

2-1-1956

Intertestamental Studies 1946-1955

Raymond F. Surburg
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm>



Part of the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Surburg, Raymond F. (1956) "Intertestamental Studies 1946-1955," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 27, Article 9.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol27/iss1/9>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

Intertestamental Studies 1946—1955

By RAYMOND F. SURBURG

MODERN Biblical studies stress the importance of an acquaintance with the era between the Testaments as a necessary aid in understanding the New Testament. It is the time span from the Medo-Persian to the Roman period. Between these two epochs is the Grecian period. During these four centuries the seat of world empire moved from the East to the West, from Asia to Europe. These years witnessed the rise of cities with Greek names in Palestine and gave us the translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek. It was in the Grecian period that the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes arose and that the Sanhedrin came into being. At the beginning of this epoch the temple of Zerubbabel was the center of worship, but in the days of Jesus the temple of Herod had replaced it. Synagogs, so prominent in the New Testament, had their origin in intertestamental times. The fourteen Apocrypha are in part the products of these years. The two Maccabees, the Wisdom of Solomon, and Ecclesiasticus are of great literary, historical, and religious importance, and their study should not be neglected by Biblical students. In this period God prepared the world for "the fullness of the time," when the Messiah would come in the person of Jesus of Nazareth.

This paper purposes to deal with some of the more important studies in the intertestamental field that have appeared since 1946. Its point of departure are the studies "Intertestamental Studies Since Charles's *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*" (J. Coert Rylaarsdam), "The Future of Intertestamental Studies" (Ralph Marcus), and "Current Progress and Problems in Septuagint Research" (Harry Orlinsky), published by the Chicago Society for Biblical Research in *The Bible Today and Tomorrow*.¹

I

APOCRYPHA, PSEUDEPIGRAPHIA, APOCALYPSES

Students of the intertestamental period have recently been placed under great indebtedness to Robert Pfeiffer for his monumental *History of New Testament Times with an Introduction*

to the *Apocrypha*.² This volume meets a great need, for it is now more than sixty years since the appearance of Emil Schuerer's *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* (1885 to 1891) and nearly a half century since the last German edition appeared (1901—1911). Pfeiffer's work is characterized by the same monumental proportions, the same encyclopedic learning, and the same clarity and incisiveness of expression that characterized his *Introduction to the Old Testament*.³ With rare skill and competence he draws on history, literature, philosophy, theology, and indispensable kindred disciplines. For example, the discussion of Hellenism, Hellenistic literature, science, scholarship, philosophy, and religion (pp. 93—165) are treated with an ease and sure-footed mastery that make this section one of the most fascinating as well as one of the most rewarding of the book. The myth of Osiris, the cults of Serapis and Isis, the Greek hymns, and Mithraism are admirably described. The Pseudepigrapha receive relatively slight attention, and apocalyptic thought, it would seem, is given less consideration than it deserves. The material, however, that is presented concerning the Pseudepigrapha is indispensable to their proper understanding. A comparison of Pfeiffer's work with Charles's *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*⁴ indicates that Pfeiffer was not influenced by Charles's extreme views on the composite nature of these books. In the opinion of Professor Muilenberg, Pfeiffer's view is in this respect much more satisfactory than the view of Charles.⁵ The student will find material and subjects in Schuerer that are absent or not treated as thoroughly in Pfeiffer's book. On the other hand, Pfeiffer offers much that Schuerer does not have. Above all, he brings the discussion up to date. Anyone who wishes to become well acquainted with the period from 200 B. C. to A. D. 200 cannot afford to leave this book unread and unstudied.

Pfeiffer also contributed "The Literature and Religion of the Apocrypha" and "The Literature and Religion of the Pseudepigrapha" to Volume I of *The Interpreter's Bible*.⁶

The last ten years have also witnessed the publication of separate volumes of the Apocrypha. Heretofore the English reader was limited almost entirely to the classical treatment by Charles.

To remedy this situation, Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning in Philadelphia is sponsoring the publication of the series *Jewish Apocryphal Literature*.⁷ Thus far *First and Second Maccabees* (Vols. 1 and 4 of the series, 1950 and 1954) by Solomon Zeitlin and Sidney Tedesche, *Aristeas to Philocrates* (Vol. 2, 1951), and *Third and Fourth Books of the Maccabees* (Vol. 3, 1953), both by Moses Hadas of Columbia University, have been issued. Two European scholars have also published commentaries on the books of the Maccabees. J. C. Dancy, a British scholar, issued a commentary on *First Maccabees*.⁸ Unlike Zeitlin and Tedesche, Dancy has given his own interpretation of the recorded events, correcting the biased point of view of the original author. According to Dancy, Antiochus Epiphanes is not a persecutor, but a sincere Hellenist who found himself in a difficult situation. The other European scholar, Father R. P. F. Abel, author of the standard two-volume *Geographie de la Palestine*, published *Les Livres des Maccabees* in 1949.⁹ A comparison of Zeitlin and Abel will reveal differences merely in the French translation, which is almost identical with the translation of the Dropsie College edition. First Maccabees, originally written in Hebrew, is extant only in a Greek translation. In many instances the translator apparently either misread or misunderstood the Hebrew. Abel, according to Zeitlin, has shown remarkable insight in restoring the original Hebrew reading.

Recent volumes of *Herders Bibelkommentar*, a Roman Catholic commentary, are devoted to the apocryphal books Tobit, Judith, and Baruch.¹⁰ Brückers, one of the contributors, concedes that Tobit and Judith are based on an historical nucleus, though many embellishments are added by the original writers. This view coincides with the opinion of Robert who contends that "Tobias is an historical account, the basic facts of which were developed and embellished by a long tradition" and that the Book of Judith "has picked up an historical tradition of this time and has presented it rather freely."¹¹ The discovery among the Qumran Scrolls of Hebrew and Aramaic fragments of Tobit is certain to stimulate a renewed interest in this book, which may result in satisfactory solutions of some of its many difficulties.

W. K. L. Clarke's one-volume *Concise Bible Commentary* (Macmillan, 1953) has an entire section devoted to the Apocrypha. In addition to an article of introduction each book is treated separately.

Norman Johnson wrote *Prayer in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Study of the Jewish Concept of God* (Volume II of *The Journal of Biblical Literature Series*).¹² A review of the aims, inducements, and responses connected with the prayers of the intertestamental period reveals some confusion and inconsistency in Jewish thought concerning God. There is, however, unanimity on certain basic tenets, such as the omnipotence of God.

George Foot Moore's *Judaism* appeared in 1927, and his view on Jewish apocalypses has been widely accepted by Christian scholars. He contends that they are to be considered only as "extraneous sources" for normative Judaism and that "it is a fallacy of method for the historian to make them a primary source for the eschatology of Judaism, much more to contaminate its theology with them." In *A Commentary on the Palestinian Talmud* (1941) Louis Ginzberg confirms Moore's judgment. Joshua Block, in *On the Apocalyptic in Judaism* (*Jewish Quarterly Review Monograph Series*, No. II), re-examined the validity of this position.¹³ It is his conviction that although there is little, if any, conscious dependence on apocalyptic material in the rabbinic sources, he finds considerable evidence of apocalyptic ideas and even allusions and unconscious quotations from the literature taken up into the body of rabbinic and later Jewish Christian literature. Referring to the realm of angelology, demonology, eschatological schemes, the figure of the Messianic banquet, and the idea of a heavenly Book of Life, to enumerate just a few, Block contends that distinctive apocalyptic ideas are found in the main stream of Jewish sources. Three articles of the October 1948 issue of *Interpretation* treated the subject of apocalypticism.¹⁴ In his contribution E. F. Scott characterizes it as "the natural language of religion," asserting: "The literature in the Intertestamental period had almost completely disappeared, but much of it has been recovered, in whole or in part, within recent years, and most scholars are now agreed that it provides the key to a great deal that is perplexing in the Gospel message."¹⁵ Prof. John Wick Bowman, in *The Religion of Maturity*, the 1948

Abingdon-Cokesbury \$7,500 prize winner, lists apocalypticism as one of five religions through which the Jewish nation passed. He terms the religion of the apocalypticists as the religion of the throne. In Bowman's opinion the apocalyptic movement was sterile. He accuses it of being inherently other-worldly, pessimistic, ego-centric, esoteric, and divisive—the product of ethical defeatism and a superiority complex.¹⁶ The latest book to deal with this subject is the publication of S. B. Frost, *Old Testament Apocalyptic: Its Origin and Growth*.¹⁷

II

SEPTUAGINT STUDIES

The last decade has also produced some significant studies in the field of Septuagint research. Roberts has given probably the latest and most complete discussion of the relationship of the Septuagint to the Hebrew Old Testament text.¹⁸ He claims that it is a misconception to look upon the Septuagint simply as a storehouse for possible emendations, which only need be retranslated into Hebrew. In his opinion the versions, including the Septuagint, are corrupt. It is important that each reading in the Septuagint be scrutinized for its own possible historical development.¹⁹ The value of the Greek translation varies from book to book, from chapter to chapter, and sometimes from phrase to phrase. According to Orlinsky, "the Hebrew text used by the Septuagint translators and the Masoretic text are two recensions (critical revisions) of one original text tradition."²⁰ Students of the Septuagint are frequently at a loss which reading to adopt when they note the textual divergencies found in the four major editions in use today (Swete, Rahlfs, Cambridge, and Göttingen). The first three depend largely upon the *Codex Vaticanus*, while the last is an eclectic text. Of *Codex Vaticanus*, Roberts asserts: "The more we learn of the characteristics of the codex, the less likely does it appear to be a faithful reproduction of the earliest Septuagint text-form."²¹

The Letter of Aristeas (ca. 110 B. C.) purports to be an account of the way in which the Old Testament was translated into Greek by seventy-two learned elders from Palestine for the library of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285—247 B. C.). A new translation and a discussion of this letter was published by Hadas of Columbia

University.²² He believes that Aristeas is a pseudonym and that the author was a Jew, thoroughly Hellenized, but faithful to his religion. It was the purpose of the Letter to Aristeas to demonstrate the high antiquity and respectability of Judaism and to enhance the position of the Jews in their Hellenistic environment. The value of the Letter of Aristeas is that in it the term Pentateuch was first applied to the five books of Moses. Orlinsky has revived the view that the extension of the name Pentateuch to include the entire Greek Bible took place in Judea because of some popular association with the "seventy elders" mentioned in Ex. 24:1, 9, or with the Sanhedrin of Seventy, or in Christian circles in connection with seventy disciples of Jesus, Luke 10:1.²³

In the Schweich Lectures for 1947 Kahle took the position that there were two earlier Greek translations of the Pentateuch.²⁴ A revision was made in the time of Philadelphus, which then was considered the standard Greek text of the Pentateuch. Kahle further contends that there never existed one archetype text of the Greek Old Testament as held by many Septuagint scholars. He believed that when the Christian Church needed one canonical text, the church chose one from a number of variants and revised it.

This view is opposed to that of Paul de Lagarde, who according to Gehman "saw the problems involved and the correct methodology for recovering the text of the original LXX."²⁵ The Jewish scholar Max Leopold Margolis employed the Lagardian principles in attempting a reconstruction of the Septuagint in his *The Book of Joshua in Greek* (1931). J. Montgomery successfully applied the methods of Lagarde in his commentary on the Book of Kings.²⁶ The principles followed by Lagarde and Rahlfs in their Septuagint studies were recently defended by P. Katz in two articles.²⁷

Although the Septuagint is considered by many scholars a representative of a pre-Masoretic Hebrew text and therefore a valuable textual aid, American scholars have emphasized the necessity of observing the methods of translation employed by the Septuagint translators. Often in the same chapter an extreme literalism is found next to a free translation. Definite exegetical and theological principles influenced the translators. In many instances, e.g., certain expressions used of God, deemed offensive or crude,

were toned down, and anthropomorphisms were eliminated. Sometimes this was accomplished by employing the device of playing with Hebrew roots. Nevertheless the studies of Gehman,²⁸ Gard,²⁹ and Wevers³⁰ have disclosed that the translators did not set out to rewrite the original, and while their exegetical principles do show a certain theological tendency, they did not apply them consistently.

The publishers of the Göttingen edition of the Septuagint, provided with an extensive critical apparatus, have in recent years released two additional parts, both by J. Ziegler: Vol. XVI, 1: *Ezekiel* (1952) and Vol. XVI, 2: *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco* (1954).

A new periodical, published by Brill in Leyden and known as *Vetus Testamentum*, has been appearing since 1951. Some articles of this magazine deal with the Greek Old Testament. Gehman has contributed two that treat of the linguistic aspect of the Septuagint.³¹

III

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND THE ESSENES

During the last decade students of intertestamental studies have been presented with important documents in the form of scrolls and fragments found in caves near the Wady Qumran, in the vicinity of the Dead Sea,³² and in the region of Wady Murabba'at,³³ located to the south of Qumran. Nine caves in this area have yielded signal finds of leather and papyrus documents. Of these caves the most important are Caves One and Four, the latter producing the most significant material.

The first group of Dead Sea Scrolls, or Qumran Scrolls, as they are now called, comprises a collection of 11 or 12 rolls of ancient manuscripts, discovered in the spring of 1947. When first found they were described as being of revolutionary importance for Biblical and related studies. The scrolls are all from the second and first centuries B.C. with the possible exception of the Holiness Code, which may be earlier.³⁴ The Qumran manuscripts are important for the fields of textual criticism, the interpretation of the Old Testament, paleography, archaeology, the intertestamental and New Testament periods.

The contents of Cave One from Qumran, including the excavated material of 1949, have now been published. The great Isaiah scroll (1Q Isa^a), the Essene *Manual of Discipline*, and the *Commentary of Habakkuk* were published by the American Schools of Oriental Research.³⁵ The materials of Cave One, acquired by the Hebrew University in new Jerusalem, were published in 1954 under the Hebrew title: *Oscar ham-Megillot hag-Genuzot* (Library of Hidden Rolls).³⁶ Those of Cave One, belonging to the Jordan government, have been made available by D. Barthelmy and J. Milik in *Discoveries in the Judean Desert*.³⁷ They contain Biblical books, two important missing columns of the *Manual of Discipline*, other sectarian works, and assorted apocryphal and pseudepigraphical material.

With the excavation of the Wady Murabba'at caves, another series of discoveries was initiated. Unlike the Qumran discoveries, the scope of these finds is from the seventh century B. C. to the second century B. C. Those coming from the second pre-Christian century are Hebrew and Greek Biblical manuscripts.³⁸

The newly found documents shed light on an ascetic and apocalyptic sect within Judaism, which is said to have had its origin in the pious party of the Hasidim of the period of national revival in the second century B. C. As a separatist party of Judaism it appears in the early Hasmonean period. Pliny reports such a community in the vicinity of the Dead Sea between Jericho and Ain Geddi. Both Philo and Josephus were impressed by this sect, called Essenes. They had cells in many of the villages of Judah and maintained a center in the desert south of Jericho, as archaeological diggings of the last four seasons have shown. Their communal life lasted till the destruction of Jerusalem A. D. 70. After the Jewish revolt of A. D. 67—70 they disappeared. They were either assimilated with Christian communities or destroyed by the Romans.

With the discovery of the *Habakkuk Commentary* and the *Manual of Discipline*, the history and beliefs of the Essenes can be studied in a manner not heretofore possible. The Qumran Scrolls have helped to establish the fact that two fragmentary manuscripts found in the old synagogue in Cairo, generally known as the Zadokite or Damascus Covenant, come from the same sect

as the documents found in the caves near the Dead Sea.³⁹ In addition, many new historical commentaries, along with several copies of Zadokite and sectarian documents, have been found in Cave Four. It is believed that the publication and the study of the latter materials will solve many disputed points. "In the meantime, however, scholars are sending up trial balloons, theoretical constructions and tentative interpretations, which properly belong to the early stages of scholarly investigation. Only after scholarly debate can tested and sound historical conclusions be established in so complex a field." ⁴⁰

One of the first scholars to interpret the new finds and relate them to the former knowledge of the Essenes was Dupont-Sommer, who set forth his views in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*⁴¹ and *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes*.⁴² According to this scholar, "The Teacher of Righteousness" of this sect lived in the days of the Hasmoneans, between 100 B.C. and the reign of Aristobulus II, 67—63 B.C., and died a martyr's death at the hands of this king. In an extraordinary fashion he was a prototype of the "Galilean Master" of the Christians. "The Teacher of Righteousness" taught the Essenes that the last days were imminent; he ordained his followers as the community of the New Covenant. In his teaching he stressed "repentance, poverty, humility, love of neighbor, and chastity." The meaning of the Law and the Prophets was disclosed by "the Teacher of Righteousness" to his flock. When he died, his followers believed that he would return as the Messiah. Dupont-Sommer even believed that the Suffering Servant passages of Isaiah were composed in his memory. According to this reconstruction, the *Habakkuk Commentary* is supposed to refer to a "resurrection appearance" of "the Teacher of Righteousness" which took place when Pompey conquered Jerusalem. Thus the death of the Essenes at the hands of Aristobulus was avenged.

Professor Frank M. Cross has subjected this thesis of Dupont-Sommer to severe scrutiny and has shown that the conclusions of the French scholar cannot be substantiated. He concludes: "In fine, the theories of Dupont-Sommer cannot stand up as the field of scroll studies progresses and as new documents are introduced into the discussion."⁴³ Other scholars are convinced that while the Essenes

had their origin prior to the reign of Alexander Jannaeus, it was especially during the latter's rule that the events occurred which gave the sect its definitive form.

The documents from the Judean wilderness also have some importance for the field of Biblical hermeneutics. Although some of the midrashim (Rabbinic commentaries) were committed to writing in the second and third centuries A.D., most of them come to us in written form from the fifth to the seventh centuries A.D. Scholars believe that the Rabbinical material in the Targumim sheds light on Jewish interpretation of the Law as it was prevalent in the first two pre-Christian centuries.

The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls gave access for the first time to Hebrew manuscripts from the first half of the first century B.C. Regarding them Brownlee writes: "These bear witness, not merely to the great importance attached to the study of Scriptures, but also to the technique of Biblical interpretation among the ancient Jews."^{43a} In the same article he discusses the importance of the Essene scrolls for Biblical interpretation and outlines the hermeneutical principles used in the Dead Sea *Habakkuk Commentary*.⁴⁴ In another contribution he demonstrates that the Damascus Document, found in the old synagogue in Cairo, and the Dead Sea Scrolls come from the same sect. It is Brownlee's conviction, however, that the sect with whom the Dead Sea Scrolls had their origin cannot be identified with the Therapeutae, whose religious views and practices were discussed by Philo in his tractate: "On the Contemplative Life."⁴⁵

The discoveries of Qumran have also raised new problems concerning the relationship of the Septuagint text to the Masoretic. Manuscripts found in Cave Four at Qumran revealed a text of Samuel which is widely at variance with that of the Masoretic text and agrees not infrequently with the text of the Old Greek of Samuel. Other historical books also favor the tradition of the Septuagint. Thus Cross asserts:

At least in these books it now becomes clear that the Septuagint's divergent text was due far less to "translation idiosyncrasies" than to the archaic form of text which it translated. In six fragments of the archaic Samuel, for example, the Septuagint is followed thirteen times when the Greek disagrees with the Massoretic tra-

dition against four cases when the Qumran text agrees with the Massoretic tradition against the Septuagint: three to one in favor of the Greek tradition. The question of which text is original is another question, to be decided in individual readings. The point is, however, that while we had previously only one clear line leading back toward the original text, we now have *three* converging lines: the Massoretic tradition, the Qumran tradition, and the Hebrew tradition underlying the Old Testament translation.⁴⁶

Intertestamental scholars are likewise of the opinion that the non-Biblical literature among the Dead Sea Scrolls will add to the knowledge of the religious thought and history of Judaism 200 years before Jesus' birth, shedding fresh light on the background of the New Testament. Cross devotes the last of his four articles dealing with the Dead Sea Scrolls, written for the *Christian Century*, to a listing and discussion of numerous parallels between the New Testament and the writings of the Essenes. Toward the end of this article he asserts:

The New Testament and Essene writers draw on common resources of language, common theological themes and concepts, and share common religious institutions. They breathe the same atmosphere, confront the same problems. We can now enter into this rich, variegated world of sectarian Judaism in the first century with new boldness and understanding; the strange world of the New Testament becomes less baffling, less exotic.⁴⁷

Lucetta Mowry has dealt specifically with the relationship of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Gospel of St. John, the author of which is supposed to have borrowed from a system of religious thought that has affinities with the Essene movement, radically altering, however, the ideas accepted by him.⁴⁸ According to Brownlee, the Qumran Scrolls validate the Fourth Gospel as an authentic source concerning John the Baptist. Brownlee says that John the Baptist was acquainted with the Essenes, probably spending his childhood in the wilderness in their care. "Almost every detail of the Baptist's teaching in both Synoptic and Fourth Gospels has points of contact with Essene belief, so that we are led not to place the Gospels in conflict and to choose between them, but to see them as fragmentary bits of information which are essentially supplemental in character."⁴⁹

IV

HELLENISTIC JUDAISM

What was the relationship of Judaism to the Hellenistic movement? Paul Liebermann of the Jewish Theological Seminary, New York City, dealt with this question in his book, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine: Studies in the Literary Transmissions, Beliefs, and Manners of Palestine in the First Century B. C. E. to IV Century C. E.*⁵⁰ Morton Smith has labeled Liebermann's study the most important investigation of Graeco-Roman Judaism to have appeared in years. This work musters much evidence to prove that Rabbinic literature shows considerable familiarity with Graeco-Roman customs and terminology. The body of the study endeavors to demonstrate the influence exerted by Graeco-Roman culture on the preservation and interpretation of the Old Testament and on the temple. To summarize briefly some of Liebermann's conclusions: The Soferim of the Persian and early Greek period produced a standard text of the Old Testament by comparing the manuscripts and following the readings of the majority. Of this text they produced an official copy and placed it in the temple. Their effort, however, was not recognized and appreciated by the people, who continued to employ a corrupt text. The Soferim, like the Alexandrian grammarians, made certain changes in the text, but because of their greater reverence for the material, they were more conservative than the Alexandrians. Later on the scribes came under the influence of Alexandria, as may be seen from the methods and terminology adopted from the Alexandrians. Haggadic methods of Scriptural interpretation show pagan influence in the adoption of the fantastic procedures of using the gematria and notarikon as hermeneutical devices. The names and terminology of interpretation testify to a strong Greek influence at some time around A. D. 100. Liebermann also claims that the old antithesis between diasporic and Palestinian Judaism was overstated in the past; in fact, it is actually misleading. Palestinian and Rabbinic Judaism was "involved in a continual give and take with Graeco-Roman culture."

It is forty-six years since Joseph Klausner's great *History of Israel* appeared in Odessa. He rewrote the second part of this

history and expanded it to three times its original size, so that now his *History of the Second Temple*, written in Hebrew, is complete in five volumes.⁵¹ It covers the period from the death of Josiah in 609 B.C. to the fall of Masada in A.D. 73. The presentation is not restricted to political history but covers social, religious, literary, and cultural developments. Sixty pages are devoted to Jesus and over forty pages to the Apostolic Church. This work embodies the results of nearly half a century of research.

Professor Baron has published the first two volumes of his revised and enlarged history of Judaism, which, when complete, will cover Jewish history from its beginnings with the patriarchs until the close of the Talmudic period, about A.D. 500. Baron contends that scholars in seeking the Jewish antecedents of the Christian Church ought to give more attention to Diaspora Judaism and the organization of its communities.⁵²

V

PHILO STUDIES

Rylaarsdam maintains that every fresh insight into the life and thought of Philo sheds light upon the entire intertestamental period. Ralph Marcus has contributed two additional volumes to the Philo edition of the Loeb Classical Library. They bear the title *Philo Supplement: Questions and Answers on Genesis and Exodus Translated from Ancient Armenian Sources*. This work of Philo is preserved only in Armenian and has become available for the first time in an English translation.

In 1948 Professor Wolfson of Harvard published a two-volume work on Philo with the subtitle: *Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*. The chief significance of this work lies in the positive presentation of Philo's system of thought. Wolfson did not undertake a detailed criticism of current interpretations of Philo, although the reader will have no difficulty in ascertaining his position. He asserts that Philo, by introducing into philosophy the principle of revelation as found in the Scriptures, was the first to give this principle systematic formulation. According to Wolfson, Philo was the founder of a new school of philosophy, and from "him it directly passes on to the Gospel of John and the Church Fathers, from whom it passes to Moslem

and hence also to Medieval Jewish philosophy, which continues uninterruptedly in its main assertions for well-nigh seventeen centuries, when at last it is openly challenged by Spinoza."⁵³ Wolfson further questions the generally accepted view that Philo was an eclectic philosopher, borrowing almost indiscriminately from Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics, and others in order to mediate the Jewish Scriptures to the Graeco-Roman world by means of allegory. Philo, he contends, was a philosopher in the grand manner, who controlled contemporary philosophy by his Scriptural principles.

VI

PALESTINIAN JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY

A number of studies have been published during the last decade that are concerned with Judaism, and particularly first-century Judaism. Professor Davies examined the Old Testament, the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and Rabbinical sources concerning the role that the Law was expected to play in the Messianic age.⁵⁴ Among other things the importance of the notions of covenant, Moses, and (new) Exodus in the eschatology of Judaism is stressed. Davies comes to the following conclusions: The Old Testament and Jewish writings portray a strong conviction that in the Messianic age the Torah would take a central place. Whether or not the Messiah was to bring a new Torah cannot definitely be ascertained. The position among Christians of a new Law in the Sermon on the Mount resulted in the formulation of counterclaims among the Jews. It is possible that the stress upon Law in later Judaic writings, at the expense of the idea of the covenant, is a reaction to the Christian appropriation of the idea of the covenant.

Morton Smith's thesis submitted for his doctorate at the University of Jerusalem dealt with parallels in Tannaitic literature and the Gospels.⁵⁵ In eight compact chapters Smith examines the "verbal parallels" of the two literatures, comparing the influence of Hebrew usage upon the Gospels and of Greek upon Tannaitic literature. Concerning Jesus, Smith asserts:

A likely inference would be that Jesus occupied in the minds of the authors of the Gospels much the same place as God and the Law occupied in the minds of the authors of Tannaitic literature. But to make such an inference would involve an act of historical

faith, for to pass from observable similarity of words to the hypothetical similarity of ideas which the words may have been meant to express is to pass from the knowable to the unknown.⁵⁶

On the basis of his study of the "parallels of idiom" Smith discusses the question of the authority of the Gospels. As a result of his examination of *κοινός* in Mark 7:2,5, he concludes that this passage shows "not the ignorance of the translator, but the author's technical accuracy in preserving the nice distinction of Pharisaic rules about cleanness of food—an accuracy which reflects the popular importance such rules acquired in Primitive Christianity."⁵⁷ In the light of this he takes issue with Torrey's Aramaic translation theory and argues the possibility that Jesus spoke Hebrew at least in discussions with the Pharisees or that the Gospels contain passages that go back to documents composed originally in Hebrew.⁵⁸

Volume II of Baron's *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, previously referred to in this paper, contains two chapters of interest to students of apostolic Christianity—"The Great Schism" and "The Closing of the Ranks." According to Baron, the schism, which separated Judaism from Christianity, was Paul's responsibility rather than that of Jesus. The earliest Christianity was a "purely eschatological Palestinian community." In this stage "the movement was hardly more than a sectarian current within Judaism, no more apart, for instance, than the Essenes."⁵⁹ Joseph Klausner's history of *The Messianic Ideal in Israel, From Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah*, written in Hebrew, has been translated by Stinespring.⁶⁰

Jesus is the subject of studies by a number of Jewish scholars. One of these studies is Morris Goldstein's *Jesus in Jewish Tradition*, in which a systematic historic account of the direct and indirect references to Jesus in Talmudic and post-Talmudic literature is presented.⁶¹ In the Tannaitic period (from Ezra the Scribe to A. D. 200) there are a few scant references to Jesus. Goldstein refutes the view of Herford and Laible that the "Balaam" and "Ben Stada" passages contain allusions to Jesus.^{61a} In the Tannaitic period, Jesus is referred to as "Ben Pantera," or "Ben Pandera." It is related that one Yeshu (Jesus) was hanged on the Eve of Passover. He was accused of sorcery and of leading Israel astray. Forty days were allowed between the date of accusation and the

time of hanging. He is said to have had five disciples. All of them are listed, but their names do not correspond to those mentioned in the Gospels. Yesu was supposed to have been a disciple of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Perahya, an uncle of Jesus. Mary, the mother of Jesus, and Mary Magdalene are also confused. The description of none of these characters corresponds to the Gospel accounts.

Another Hebrew scholar to deal with Jesus is Jacob Lauterbach, whose essay "Jesus in the Talmud,"⁶² is nearly one hundred pages in length. The third essay in *The Vanderbilt Studies in the Humanities*, Volume I, has as its theme: "Judaism, Jesus, and Paul: Some Problems in Scholarly Research." The author of this article, Professor Spear, believes that the center of gravity of New Testament studies needs shifting. For proper interpretation of the Gospels an understanding of the Graeco-Jewish writers, Philo, Aristaeus, and Aristobulus, together with the background of the Hellenism of the non-Jewish world, is essential.

A work which would aid the student in following Spear's suggestion is that edited by Louis Finkelstein: *The Jews: Their History, Culture and Religion*. The articles of special interest to students of the intertestamental period would be: "The Historical Foundations of Post-Biblical Judaism," by Elias J. Bickermann; "The Period of the Talmud (135 B.C.—1035)," by Judah Goldin, and "Hellenistic Jewish Literature," by Ralph Marcus.⁶³

The French Roman Catholic scholar Joseph Bonsirven has issued a collection of Rabbinical texts which help one to understand the materials of the New Testament.⁶⁴ The journal *Interpretation*, which had its inception in 1947, offered its readers two articles on the use of Rabbinic writings as implements of interpretation.⁶⁵ Concerning the use of Rabbinical writings, Bowman says: "The student should go to them, therefore, not for the refinements in interpretation of the text of Scripture, but rather for orientation to the Rabbinic viewpoint and for background materials against which to view the rise of the early Christian movement." In his article he lists a great many passages which he believes will furnish background for the understanding of Christianity.⁶⁶

Hugh Schonfield, a British Jew, authored a book about Paul the Apostle.⁶⁷ In contrast to Rabbi Klausner's books about Jesus and Paul,⁶⁸ Schonfield says that "Jesus is for me the Messiah" and

that Paul was very much the kind of Jew he is. By comparison with Klausner, Schonfield seems to approach Christianity, although he rejects the Trinity and several post-Pauline theological developments. While Klausner portrays Paul as going astray in terms of normative Judaism, Schonfield holds that Paul remained a good Jew to his end.

Another British book concerned with Paul is the one by George Knight, *From Jesus to Paul*.⁶⁹ This work endeavors to deal with the tragic breach between Judaism and Christianity and to give suggestions for healing it. Both Judaism and Christianity have a common world of life and faith and derive their sustenance from the same fountain, the Old Testament. According to Knight, the great error of Christianity was that it turned from its Hebrew heritage to that of the Greeks. Hellenism was responsible for falsifying the revelation the Christian Church received through Israel. He also discovers in the first Christian century the norm for authentic Judaism and authentic Christianity. Judaism and Christianity erred in forsaking the faith of this period.

The first volume of Father F. Abel's *History of Palestine* will prove to be invaluable for students of the intertestamental period. This portion of the Frenchman's work deals with the period from the conquest of Alexander the Great until the Jewish War.⁷⁰ The eminent Dominican savant has studied the history, archaeology, and topography of the period covering a thousand years between Alexander the Great and the Arab invasion, producing a work which will be the standard for years to come.

Seward, Nebr.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1947, pp. 32—51; 190—208; 144—161.
2. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949, 561 pages.
3. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941.
4. R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913).
5. James Muilenberg, "The Indispensable Account," *Interpretation*, IV (January 1949), 93.
6. New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952, pp. 391—436.
7. Published by Harper & Brothers.
8. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1954
9. Paris: Gabalda et Cie, 1949.

10. Herman Brückers, *Herders Bibelkommentar. Die Heilige Schrift für das Leben erklärt*. Tobias, Judith und Esther. (Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1953), Bd. IV, 2. Heinrich Schneider, *Das Buch Daniel. Das Buch Klage- lieder. Das Buch Baruch*. 1954. Bd. IX, 2.
11. A. Robert and A. Tricot, *Guide to the Bible* (New edition, revised and enlarged; English translation by E. P. Arbez and M. R. P. McGuire, Paris: Desclee & Co., 1951), I, 126—128.
12. Philadelphia: The Society for Biblical Literature, 1948.
13. Philadelphia: The Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1951.
14. H. H. Rowley, "The Voice of God in Apocalyptic," *Interpretation*, II (October 1948), 403—418; E. F. Scott, "The Natural Language of Religion," *ibid.*, pp. 419—429; R. Calkins, "Militant Message," *ibid.*, pp. 430 to 443.
15. Scott, *ibid.*, p. 419.
16. Cf. the review by Paul S. Minear, "The World and Its Fulfillment," *ibid.*, pp. 491—493.
17. London: The Epworth Press, 1954.
18. Bledodyn J. Roberts, *The Old Testament Text and Versions* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1951), pp. 101—119; 272—279.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 275.
20. H. M. Orlinsky, "The Septuagint, Its Use in Textual Criticism," *The Biblical Archaeologist*, IX (May 1946), 26.
21. Roberts, p. 274.
22. Moses Hadas, *Aristeas to Philocrates* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), 233 pages.
23. H. M. Orlinsky, *The Septuagint: The Oldest Translation of the Bible* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union Anniversary Series, 1945), p. 4.
24. P. E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (Oxford University Press, 1947).
25. Henry S. Gehman, "Septuagint," *Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1955), p. 1015.
26. J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), 571 pages.
27. P. Katz, "Das Problem des Urtextes der Septuaginta," *Theologische Zeitung*, V (1949), 1—24; *idem*, "Recovery of Original LXX: A Study in the History of Transmission and Text Criticism," in *Acts du Premier Congrès de la Fédération Internationale des Associations d'Etudes Classiques* (1951), pp. 165—182.
28. H. S. Gehman, "The Theological Approach to the Greek Translator of Job 1—15," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXVIII (1949), 231—240; *ibid.*, "Exegetical Methods Employed by the Greek Translator of 1 Samuel," *Journal of American Oriental Society*, LXX (1950), 292—296.
29. D. H. Gard, *The Exegetical Method of the Greek Translator of the Book of Job*, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Philadelphia, 1952.
30. J. W. Wevers, "Principles of Interpretation Guiding the Fourth Translator of the Book of the Kingdoms (3K 22:1—4 K 25:30)," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XIV (1952), 40—56.
31. H. S. Gehman, "The Hebraic Character of Septuagint Greek," *Vetus Testamentum*, I (1950), 81—90; *ibid.*, "Hebraisms of the Old Greek Version of Genesis," *Vetus Testamentum*, III (1953), 141—148.
32. Frank M. Cross, "The Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Christian Century*, LXXII (August 3, 1955), 890.

33. Ibid., p. 890.
34. W. Albright, in *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 115, October 1949, p. 19.
35. Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery* (New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950, 1951), 2 vols.
36. Jerusalem: The Bialik Foundation, 1954.
37. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954.
38. Frank M. Cross, "The Manuscripts of the Dead Sea Caves," *The Biblical Archaeologist*, XVII (February 1954), 17—21.
39. Floyd V. Filson, "Some Recent Study of the Scrolls," *The Biblical Archaeologist*, XIII (December 1950), 99.
40. Frank M. Cross, "The Essenes and Their Master," *The Christian Century*, LXXII (August 17, 1955), 944.
41. Trans. E. Margaret Rowley (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1952), 100 pages.
42. Trans. R. D. Barnett (London: Vallentine, Mitchell & Co., Ltd., 1954), 195 pages.
43. Frank M. Cross, "The Essenes," etc., p. 945.
- 43 a. "Biblical Interpretation Among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Biblical Archaeologist*, XIV (September 1951), 54.
44. Ibid., pp. 60—63.
45. W. H. Brownlee, "A Comparison of the Covenanters of the Dead Sea Scrolls with Pre-Christian Jewish Sects," *The Biblical Archaeologist*, XIII (September 1950), 66.
46. Frank M. Cross, "The Old Testament and the Scrolls," *The Christian Century*, LXXII (August 10, 1955), 921.
47. Frank M. Cross, "The Essenes," etc., p. 971.
48. Lucetta Mowry, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel of John," *The Biblical Archaeologist*, XVII (December 1954), 97.
49. W. H. Brownlee, "John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls," *Interpretation*, IX (January 1955), 89.
50. *Text and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, XVIII (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary, 5711—1950), 231 pages.
51. *Historiyah shel hab-Bayit hash-Sheni* (Jerusalem: Ahiasaph, 5709—11, 1949—1951), Vols. I—V.
52. *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, 2d ed., revised and enlarged, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952), Parts I, II.
53. H. A. Wolfson, *Philo, Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948), II, 457.
54. W. D. Davies, "Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come" (Philadelphia: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1952), 99 pages.
55. Philadelphia: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1951.
56. Ibid., p. 159.
57. Ibid., p. 32.
58. Ibid., p. 36.
59. Baron, II, 62, 63.
60. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955), 543 pages.
61. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950.

- 61 a. R. Travers Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1903); Heinrich Laible, *Jesus Christus im Talmud* (Leipzig, 1900).
62. Rabbinic Essays (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1951).
63. Harper and Brothers, 1949, I, 70—114; 118—215; II, 745—783.
64. Joseph Bonsirven, *Textes rabbiniques des deux premiers siècles chrétiens pour servir à l'intelligence du Nouveau Testament* (Roma: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1955), 804 pages.
65. E. W. Hammer, "The Onkelos Targum," *Interpretation*, III (April 1949), 174—183. John Wick Bowman, "The Rabbinic Writings," *Interpretation*, III (October 1949), 433—449.
66. *Ibid.*, pages 445—449.
67. *The Jew of Tarsus: An Unorthodox Portrait of Paul* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947), 255 pages.
68. *Jesus of Nazareth* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1925), 434 pages; *From Jesus to Paul* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1943), 624 pages.
69. *From Jesus to Paul* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949), 194 pages.
70. *Histoire de la Palestine*. Vol. I: *De la conquête d' Alexandre jusqu'à la guerre juive* (Paris: Gabalda, 1952), 505 pages.