chajes, *The Student's Guide through the Talmud*, p. 169.
44. Antiq. IV. 8. 33.
45. Pirke Aboth 1:3 (Mishnah).
46. Hillel: "He that makes worldly use of the crown (i.e. the Torah) shall perish" (Pirke Aboth 1:13, 4:5); Zadok: "Make them (i.e. the words of the Law) not a crown wherewith to magnify thyself or a spade wherewith to dig" (Pirke Aboth 4:5); Johanan: "If thou hast wrought much in the Law claim not merit for thyself, for to this end wast thou created" (Pirke Aboth 2:8). Cf. D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 295, regarding the date of Zadok. Also see Abodah Zarah 19a (Babylonian Talmud), where Antigonous' admonition is repeated in later literature, and Exodus Rabbah 30:24, where merit is de-emphasized.
47. Numbers Rabbah 19:8 on Num. 19:2. Cf. D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 107.
48. Pirke Aboth 2:9. Cf. Shabbath 63a (Babylonian Talmud) and Berakoth 6a, 13a, and 20 (Babylonian Talmud), where, in the literature of a later time, intent is stressed as the basis of all action and that which God judges.
49. The first words of The Shemoneh Esreh are regarding the Person and majesty of God, the first activity cited is that of His graciousness, while it is not until Benediction #5 that there is mention of service on the part of man. For a translation of the Benedictions, see E. Schurer, *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, Div. II, Vol. II, pp. 85-87.
50. The listing of the 613 commandments begins: (1) "To know that the Lord God exists"; (2) "To acknowledge His unity"; (3) "To love Him"; (4) "To fear Him." Though the list was finally compiled by Maimonides, there is reason to believe that its roots are very ancient. See I. Broyde, "The 613 Commandments," *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. IV, pp. 181-186, for Tannaitic and Palestinian Amoraic testimony to its antiquity and for a listing of the commandments.
51. In New Testament times "it is possible that many experts even then considered the verse 'I am the Lord, which have brought thee out of the house of bondage' to be one of the ten portions forming the whole" (D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 249). Cf. Makkoth 24a (Babylonian Talmud). If this be true, then the ten laws began with: (1) a declaration of the Person of God, and (2) an expression of God's gracious activity. Only then followed commands to obedience. This same emphasis on beginning with God and His mercy is continued in the later writings; e.g., Berakoth 2:2 (Mishnah), where Deut. 6:4-9 is so interpreted; and Berakoth 63a (Babylonian Talmud), where a similar stress is found by the Rabbis in Prov. 3:6.
52. See N. N. Clutzer, "Hillel the Elder in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl, pp. 233-234, for an excellent treatment of Hillel on this point and a bringing together of the many Talmudic references.
53. Here is where Hillel and the Essenes came the closest to one another. The affinity is most easily explained by a common foundation in the Maccabean Hasidim.
54. Aboth de R. Nathan I. 4.
55. Sotah 31a: "It has been taught: R. Meir says: It is declared of Job 'one that feared God,' and it is declared of Abraham 'thou fearest God'; just as 'fearing God' with Abraham indicates love, so 'fearing God' with Job indicates from love. Whence, however, have we it in connection with Abraham himself [that he was motivated by love?]. As it is written, 'The seed of Abraham who loved me.'" The passage then goes on to contrast the motivation of love with that of fear; and concludes that while both engender righteousness, the motivation of love is greater.
56. Shabbath 88b: "Our Rabbis taught: Those who are insulted but do not insult, hear themselves reviled without answering, act through love and rejoice in suffering, of them the Writ saith, 'But they who love Him are as the sun when he goeth forth in his might'."
57. W. Bacher, "Hillel," *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. VI, p. 398.
58. Hillel's famous statements are: (1) "What is hateful to thee, do not unto thy fellow man: this the whole Law; the rest is mere commentary" (Shabbath 31a, Babylonian Talmud); (2) "Be of the disciples of Aaron, loving

- peace and pursuing peace, loving mankind and bringing them nigh to the Law" (Pirke Aboth 1:12, Mishnah); and (3) "Trust not in thyself until the day of thy death, and judge not thy fellow until thou art come to his place" (Pirke Aboth 2:5, Mishnah).
58. Pirke Aboth 2:10 (Mishnah): "R. Eliezer said: Let the honour of thy fellow be dear to thee as thine own."
59. Letter of Aristes 207: "As you wish that no evil should befall you, . . . so you should act on the same principle towards your subjects and offenders."
60. Mk. 12:28-34.
61. Note the cases of the certain Pharisees who warn Him to flee (Lk. 13:31), Joseph of Arimathea (Mk. 15:43), Nicodemus (Jn. 3:1, 19:39), and possibly the chief Pharisee who had Jesus to dinner (Lk. 14:1).
62. Antiq. XIII. 15. 5.
63. A. L. Williams' phraseology, *Talmudic Judaism and Christianity*, p. 32.
64. S. Schechter, *Studies in Judaism*, p. 240. Schechter continues: "The greatest fault to be found with those who wrote down such passages as appear objectionable to us is, perhaps, that they did not observe the wise rule of Johnson, who said to Boswell on a certain occasion, 'Let us get serious, for there comes a fool'."
- C. G. Montefiore, *A Rabbinic Anthology*, p. xvi, mentally resurrects a jovial ancient Rabbi and creates his apology as follows: "As you know, we Rabbis in those days loved to argue with one another. We liked to use the words of Holy Scripture to prove our various assertions, as they chanced to crop up in our minds. If one of us said A, the other loved to say B. It was such fun. We had not so many outlets for fun in those days. But you must not take our differing and differing sayings so seriously. We never thought of them like that. They were just the outcome of the moment, and we did so enjoy the arguing."
- On pain of being classed a humorless fool, this author cannot believe that the Rabbis ever "thought of them like that." It is true that there are light touches in the Talmud, but the work is a basically serious one. And it was meant to be taken seriously. Akiba was certainly not jesting regarding jesting when he said: "Jesting and levity acustom a man to lewdness" (Pirke Aboth 3:14, Mishnah).
65. J. Z. Lauterbach, "Nomism," *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. IX, p. 328.
66. E.g., G. F. Moore, R. T. Herford, A. L. Williams.
67. A. L. Williams, *Talmudic Judaism and Christianity*, p. 53.
68. J. Parkes: "The motive for obedience to Torah could only be love towards God who had given it. But a Jew could at the same time believe that a righteous God would be pleased by such obedience to His own commands, and that it would win His favour" (*Jesus, Paul and the Jews*, p. 70).
69. W. L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*, p. 98. Wm. Barclay has said: "When Paul laid such stress on grace, he set out on a road of thought which was quite strange to the orthodox Jewish teaching of his day. It is true that in its highest and most devotional moments Jewish religion did rest in the mercy of God and in nothing else . . . But that is not representative of the teaching of the orthodox Rabbis in the days of Paul" (*The Mind of St. Paul*, pp. 155-156). Cf. also H. St. John Thackeray, *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, p. 85; R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, Vol. I, p. 314; E. Stauffer, *New Testament Theology*, pp. 35-36.
70. A. Deissmann, *Paul*, pp. 117-118; cf. *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*, pp. 195ff.
71. Sotah 22b (Babylonian Talmud).
72. Leviticus Rabbah 34:3: "A man of mercy benefits himself (Prov. 11:17) — this refers to Hillel the Elder."
73. Pirke Aboth 2:9 (Mishnah).
74. Pirke Aboth 2:10b (Mishnah): "Warm thyself before the fire of the Sages, but be heedful of their glowing coals lest thou be burned, for their bite is the bite of a jackal and their sting the sting of a scorpion and their hiss the hiss of a serpent, and all their words are like coals of fire." Sotah 3:4 (Mishnah) speaks in the same breath of "a woman that is a hypocrite and the wounds of the Pharisees."
75. Jn. 5:42.
76. The endeavor to disassociate the scribes from the Pharisees and to attribute the opposition to Jesus and the desire for His death only to Sadducean scribes (e.g., J. Bowman, "The Pharisees," *The Evangelical Quarterly*, Vol. XX, No. 1, April 1948, p. 133) is not convincing. The penetrating analysis of Pharisees and Sadducees of L. Finkelstein, "The Pharisees: Their Origin and Their Philosophy," *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. XXII, No. 3 (July, 1929), pp. 185-261, well substantiates his opinion that "almost all of the scribes were of the Pharisaic persuasion" (p. 215). Cf. also G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, Vol. I, p. 66.
77. Lk. 13:31; Mk. 15:43 and par.; Jn. 3:1ff. and 19:39; Lk. 14:1.
78. Antiq. XIII. 15. 5.
79. The terms 'legalism' and 'nomism' are certainly synonymous in their primary and strict meanings; and are often so used interchangeably. And yet there is both a denotation and a connotation, an explication and a secondary meaning, to the terms. The primary meaning of both refers to the control of life in conformity to a rule or standard. But a secondary idea has arisen suggesting only a formal arrangement of the external aspects of life in order to gain righteousness and/or appear righteous. It is therefore necessary to distinguish between the denotation and the connotation. And this we are endeavoring to do by allowing the term 'nomism' to refer solely to the primary meaning and 'legalism' to refer to the secondary idea.
80. Josephus spoke for the whole of Judaism in saying: "We think it to be the most necessary business of our whole life to observe the laws that have been given us, and to keep those rules of piety that have been delivered down to us" (Contra Apion, I. 12). But within this unanimity, the concluding words of R. Safra's prayer are significant: "May it be Thy will, O Lord our God, to establish peace . . . among the disciples who occupy themselves with Thy Torah whether for its own sake or for other motives; and may it please Thee that all who do so for other motives may come to study it for its own sake!" (Berakoth 17a, Babylonian Talmud).
81. Cf. E. Schurcr, *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, Div. II, Vol. I, pp. 51-56; though, of course, many Jews insist that such an emphasis began with Ezra (cf. A. Cohen, *Everyman's Talmud*, p. xvii).
82. Cf. C. H. Dodd, *History and the Gospel*, p. 130.
83. The Jewish insistence is that Christian investigators have closed their eyes to the fact that "the constant reminder of God's presence such as the precepts supply can not fail to have a beneficial influence upon man's morality" (M. Friedlander, *The Jewish Religion*, p. 234).
84. E.g., W. H. P. Hatch: "Indeed, fidelity to the divine law was the fundamental principle of Jewish religion, and hence Judaism stands forth as a leading representative of the legalistic type of religion" (*The Pauline Idea of Faith*, p. 14).
85. E.g., C. H. Dodd: "A legal religion lays all the emphasis on what a man does, or wills to do. The power of the will, the self-assertive element in us, is brought into the foreground. In direct contrast to this is the religion which says that not what we do, but what God does, is the root of the matter" (*The Meaning of Paul for Today*, p. 122).
86. War II. 8. 9: "They are stricter than any other of the Jews."
87. IQH (The Psalms of Thanksgiving) and the closing psalm of IQS (The Manual of Discipline), columns 10 and 11, are especially full of this theme; but traces are also found in other parts of this literature. The most obvious examples are: IQH 10:16, 11:18-19; IQS 11:2-5, 13b-15, 17.
88. Cf. IQS 3:4-12, where the prerequisites to walking blamelessly in the commandments (10-11), being acceptable before God (11), and becoming accepted by the sect (12), are not "by mere ceremonies of atonement" or washings, sanctifications and purifications, but, rather, a spiritual apprehension of God's truth (6-7), the working of God's Holy Spirit (6-7), and an attitude of uprightness, humility and submission (8). Likewise, IQS 5:13 insists that ritual washings will not gain one the purity of a holy man, "for men cannot be purified except they repent their evil" (T. H. Gaster's trans., *The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect*). The whole attitude of the Essenes toward the polluted sacrifices at Jerusalem and the relationship of sacrifice to the spiritual life is further evidence at this point; cf. J. M. Baumgarten, "Sacrifice and Worship Among the Jewish Sectarians of the Dead Sea (Qumran) Scrolls," *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. XLVI, No. 3 (July, 1953), pp. 141-159, and F. M. Cross, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, pp. 74-77.
89. Cf. M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 263-264. J. T. Milik says: "They realized . . . man's congenital inability to carry out his part in God's plan of salvation" (*Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, p. 120).
90. In the opening words of IQS (1:2), and before the command to obedience, there are the words "to seek God . . ." followed by a lacuna. The command "to seek God" is undoubtedly taken from II Chron. 15:12 (cf. W. H. Brownlee, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline," *B.A.S.O.R. - S.S.*, Nos. 10-12, p. 7, n. 5), where, likewise, a covenant is entered into. Thus, whatever the lacuna in the text really be, the meaning of the phrase in Chron. 15:12 was probably included in the verb 'darash'; i.e. "to seek God . . . with all their heart and with all their soul."
91. W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit," *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl, pp. 180-181.
92. The extent of Essene influence in Palestine is very uncertain (cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes*, pp. 147-148, for the extreme view that they had a great impact upon contemporary thought, and T. H. Gaster, *The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect*, pp. 44 and 110, n. 25, for an expression of the more moderate opinion of the majority of scholars). At any rate, Josephus clearly tells us that they were dispersed into every city (War II. 8. 4), and the Damascus Document provides for such urban members in 12:19-22. The fact that there were laws designated for the camps implies that there were Essenes not living in camps; see The Damascus Document 7:6, 12:22, 13:20, 14:3. There is even the intriguing suggestion made by N. N. Glotzer, "Hillel the Elder in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl, pp. 242-243, that there was personal contact between Hillel and the Essenes; a contact established through Hillel's continued friendship with Menahem, who preceded Shammai as a leading Pharisaic teacher but who later separated to become (possibly) the Essene Menahem.
93. H. Lietzmann, *The Beginnings of the Christian Church*, spoke of the Pharisees (pp. 36-37) and the Essenes (pp. 40-41) as two shoots from the same Hasidic root. For excellent discussions advocating this position, see: J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, pp. 59, 80-81, 87-90. F. M. Cross, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, p. 107, n. 66; C. H. Dodd, *History and the Gospel*, pp. 117-118.
94. W. F. Lofthouse, "The Old Testament and Christianity," *Record and Revelation*, ed. H. W. Robinson, p. 473-474.
95. I. Epstein, *The Babylonian Talmud* (Soncino), Seder Zerecim, Vol. I, p. xv.
96. Cf. IQHab. (Habakkuk Commentary) 2:4, where the Essene definition of faith is to fear God and do His will, and the adjunct to IQS (entitled "A Formulary of Blessings" by Gaster), where the definition of a righteous man is one who fears God and does His will. Acceptance in the community meant trust in the mission and message of the teacher and fidelity to his instruction.
97. R. T. Herford is quite correct in emphasizing this motivation if we apply it to the nomistic element of Pharisaism (*Pharisaism*, pp. 26-27, 64-65; "The Law and Pharisaism," *Judaism and Christianity*, Vol. III, ed. E.I.J. Rosenthal, pp. 108-109); though, again, it is not entirely correct for legalistic Pharisaism.
98. Benedictions Nos. 14 and 15.
99. See H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*, Vol. I, pp. 6-11, on Matt. 1:1b, "Christus," and Vol. IV, "Exkurs 29," pp. 799-976. Also K. Kohler, "Eschatology," *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. V, pp. 209-218; M. Bittenwieser, "Messiah," *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. VIII, pp. 510-511; J. Klausner, *The Messianic Idea in Israel*, p. 396.
100. See Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, Vol. II, p. 589 on Acts 1:7.
101. See S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, pp. 282-284, which section begins: "In particular, the Targums provide evidence of the important place given to the Messianic idea in leading religious circles," and then goes on to cite many references.
102. See M. Bittenwieser, "Messiah," *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. VIII, p. 508, for extensive citation.
103. K. Stendahl puts it quite simply: "The sect is an anticipation" (*The Scrolls and the New Testament*, p. 10).
104. W. F. Lofthouse, "The Old Testament and Christianity," *Record and Revelation*, ed. H. W. Robinson, p. 460.

Wheaton College
Wheaton, Illinois